

COMMITTEE:	COLLEGE COUNCIL
MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, November 19, 2014
LOC./TIME:	T-850, 2-4pm
ATTENDEES:	Lilia Celhay, Phyllis Carter, Rebecca Bailey, Lisa Cook, Irina Rivkin, Antoine Mehouelley, Louis Quindlen, Lilian Chow, James Blake, Carl Oliver, Kim Bretz, Phyllis Carter, Roxanna Post, Peter Crabtree, Anne Agard, Maisha Jameson
ABSENT:	Elnora Webb, Trudy Walton-Keys, Evelyn Lord, Jim Cave, William Highsmith, Sonja Franeta/Miriam Zamora-Kantor, Tina Vasconcellos, Tamika Brown, Heather Sisneros, Mark Rauzon, David Raughton
MINUTES:	Maisha Jameson
HANDOUTS:	<ul> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> <li>October 22, 2014 College Council Meeting Minutes</li> <li>ISE Status Report – Executive Summary Document presented to the BOT meeting (11/18)</li> <li>Summary of Budget vs. Actual Financial Results (Preliminary – Period 10.31.14) – uploaded to dropbox only</li> </ul>

NEXT MEETING: December 17, 2014

Item	Description (Agenda Item and Discussion)	Action Item
I. Welcome and Introductions	<ul> <li>President Webb is out ill and hence, VPI Lilia Celhay will facilitate the Council meeting</li> <li>Maisha Jameson gave a quick update to inform the Council that the discussion and review/approval of the 2014-15 College-wide Goals, as well as the updated Participatory Governance Manual are still pending items and will hopefully be ready to come before the December Council meeting.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2014-15 College- wide Goals to be drafted to come before the College Council for review/approval for recommendation at the December Council meeting</li> <li>Updated Participatory Governance Manual to be completed to come before the College Council for review/approval</li> </ul>



		for recommendation at the December Council meeting
II. Approval of the 10/22/14 College Council Minutes	<ul> <li>James Blake (JB), Irina Rivkin (IR) &amp; Phyllis Carter (PC) noted that there were corrections that needed to be made to the Oct. 22, 2014 Council meeting minutes. Noted Corrections</li> <li>(JB) Page 2 – Change the language to note that a decision was made during the October 2013 Council meeting as to who had College Cou ncil voting rights and who didn't. <i>Response: Upon checking the Oct. 2013 Council meeting minutes, it was clarified that a motion was never made to officially make any such recommendation from the Council in this regard, nor was an ultimate decision made. There were only recommendations posed from the Participatory Governance Task Force members (James Blake &amp; Evelyn Lord).</i></li> <li>(IR) The meeting actually adjourned at 4:10pm</li> <li>(JB) Page 4 – Note that when there were gaps identified in the ISE, then we have to identify an action plan to address them.</li> <li>(PC) Phyllis Carter was not present at the 10/22/14 meeting, Remove her from the attendees list for that meeting.</li> <li>Louis Quindlen made a MOTION to approve the meeting minutes from the October 22, 2014 Council meeting (with adjustments included). Lisa Cook seconded the motion. The motion was approved with 10 yays and 3 abstentions.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Maisha Jameson to make the noted corrections to the 10/22/14 College Council minutes.</li> </ul>
III. Basic Skills Report	<ul> <li>The original due-date for the Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) Report was 10/10/14. The College was granted an extension to 10/24/14. The College requested an additional extension until 11/14/14. The extension is required given the issues those responsible were having related to the expenditure report section.</li> <li>The BSI Report was approved by the Faculty Senate and submitted on Friday Nov. 14, 2014.</li> <li>The State required that the College respond to questions indicating how the BSI funding allocations received were spent. Lisa Cook noted that the College needs to work on our tracking process in the future. It was difficult to get the numbers.</li> <li>There has been some stability in the Foundation (Basic)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Upload the Basic Skills Report that was submitted to the College Council DropBox</li> <li>Address the various recommendations revealed in the Basic Skills report</li> </ul>



