



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

COMMITTEE: COLLEGE COUNCIL

MEETING DATE: December 12, 2018

LOC./TIME: T-850, 2-4pm

ATTENDEES: Tammeil Gilkerson, Rudolph Besikof, Vicki Ferguson, Derek Pinto, Diane Chang, Robert Tracy, Fred Bourgoin, Mark Rauzon, Barbara Yasue, Jacinda Marshall, Dagnachew (Dag) Sibhat, Blake Johnson, Heather Sisneros, Stephen Corlett, Rupinder Bhatia, Chris Weidenbach, Max Bernal, Gary Albury, Reginald Constant, LaNiece Jones (Guest), Donald Moore (Guest)

ABSENT: Chuen Chan, Ann McMurdo/Miriam Zamora-Kantor, Elani Gastis, Manuel Alcala, im Glosson, Glenn Pace, Kimberly King, Shirley Brownfox, Evelyn Lord, Tameem Bahram

MINUTES: Maisha Jameson

- HANDOUTS:**
- Meeting Agenda
 - College Council Minutes – 11.21.18 Meeting
 - Accreditation and Mid-term Report-DRAFT
 - College Council Attendance Log
 - College Council Goals 2018-19 FINAL
 - DE Membership Responsibilities
 - E-Scooter Skateboard Policy FPC
 - Hourly Staff Summary
 - Mid-Year Report – College Council 2018-19
 - Non-Discrimination Statement DRAFT
 - 2018-19 IELM Prioritization Criteria
 - Prioritization Criteria 2018-2019 - Classified
 - Technology Planning Committee – Prioritization Rubric
 - DRAFT - Safe Parking Program Budget Start Up and Annual Costs
 - Safe Parking Proposal FPC Proposal

NEXT MEETING: February 13, 2018

Item	Discussion/Decisions	Action Item
I. Welcome & Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions of newly appointed members to the College Council were made. • RUDOLPH BESIKOF CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 12, 2018 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA. VICKI FERGUSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED. 	
II. Approval of the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FRED BOURGOIN CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE 	



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

<p>Council Minutes - November 21, 2018</p>	<p>NOVEMBER 21, 2018 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENT → “ON PAGE 11 UNDER THE RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE THE FACULTY PRIORITIZATION, TAKE OUT THE WORD ‘RUBRIC’”. RUDOLPH BESI KOF SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED. ABSTENSIONS – VICKI FERGUSON, STEPHEN CORLETT, RUPINDER BHATIA.</p>	
<p>III. President’s Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report-back - College President’s decisions made on recommendations from the previous Council meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ President Gilkerson accepted the College Council’s recommendation to approve the proposed change to the Enrollment Management Committee’s membership composition. ○ President Gilkerson accepted the College Council’s recommendation to approve the proposed change to the Budget Advisory Committee’s charge. ○ President Gilkerson accepted the College Council’s recommendation to approve that the College Council work to maintain the money within Funds 3, 7, 10 & 12 at the College. She requested that this recommendation be placed on the District’s PGC Meeting agenda for their next meeting. ○ President Gilkerson accepted the College Council’s recommendation to approve the BAC’s proposal regarding support for hourly employees and the associated funds. ○ President Gilkerson accepted the College Council’s recommendation to approve the Faculty and Facilities resource committee prioritization criteria/rubrics. ○ President Gilkerson accepted the College Council’s recommendation to approve the proposed change to the Instructional Equipment and Library Materials (IELM) Committee’s charge and membership. ○ President Gilkerson has not yet accepted the College Council’s recommendation to approve the Laney College Faculty Prioritization. This is currently on hold. <p><u>Update on the Budget Development & Resource Prioritization Process & Timeline</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the Colleges are still waiting for the District to provide the timeline. The President noted that the College is currently working on program reviews which will be the foundation for the College’s resource prioritization for the next fiscal year. 	



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

<p>IV. Presentation on the Peralta Colleges Foundation – LaNiece Jones</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Peralta Colleges Foundation (PCF) now has four new staff members → A director, student worker, a scholarship program manager and a finance person. • The Foundation manages funds that are for special projects/initiatives of the colleges, similar to a bank. When someone wants to pull money – there are certain forms that are required to be approved through to the college president. • Foundation staff can provide balance inquiries as well. • The Foundation also manages a comprehensive scholarship program as well. There are currently about 85 scholarships that are administered and offered through the PCF. Scholarship season started October and ends in March. All were asked to share the information on scholarships with the Laney students. It was acknowledged that the Foundation needs to do a better job with regard to outreach about the scholarships. Will be implementing Scholarship Pop-Ups where the PCF will have someone visiting the colleges to inform students of those available. • It was noted that the PCF would like to play a more partnered role with the college presidents to do more fundraising for the colleges. • Director Jones provided President Gilkerson with a list of the College’s managed fund accounts. • A period for questions and answers followed. 	
<p>V. Recommendation from Distance Education Committee to Approve the DE’s Committee Charge and Membership Composition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rupinder Bhatia presented on this item. • The Distance Education (DE) Committee originally had a charge, but no committee responsibilities were included. The responsibilities have now been added. • The committee’s membership added one more classified staff representative. The Committee is still trying to recruit a student representative member. • DE Committee is a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate. This was approved by the Faculty senate at their 12/19 meeting. • Question asked → Who will be responsible for looking at the DE Addendum to ensure we are meeting the standards? Will it be the Curriculum Committee or the DE Committee? Answer - Rupinder Bhatia noted that the College’s Curriculum Specialist serves on the Committee. President 	



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

	<p>Gilkerson noted that a follow-up conversation needs to be had in this regard. The State is working on a DE Addendum and DE guidelines and definitions for fully online and partially online courses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the DE Committee has been focusing on the equity piece and how we support different populations with our DE offerings. An equity rubric was presented at the District level. Also looking through equity data to inform the development of a Distance Education Plan. • The VPI suggested that we designate one or more of the tech review hours that the Curriculum Committee is offering for help with distance education. • The point was made that there needs to be a larger strategy to integrate the work of the DE Committee with the Deans' work to create a structure that ensures we have a more of a meaningful process to improve our DE instruction. • CHRIS WEIDENBACH CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE'S PROPOSED CHANGE TO THEIR COMMITTEE'S CHARGE AND MEMBERSHIP. Rudy SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED. ABSTENSIONS – DIANCE CHANG. 	
<p>VI. Recommendation to Approve the Resource Committee Prioritization Rubrics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technology - Classified Positions - IELM Funds 	<p>Technology (presented by Rupinder Bhatia)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed technology prioritization criteria rubric is similar to that used last year. The only change was to add "Student Services" to the consideration for impact on student success. • It was requested to see a delineation of what we are looking for, and noted that the proposed rubric wasn't specific enough. For example, how is viability of program being defined? • President Gilkerson noted that the Facilities Planning Committee developed a helpful rubric based on the new resource allocation request form and shared that we need to tie our prioritization criteria to our strategic goals? Also need to consider how previously granted resources were used last year. Noted that she felt these things should be added and included in how requests are weighted and scored. • It was noted that these points are very similar to other resource committees as well, and asked whether the Council should suggest a general template for resource allocation requirements so that these points of interest can automatically be included? • The group agreed that it would be a good idea to implement a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Institutional Effectiveness Committee will work to develop a standardized criteria/rubric for prioritization.



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

	<p>general rubric for all prioritization of resource requests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> STEPHEN CORLETT CALLED A MOTION TO DEVELOP A GENERAL PRIORITIZATION RUBRIC CRITERIA FOR ALL RESOURCE COMMITTEES AND A STANDARD TEMPLATE FOR RUBRIC RESOURCE PRIORITIZATION. BLAKE JOHNSON APPROVED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED. The work to develop the standardized prioritization rubric criteria and template for resource prioritization will be assigned to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. RUDOLPH BESIKOF CALLED A MOTION TO TABLE THE REVIEW/APPROVALS OF THE CLASSIFIED AND IELM RESOURCE PRIORITIZATION RUBRIC CRITERIA GIVEN THE PRVIOUS MOTION TO DEVELOP GENERAL PRIORITIZATION RUBRIC CRITERIA FOR ALL RESOURCE COMMITTEES AND A STANDARD TEMPLATE FOR RUBRIC RESOURCE PRIORITIZATION. FRED BOURGOIN APPROVED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED. <p><u>Classified Positions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This item was tabled given last motion. <p><u>IELM Funds</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This item was tabled given last motion. 	
<p>VII. Overview of Hourly Employees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Derek Pinto presented on this item. An overall review of the Laney College hourly employees and the departments/units they served in, as well as the time and budget for their hourly positions was completed. Presentation of this overview summary was provided. Background information was provided on the reason why there has been a change in our ability to hire and maintain hourly employees. A reminder of the new restrictions on hourly extensions was shared. It was noted how some positions were initially classified as exempt (lifeguards, instructional aides, interpreters, etc.). Right now the decision is being made that there are no exemptions - in order to be in compliance with Ed Code (vs. the lawsuit agreement). The issue of compliance is currently being further analyzed. District HR/Legal is reviewing to see if the previous union agreement was even lawful given Ed Code. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide another report back at the February College Council meeting re: the progress on this planning after the Dept. Chairs Retreat on 2/1/19.