	Skills Committee. With Dean Lewis being the Co-Chair for	
	two years now, it has helped. Since Dean Lewis came on board, the figures are clear.	
	The College was also asked to describe our progress with	
	the institutionalization of the programs/projects funded with	
	BSI dollars.	
•	Campus awareness of all constituents in this regard needs to	
	be greater.	
•	Lisa Cook shared some of the College's Foundation Skills	
	Pathways Programs and noted that they need to be better	
	communicated across the college so that they can reach	
	more students who are in need.	
•	Also, scheduling for learning communities has not been	
	institutionalized. It was identified that we need to make this	
	systematic. Need to streamline all of this.	
•	Lisa Cook noted that the Foundation (Basic) Skills	
	Committee would bring back recommendations to the College Council related to the institutionalization of the	
	funding, tracking and scheduling procedural issues.	
	It was noted that there is always a problem when we create a	
	cohort – We always need to inform Amani ElMasry at the	
	District as to how to address the pre-requisite issue, as this	
	issue affects enrollment of students. We need to also look at	
	scaling up our efforts for creating cohorts.	
•	It was noted that we haven't seemed to have made much	
	impact on student success numbers as a direct result of the	
	funding. State-wide, the BSI funding has had an overall low	
	impact. Math success rates have even decreased. Need to	
	change this.	
•	Lisa Cook gave an overview of how the new accelerated	
	ESL curriculum works and is working. Need data that	
	shows how these new ESL students are performing and accelerating compared to how they used to.	
	Question was asked: Is there is a difference between	
	learning communities and cohorts? Is it synonymous? – Lisa	
	Cook responded. $\rightarrow$ Learning Communities include	
	programs like TRiO that have no programmatic-specific	
	courses, but do include wrap-around services. A cohort	
	means that a group of program students have a linked course	
	package. Some learning communities include cohorts, and	
	some do not.	
•	The Cal-PASS system may help here. Can we track students	
	who took English and math via this system, and then track	



	<ul> <li>how well they did in the CA State University system? This could be strong evidence for our success as it relates to basic skills. It was noted that completion rates are low here, so it's hard to track this data. Need to be looking at this system (PCCD) wide.</li> <li>Action Plan 1 report to move forward. Includes looking at what we can do to increase the scope and impact to reach more students, i.e. begin an ESL accelerated college (develop professional development around an accelerated approach to teaching accelerated ESL).</li> <li>Irina Rivkin asked whether counselors could be informed as to which sections were participating in this program? She noted that would help match students learning styles with certain faculty members. Lisa Cook responded that the long-term vision is that students will have different choices and all this would be clear.</li> <li>Kim Bretz posed a question: Why are the learning communities and cohorts structured along culture and not need? Lisa Cook responded that the Pathway programs are based on assessment, not culture.</li> <li>Also part of action plan is to be able to fund basic skills and the coordination of these efforts.</li> <li>Louis Quindlen asked why Laney can't institutionalize some of the model programs that are succeeding. Need to look at these programs before the grants run out and determine how sustainable they are. Look for alternative funding services to keep them going.</li> <li>Lisa Cook asked what is the process by which a program becomes institutionalized within the College? We need to address this. VPI Celhay noted that she has seen it work with limited funding, but it is a lot of work.</li> </ul>	
	• Lilian Chow – counselors are looking at how we can use the SSSP funds to address this need.	
IV. Accreditation – Institutional Self- Evaluation – ( <i>Rebecca</i> <i>Bailey &amp; Lilia Celhay</i> )	<ul> <li>Rebecca Bailey and Lilia Celhay provided a summary of the status of where things are as it relates to the drafting of the Institutional Self-Evaluation (ISE).</li> <li>A presentation of the first full draft was made to the Board of Trustees (BOT) yesterday on 11/18/14.</li> <li>Lilia Celhay passed out and went over the status report handout that was also presented at the BOT meeting.</li> <li>The BOT wanted to know the number of actionable improvement plans the College planned to submit.</li> <li>It should be noted that some of the Colleges have hired</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>All Council Members were asked to review the ISE Moodle site and provide feedback.</li> <li>Need to have committee agenda and minutes on the website. Be diligent about taking</li> </ul>



putside consultants to do most of the writing. Laney has used internal staff & faculty. Lisa Cook shared that the Faculty Senate did not feel ready to vote on the ISE at yesterday's meeting and hence will review it further and then vote on it during a neeting to be scheduled for next week. Lilia Celhay spoke to the evidence project and shared how tedious the project's work is. She spoke to the mportance of the committees having agendas for each neetings, as well and minutes taken at each meeting. Maisha Jameson provided an overview of the work that he consultant is doing with the evidence in the President's Office, i.e. cataloging documents and evidence that were in the Accreditation Room – most of evidence that were in the Accreditation Room – most of evidence that were in the Accreditation Room – most of evidence that were in the Accreditation Room – most of evidence that were in the Accreditation Room – most of evidence that were in the Accreditation Room – most of evidence that were in the second that Brandi Howard has been fantastic in responding to website needs. Wordpress training is also available and sessions will be scheduled soon. t is important to maintain duplicate copies of all evidence on the website and within the Dropbox. We've recently institutionalized DropBox – Laney has purchased 30 licenses for key leads. t was asked whether there is a standard College emplate for the minutes of Committees. It was recommended that we have a strategy discussion or be provided instruction as to what is appropriate or necessary for minute taking. The committee minutes of the following committees are really important to be updated → Curriculum, Budget, Facilities and Technology Committees. Peter Crabtree noted that it is not necessary for all committee minutes to look the same. Minutes should generally include the meeting date/times, attendees, iction items, discussions, decisions, etc. Lisa Cook noted that the committees that have Chairs who have paid release-time have	<ul> <li>minutes/notes for each meeting.</li> <li>Dept. Chairs should have institutional DropBox accounts.</li> <li>Those Committees that do not have webpages, need them and need to upload their agendas and minutes.</li> <li>To determine whether the status report presented to the BOT matches the actual Draft ISE</li> </ul>



<ul> <li>Lilia Celhay spoke to the ISE presentations that were made to the various shared governance committees.</li> <li>Lisa Cook asked what the Forum is for given that the report has already been presented to the BOT? Lilia Celhay acknowledged that this is not a perfect scenario and noted that the forum had to be cancelled due to Dr. Webb's illness. She shared, however, that the opportunity for all (via FAS) to provide input via Moodle has been offered regularly through-out the process.</li> <li>Kimberly Bretz shared that she was confused as to how the President's edits came into the document. She noted that the President's edits are. Rebecca Baily noted that this is the case for all of the standards. The full document has Dr. Webb's feedback and edits through-out many of them. VPI Celhay responded that it has been a challenge to document the drafts and identify who provided comments and edits. Not all of the edits are being done in track changes mode.</li> <li>Louis Quindlen shared that he feels there has been ample opportunity for faculty to provide input to this document. He is however, concerned about low faculty participation. Would urge us to look at participation in Accreditation as part of our tenure review process. This may encourage candidates to review this document because it is helpful and adds instructional value to our faculty in understanding how our college works.</li> <li>The next draft that is to be submitted will be updated on Moodle as well.</li> <li>Tuesday the Faculty Senate generated a resolution to affirm that when the College has not fully met a standard, that the College will include an actionable improvement plan within the ISE in order to address that specific issue. A debate ensued around whether Laney should note that we partially meet the standards and include action plans vs. noting that we do not meet the standard and include</li> </ul>	
that the College will include an actionable improvement plan within the ISE in order to address that specific issue. A debate ensued around whether Laney should note that we partially meet the standards and include action plans vs. noting that we do not meet the standard and include action plans. Concern was also expressed at the District	
<ul> <li>accreditation meeting on this matter. None of the other Colleges are going to note that they did not meet the standards. Our Accreditation team leads are trying to get clarification from ACCJC on this in terms of how the Colleges should respond in this regard.</li> <li>Concern was expressed that President Webb edited</li> </ul>	