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data included in the summary presentation was presented in order to help begin the assessment of the impact to the College – budget and otherwise. • It was noted that the VPI, Deans and Dept. chairs will need to assess what is required (legally mandated) as far as required staffing...For example Instructional Assistants in certain CTE classes...Are they required to ensure safety vs. being helpful to foster student success. Need to determine what is the threshold for affecting safety. The issue of how the ultimate impact of these decisions may include creating unsafe working conditions was brought up. • We need to be thinking creatively as to how we will meet our staffing needs while we wait for the District to confirm how it stands in this regard. • The budget constraints will be our largest hurdle. We clearly don't have the funds to maintain this staff. We need to assess what we need to do, given this fact, moving forward and develop a plan • It was noted that the Dept. Chairs are having a retreat in February (2/1) and that this issue will be brought back to the February Council meeting in order to provide a report-back on progress made towards this planning. • It was noted that there are no College funds allocated to the Child Care Center – even though they are showing on our report. 	
<p>VIII. Accreditation Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rudy Besikof presented on this item. • The College will have a Mid-term Report due soon, and then our Self-Study (ISE) will be due in 2021. A comprehensive visit and evaluation visit will then follow. • Background information was provided on the Institutional Self Evaluation document and cycle and what they include. Traditionally the cycle has been every 6 years. A rough table of contents on what the ISE should include was provided. A brief summary on the four standards that we will need to evaluate Laney against was shared. We will also identify areas of need and plan for realistic projects to increase student learning and services. The ACCJC is looking for the colleges to be a lot more concise in their ISE (so shorter documents). • The ALO/VPI and others will soon begin visiting the SG committees to discuss Accreditation and will develop a plan for ensuring that there is College involvement and input. • It was noted that accreditation should now be a standing item 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

	<p>on all shared governance committee meeting agendas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Laney College Accreditation Midterm Report is partially completed. A presentation on the status of the work completed thus far on the report was provided. The final report will need to come to the College Council for final recommendation for approval. • Response to the ACCJC on Fiscal Stability • The history and context of what proceeded the ACCJC’s most recent correspondence asking for an actionable improvement plan as it relates to fiscal stability was provided. The Board made it clear last night that they will require a more robust response (a more strong and specific response) to the ACCJC (due 12/14) than that which was presented at the Board Meeting. • Dynamics of the new vs. old Board was discussed. The Board is now wanting to see more robust explanation from the Chancellor on items up for their consideration. • There are six working groups coming out of PGC working to address the ACCJC stated issues. 	
<p>IX. Review College Council Goals & Make Plans for Addressing Them</p>	<p>Goal #1 has been met → “(Carry-over 2017-18 Goal) Evaluate the committee structure and committee charge for both the Instructional Equipment and Library Materials (IELM) & the Enrollment Management Committee. “</p> <p>Goal#4 has been met → “Develop a membership absence and replacement policy to ensure habitual non-attending members are replaced “</p> <p>Goals #2, #3 & #5 → Need to actively work on these Goals</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To add this item to the February College Council meeting agenda
<p>X. Process for Revising Laney’s Non-Discrimination Statement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max Bernal presented on this item. • Currently Laney lists a few classifications in its Non-Discrimination statement. The new proposed statement adds ten additional classifications...one of which is immigration status. • These additional classifications go above and beyond the federal mandates (i.e. race, color, sex, age, nationality, etc.) and include many of the State mandates as well. • President Gilkerson recommended to remove the verbage “in accordance with” from the proposed non-discrimination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Council representatives were asked to take this item back to their constituencies for feedback. • To add this item to the February 2019 Council agenda.



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

	<p>statement for Laney.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Council representatives were asked to take this item back to their constituencies for feedback. • To add this item to the February 2019 Council agenda for a vote. 	
<p>XI. First Read – Draft Policy from the FPC regarding the Use of Motorized Scooters on Campus</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen Corlett presented on this item. • The Facilities Planning Committee started looking into this last fall due to safety reasons. The draft campus policy was developed by a sub-committee of the FPC who modeled a draft policy off of the Long Beach Community College policy. It also has some basis in the CA vehicle code as well. • In short, the proposed policy is suggesting for the riding of scooters on campus to <u>not</u> be allowed. Proposing that scooter riders drop the scooters off at drop off zones on the out-skirts of campus. • The coordination for enforcement hasn't been addressed yet. Will get to this at some point and will work with the vendors to help with this. • The FPC asked for input on the proposed policy. • The plan is to ultimately submit this policy to the District for consideration. There is already a District policy on skate boards and bicycles. • All Council members representing constituencies were asked to take the proposed policy back to their constituent bodies for input and feedback. • This proposal will be added to the College Council agenda for February. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Council members representing constituencies were asked to take the proposed policy back to their constituent bodies for input and feedback. • This proposal will be added to the College Council agenda for February.
<p>XII. Facilities Planning Committee's Presentation on the Safe Parking Proposal by the City of Oakland</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen Corlett presented on this item • The City of Oakland presented a proposal to the Business Office on their desire to begin a Safe Parking Program using Laney College Facilities. The proposal was then brought to the Facilities Planning Committee (FPC) for review/recommendation. The FPC felt they weren't in position to make a decision without bringing it to College Council for a recommendation to the College President. • The location for the program was identified as the space on other side of the Laney parking lot. The City would like to lease the land for the Safe Parking Program for 2 years to allow homeless to safely park and sleep in their vehicles. The program will provide security, restrooms, showers, laundry, etc.. This will be a transition service, as the program also provides services to help transition the homeless individuals into other housing. The City is offering to improve the lighting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Council reps to take the proposal back to their constituent bodies for input. • To bring this item back to the February College Council meeting as an agenda item.



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

	<p>in this area. This could help us in the long run.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question was posed...Do we get the space ready for our own students to use or do we contract it out to the City? • The organizers have already agreed for Laney College students to be given preference, and can allocate a certain number of spaces for Laney students. • It was suggested that given the use of the tough sheds will only be a short term situation with the City, that the College negotiates for them to allow us to use the tough sheds to house our own students after the 2 year period is up? • President Gilkerson asked whether the Council was interested in pursuing this proposal? The Council responded that they need more information and would like to check-in with their constituent bodies. • President Gilkerson asked all Council members to read the information in the Dropbox folder (specifically the budget + answers to questions posed by the FPC). • The Council felt that the College needed to mandate that Laney students be granted first priority access to the spaces/sheds. • It was noted that we should also include input from the Laney Homeless Students Support Group on this proposal. • Concerns about the safety of Laney students parking in our parking lot were expressed. • All Council reps were asked to take the proposal back to their constituent bodies for input. • We will consider this a first read of the proposal and will add it to the February Council agenda. 	
<p>XIII. College Council Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Check-in on College Council Membership - College Council Mid-Year Report - College Council Mid-Year Evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council will be moving to the newly approved structure of membership composition and consequences for non-attendance next semester. Will revisit what to do about habitual non-attenders at the February meeting. • The Mid-Year Evaluation for College Council was sent out to all members. All were asked to complete the short survey by the deadline of January 25? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move to the newly approved structure of membership composition and consequences for non-attendance next semester. • Revisit what to do about habitual non-attenders at the February meeting. • All Council members to complete the brief Mid-Year evaluation survey



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

		by the deadline.
XIV. Meeting Adjournment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• RUDY BESIKOF CALLED A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 12, 2018 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING. VICKI FERGUSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. ABSTENSIONS – NONE.	

Meeting Adjourned 4:20 pm.