	Standards I and 111B1 and changed them to report that the facilities related sections met the standards, given that this is different from what the group responsible for responding to that standard wanted to report. It was shared that the group felt strongly about taking this position. VPI Lilia Celhay noted that the status report that was provided to the BOT this week is not completely in alignment with the current draft of the ISE. This will be followed-up on. Kimberly Bretz asked who would have the final say as to what is reported to the Commission in the document?She went on to ask, "If we as a committee say that we don't want to say that we meet the standard, and Dr. Webb says that we do, who gets the final say?" Lilia Celhay affirmed that we have not completed the final draft. This document is still a work in progress. Still working with the stakeholders on feedback. It was stated that the reviewers, the writing group, the Faculty Senate, the Committee, the VPI, Rebecca Bailey and the President agree that for most of the Standard IIIB section, the College is resulting in "partially meets the standard". Peter Crabtree – the action improvement plan items do not have to be directly connected to whether we meet the standards or not. It's just a way of saying that the issues are so important to the College that the college wants to call them out in order to commit to them. The Commission gets upset when they sense dishonesty. They understand that the colleges are always in a constant improvement state. Lisa Cook asked how do you know if we meet a standard without the evidence to determine whether you do so? Hard to have a sense of where we are when the evidence is not included. For Ex. concerned that the status report states we have a Puente program when we don't have one. We can't say that we've reached that point when we haven't. Faculty Senate Cook asked when we would have a draft to have a clear understanding to know what we are	
•	haven't.	



<ul> <li>something different to the Commission in January. Concern as a shared governance leader, which document are we signing and how do we know what has been changed in them? Who makes the final decision? Who's truth are we following and from who's perspective? If we are asking all of our stakeholders to support this, their voice should be included in the body of the document. People need to see their truths or perspectives included.</li> <li>Responding to the Executive Summary that was submitted - Concerned that we have submitted something to the board that is inaccurate and that is now public record.</li> <li>Lilia Celhay is still finding error of facts, grammar, etc</li> <li>Rebecca Bailey and VPI Celhay can't do all of the work that the team should be doing. Relying on the administrators to go through their sections and for the faculty to provide their feedback as well.</li> <li>Q: (Carl Oliver) what was the intention of having the Accreditation forums? A: (Lilia Celhay) To reach out to those who have not heard the updates so that when the visitors come, they will know where the College is with things, the process that was followed, and what to expect. Basically, to broaden their perspective.</li> <li>ASLC President Carl Oliver expressed concern that the students were not included in the process until too late in the game to provide substantive and informed feedback. Weren't able to read the document first. Noted that the draft seems kind of flufy and concerned about it not telling the truth. Didn't seem accurate. Also noted that a few of the other ASLC senators are also concerned about the accuracy of this. Asked is it too late for the ASLC to provide their perception of the institution and the various standards? There are a few things that need to be changed within the institution and Mr. Oliver noted that he would like those recognized short of submitting a complaint to the ACCJC.</li> <li>Rebecca Bailey – Spoke to the timeline for presenting to the ASLC → There were several attempts to make contac</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>Rebecca Bailey – Spoke to the timeline for presenting to the ASLC → There were several attempts to make</li> </ul>	
contact with the ASLC in order to schedule the presentation, and when they did come, it was when they were able to make contact. Made it clear that they don't	
expect any one individual to read the entire document. Rather, you should pick what section you are interested	



	<ul> <li>in and respond to that.</li> <li>Carl Oliver asked if he notes something in the comments section, will it be incorporated into the document? VPI Celhay noted that she would look at it and take it into consideration.</li> <li>It was shared that we have had to narrow the focus on what improvements we can make realistically in 2 years.</li> <li>The final ISE report will be updated to Moodle and Dropbox and can be reviewed then.</li> <li>Carl Oliver asked how recommendations are made for decisions to be made.</li> <li>Louis Quindlen noted that the worst thing that we can do is to not follow what the stakeholders have offered in their feedback and to make changes to a document after feedback has been confirmed.</li> </ul>	
V. Updates – - Resources - Committees/Work- groups & Task-forces	• There was no time to address this agenda item.	

Meeting Adjourned 4:08 pm.