



# COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

**COMMITTEE:** COLLEGE COUNCIL

**MEETING DATE:** February 13, 2019

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

**ATTENDEES:** Tammeil Gilkerson, Rudolph Besikof, Derek Pinto, Chuen Chan, Diane Chang, Glenn Pace, Clifton Coleman, Karen Tellegan, Blanca Montes de Oca, Chungwai Chum, Fred Bourgoin, Eleni Gastis, Mark Rauzon, Barbara Yasue, Kimberly King, Blake Johnson, Evelyn Lord, Dagnachew (Dag) Sibhat, Stephen Corlett, Dolores (Max) Bernal, Rupinder Bhatia, Chris Weindenbach, Amy Marshall, Guests: Tina Vasconellos, Joseph Bielanski, Mario Rivas, Alejandro Acosta, Nathaniel Pyle, Felix Soloman, Eva Hannan, Lynne Williams, Donald Moore, Arlene Lontoc

**ABSENT:** Ann McMurdo/Miriam Zamora-Kantor, Terrence Fisher, Kim Glosson, Tameem Bahram, Heather Sisneros/Pinar Alscher

**MINUTES:** Maisha Jameson

**HANDOUTS:**

- Meeting Agenda
- College Council Minutes – 12.12.18 Meeting
- 5 Year Fiscal Plan - PBC PGC Plan Info.
- 2018-19 CC Mid-Year Evaluations Survey Results
- 2018-19 College Council Attendance Log
- College Council Charge & Responsibilities Overview
- College Council Goals 2018-19
- College Council Meeting Minutes 12-12-2018
- DRAFT – Safe Parking Program Budget Start Up & Annual Costs
- E-Scooter Skateboard Policy FPC Draft
- Facilities Project Updates
- General Delineation of Functions
- OakDOT Scooter Terms & Conditions
- PCCD Mission Statement Laney Survey
- Peralta Community College District Mission Statement Review Process
- Participatory Governance Organization Manual (PGOM)
- Recommendation for Standardizing Prioritization Criteria
- Resource Prioritization Criteria Rubrics (IELM, Classified Position, Technology)
- Non-Discrimination Statement
- Safe Parking Proposal FPC
- State PCCD Goals

**NEXT MEETING:** March 20, 2018



# COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FINAL

Item	Discussion/Decisions	Action Item
<b>I. Welcome &amp; Introductions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions were made, specifically for newly appointed members to the College Council.</li> <li>• CHUEN CHAN CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REVISED FEBRUARY 13, 2019 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA. DIANE CHANG SECONDED THE MOTION. NO ABSTENSIONS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED.</li> </ul>	
<b>II. Approval of the Council Minutes</b> - December 12, 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FRED BOURGOIN CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 21, 2018 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES. RUDY BESIKOF SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED.</li> </ul>	
<b>III. President's Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report-back – College President's decisions made on recommendations from the previous Council meeting:</li> <li>• President Gilkerson accepted the College Council's recommendation to approve the Distance Education Committee's proposal for a change to the committee charge and membership composition.</li> <li>• President Gilkerson accepted the College Council's recommendation to develop standardized prioritization rubric criteria for all resource committees to use during the prioritization process. However, given the timeline for resource prioritization, the President presented a qualifying recommendation on the process/timeline to do so (see proposal below).</li> </ul> <p><b>Update on Budget Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Budget Development calendar should be coming out soon from the District Office. In the mean- time, the College will move forward with the budget development process. It was noted that whether or not there is funding provided to fund the identified resource priorities, the College will still prioritize in order to communicate what the College's needs are. This is needed for effective institutional</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of the PCCD Five Year Fiscal Plan will be added as a standing item on the College Council agendas moving forward until the final Plan is submitted.</li> </ul>



# COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FINAL

effectiveness, and is also required for accreditation.

- All APUs/Comprehensive Program Reviews were due February 4<sup>th</sup>. These are now being validated by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and resource requests are being organized so that they can be sent to the resource committees for prioritization (to be completed by March).
- It was noted that all administration and student services units are also all now doing program reviews in order to add to our continued progress in integrated planning.

#### **Update on the PCCD Five Year Fiscal Plan**

- President Gilkerson asked all to review the email she sent out last week in this regard noting the stated requirements from ACCJC and the District's plan for responding. This development of the Plan is coming from the District, and the District will submit it to the ACCJC. The Plan is not coming through the College's formal shared governance process. President Gilkerson asked all to voice feedback to the College's representatives serving on the District Planning and Budgeting Council. The dates of the District meetings where the Plan will be reviewed was shared. The letter due March 1<sup>st</sup> is an update on the progress/planning for that Fiscal plan.
- DAS President Donald Moore advocated for review of the draft plan to come through the College's shared governance process.
- Discussion of this Plan will be added as a standing item on the College Council agenda moving forward until it is submitted in order to provide updates as they come.
- It was asked for the College to plan ahead and schedule a special College Council meeting to review/approve the Plan. President Gilkerson responded that we will try to do so, but noted that she was concerned about the tight timeframe, and whether the process/timeline will allow for any potential requested changes (based on feedback provided by the Council) to be included at that point.



# COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FINAL

	<p><b>Misc. Updates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that nothing official has come out from the District on any budget cuts.</li> <li>• It's time for nominations for the Laney "We Rise Awards". This award replaced the Faculty and Classified Staff of the Year Awards and is now expanded to include the other staff categories of the College (hourly/part-time staff and administrators). An announcement and online form will come out soon requesting nominations. The criteria used for nominations are the College's values.</li> <li>• There will be a mandatory Evacuation Drill on March 12. There will be one drill in the morning, and another in the evening. Details will be sent out soon.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>IV. Review of PCCD Mission Statement</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tina Vasconcellos presented on this item and was accompanied by Joseph Bielanski and Mario Rivas.</li> <li>• The PCCD Mission has not been reviewed or revised for a long time. It's now time to go through this process again.</li> <li>• The four colleges will begin the process of completing Institutional Self Evaluations (ISE) next year and it would be nice if the District Office also had an updated mission statement that met the standards and/or was in support of the four colleges' mission statements.</li> <li>• All were asked to consider whether the current PCCD mission statement was clear as it currently stood.</li> <li>• It was noted that the District Office is not accredited – nor does it generate revenue like the colleges do.</li> <li>• The general required standards for a mission statements were shared. President Gilkerson made a clarification that the ACCJC approved that the requirements for a mission statement can be encapsulated within the vision and values statements as well.</li> <li>• The group was asked to take the online survey during the meeting. This is a peer assessment of the mission statement as it currently stands. Laney College</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laney College sub-group to develop a new recommended PCCD District Office Mission Statement. Tina Vasconcellos to follow-up to schedule this meeting.</li> </ul>



# COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

	<p>Survey Results were shared.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was shared that the District’s mission/purpose should be to provide services to support the colleges so that they meet their respective missions.</li> <li>• Tina Vasconcellos mentioned that they would be coming back to the College (either to the College Council or to a sub-group) to work on drafting mission statements for the District. Will do this with each of the colleges and then take all of draft mission statements and put them up for a vote. The associated student groups will also vote so that the student voice is included.</li> <li>• The finalized mission for the District will then need to go through the shared governance process, to include the College Senates, Councils, and the District’s Planning and Budgeting Council, to go as a recommendation to the Chancellor, and then up for Board approval in May or June.</li> <li>• Asked for volunteers for a sub-group at Laney that will be charged with developing a recommended mission statement for the District. Subgroup volunteers: Stephen Corlett, Dagnachew (Dag) Sibhat, Eleni Gastis, Maisha Jameson, Rudy Besikof, Rupinder Bhatia, Chungwai Chum, Nathaniel Pyle, Blanca Montes de Oca.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>V. Recommendation to Approve the Facilities Planning Committee (FPC) Proposed Policy on the Use of Motorized Scooters on Campus</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stephen Corlett presented on this item.</li> <li>• It was noted that since the last meeting, the City of Oakland has put out more information. The City is now requiring training and permits to be secured for authorized use.</li> <li>• The next step is to work to get the District to approve a policy as well. Questions were posed as to how the District policy would work with separate College policies.</li> <li>• Charging of scooters on campus is to be included in the next policy.</li> <li>• GARY ALBURY CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE’S PROPOSED POLICY ON THE USE OF MOTORIZED SCOOTERS ON CAMPUS. RUDY BESIKOF SECONDED THE MOTION.</li> </ul>	



# COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

	<p>ABSTENSIONS – BARBARA YASUE, KIMBERLY KING, GLEN PACE. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED.</p>	
<p>VI.    <b>A.) Recommendation to Approve the Process for Moving Forward with Resource Prioritization</b></p> <p>      <b>B.) Recommendation to Approve the Resource Committee Prioritization Rubrics</b></p> <p>      - <i>Technology</i></p> <p>      - <i>Classified Positions</i></p> <p>      - <i>IELM Funds</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>President Gilkerson presented on this agenda item.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>A. Recommendation on Process for Moving Forward with Resource Prioritization</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was recommended that the standardized resource prioritization rubric/criteria be developed in time for next year’s resource prioritization cycle, and that for this year, the already approved rubric criteria be used so that prioritization could begin right away.</li> <li>• FRED BOURGOIN CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE MOVING FORWARD WITH THE RESOURCE PRIORITIZATION PROCESS USING EXISTING RUBRIC CRITERIA. AMY MARSHALL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.</li> </ul> <p><b>B. Recommendation to Approve the Resource Committee Prioritization Rubric Criteria</b></p> <p><b><u>Resource: Technology – Presented by Rupinder Bhatia</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The prioritization rubric criteria proposed will be the same as that which was used last year. The only change was to add the “Impact on Student Success and/or Services”.</li> <li>• RUPINDER BHATIA CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE TECHNOLOGY PLANNING COMMITTEE’S RUBRIC CRITERIA FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF THE COLLEGE’S TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES. FRED BOURGOIN SECONDED THE MOTION. ABSTENSIONS – CHUEN CHAN, EVELYN LORD AND RUDY BESIKOF. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Resource: Classified Positions – Presented by Vicki Ferguson</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The prioritization rubric criteria proposed will be the same as that which was used last year.</li> </ul>	



# COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FRED BOURGOIN CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CLASSIFIED PRIORITIZATION COMMITTEE'S RUBRIC CRITERIA FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF THE COLLEGE'S CLASSIFIED POSITIONS. RUDY BESIKOF SECONDED THE MOTION. ABSTENSIONS – DAGNACHEW (DAG) SIBHAT. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Resource: Instructional Equipment and Library Materials (IELM) – Presented by Fred Bourgoin</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The prioritization rubric criteria proposed was summarized.</li> <li>ELENI GASTIS CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE IELM PRIORITIZATION COMMITTEE'S RUBRIC CRITERIA FOR THE PRIORITIZATION OF THE COLLEGE'S IELM FUNDS. VICKI FERGUSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ABSTENSIONS – CHUEN CHAN, EVLEYN LORD, DIANE CHANG, RUDY BESIKOF, DAGNACHEW (DAG) SIBHAT, STEPHEN CORLETT AND BARBARA YASUE. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>VII. Recommendation to Approve the Revision of Laney's Non-Discrimination Statement</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Max Bernal presented on this item.</li> <li>The revised statement was shared.</li> <li>The question was asked: What legally happens if we have these groups included in our statement and they feel discriminated against? Answer: They can file a complaint through the process. Yet, they can already do so anyway as long as we are receiving federal and state funding.</li> <li>The question was asked: Is sex no longer a protected status? Answer: Gender Identity is included now instead. Neither the State, nor the Federal level includes sex anymore.</li> <li>EVELYN LORD CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REVISION OF LANEY'S NON-DISCRIMINATION STATEMENT. VICKI FERGUSON SECONDED THE MOTION. NO ABSTENSIONS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>VIII. (2<sup>nd</sup> read) Facilities Planning Committee's (FPC)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stephen Corlett presented on this item.</li> <li>This is a second read.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The FPC will work on bringing back to the</li> </ul>



# COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FINAL

<p><b>Safe Parking Proposal by the City of Oakland</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It was made clear that the FPC has not approved this item. The Committee wanted to get guidance from the College Council on the item to inform whether a recommendation should be presented as to whether we should move forward with this or not.</li><li>• The key points about the program were shared again. Proposing to contract out use of the land on the other side of the Laney College parking lot as a safe parking area for homeless individuals living in their cars. The City will cover the entire cost. The City offered five spots to be set aside for Laney homeless students. The City's intention is to offer the space to an already existing homeless community who are already living near each other ("Romandy Park"), and to move them here.</li><li>• Concern was expressed about having homeless encampments near the Laney College campus. Some concerns included: the impact to our local environment; safety concerns; causing more traffic of homeless on campus; increased use of campus facilities (restrooms electricity from outdoor electrical outlets, etc.); associated higher levels of crime; environmental impact to this wildlife sanctuary of Lake Merritt, etc..</li><li>• It was noted that if the Council and FPC are interested in moving forward, the FPC can ask the City to come back for a forum.</li><li>• It was noted that there is a competing proposal from PG&amp;E who are asking to lease the same site for \$10K/month.</li><li>• It was asked what the evidence is that associates the crime happening (car break-ins, etc.) with the homeless people in the area? All were reminded that there is a housing crisis in the city, and everyone is saying no to these communities. Asked all to think about what we're saying when we say no. Suggested that we focus more on this being Laney students only....monitored by Laney students/staff.</li><li>• Suggested the idea of putting this out to the campus community (most importantly students) to see what they think about it.</li></ul>	<p>Council a recommendation for a safe park program for Laney College homeless students.</p>
--	--	--





# COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• President Gilkerson shared that she has been sitting on statewide taskforce on food and housing insecurity and shared information about AB302 legislation coming down where community colleges will be required to do provide safe parking programs for their homeless students.</li> <li>• It was noted that the will of the Council is that we would like to instead consider a safe parking program specifically for homeless Laney students, and that the Council would charge the FPC to come back to the Council this semester with a proposal.</li> <li>• GLENN PACE CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THAT THE COLLEGE CONSIDER A SAFE CAR PARKING PROGRAM SPECIFICALLY FOR HOMELESS LANEY STUDENTS, AND THAT THE FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE BRING A PROPOSAL BACK TO THE COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION. DEREK PINTO SECONDED THE MOTION. FRIENDLY AMENDMENT BY MARK RAUZON: THAT WE EXPLORE EXTERNAL FUNDING IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHO WILL PAY FOR THIS AND TO CONSIDER USING THE REVENUE RECEIVED FROM THE PG&amp;E PARTNERSHIP TO FUND IT. NO ABSTENSIONS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>IX. (1<sup>st</sup> Read) Updated Participatory Governance Organization Manual (PGOM)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maisha Jameson presented on this item.</li> <li>• The PGOM is currently out of date and needs to be updated and made current. There are changes to committees that have not been reflected in the manual. The version of the PGOM that is presented today includes all of the changes that have been approved through College Council since the last revision of the manual.</li> <li>• A summary of changes that need to be made to bring the PGOM current was presented.</li> <li>• Maisha Jameson will reach out to the Committee Leads who have action items that need to be completed in order to finalize the update to the PGOM and bring it current.</li> <li>• The timeline is to complete the revision and update of the PGOM by the end of this academic year.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maisha Jameson will reach out to the Committee Leads who have action items that need to be completed in order to finalize the update to the PGOM and bring it current.</li> </ul>



# COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FINAL

<p><b>X. Delineation of Functions And PCCD Strategic Goals</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tammeil Gilkerson presented on this item.</li> </ul> <p><b>Delineation of Functions between Colleges and District Office</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The documents shared are from the District Office. The District asked for the Colleges to request feedback from their College Councils.</li> <li>• Background and context were provided – This work is required and is important to accreditation, as it was an accreditation finding that the delineation of functions between Colleges and District Office wasn't clear. Some work has been done to provide a draft to work from. This is to go through the Colleges' shared governance processes, then to the PGC and then to the Board.</li> </ul> <p>Some feedback was shared:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom and lab support for technology is not included anywhere</li> <li>• Support systems for the Colleges to be the primary for Dual Enrollment Education are not set up.</li> <li>• Currently the Laney website receives no support from the District. Can we separate the Colleges and District websites on the list?</li> <li>• Remove Learning Management and include Classroom and Lab Equipment.</li> </ul> <p><b>PCCD State Strategic Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State required that all Districts map their strategic goals to the State's Vision for Student Success.</li> <li>• The draft PCCD Strategic Goals were presented.</li> <li>• Asking for feedback from the Colleges on these Goals.</li> <li>• Asked for all to review the goals and provide feedback to Maisha Jameson by next week.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All were asked to provide feedback to Maisha Jameson on the following documents by the end of next week:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Delineation of Functions between Colleges and District Office</li> <li>○ PCCD State Strategic Goals</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>XI. Review College Council Goals &amp; Make Plans for Addressing The</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tammeil Gilkerson presented on this item.</li> <li>• Goal #1 has been met</li> <li>• Goal #2 → Strides have been made towards accomplishing this Goal. The College Council website is now kept up to date with the current minutes and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PIO will standardize a template for shared governance committee report</li> </ul>



# COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FINAL

	<p>agendas. The Council Meetings are now announced to the College community via reminder emails sent out FAS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goal #3 – In process. We have done the evaluation, yet there has not been great Council support. To extend the deadline. This is in progress.</li> <li>• Goal# 4 – has been met</li> <li>• Goal #5 → Have not met this goal. One of the issues is that College Council only meets once a month for two hours. This doesn't allow for time for addressing Council business and also receiving regular updates from all of the shared governance committees.</li> </ul> <p>Some suggestions were provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold a Spring College Planning Retreat where time is provided for committees to give reports</li> <li>• Have committees submit written updates at each meeting</li> <li>• More meetings or longer meetings</li> <li>• Rotated committee report-outs at meetings</li> <li>• Incorporate Goal #2 &amp; #5 – Suggested to send out committee updates monthly via the PIO. Short updates provided (in bullet format) by each committee. If the committee didn't submit any updates, the report would say "no report". Reports would be sent out the week after College Council. Updates could link to committee webpages. The PIO will standardize a template.</li> <li>• Collect highlights of each meeting at the end of the meeting to send out in the Time for Tuesdays with Tameil. At the end of Council meetings, the Council could determine what three highlights to include in this summary newsletter.</li> <li>• Hold a mid-term extra meeting - In November ask for written or in person updates from committees</li> <li>• Allow two committee updates at the beginning of each the meeting.</li> </ul>	outs.
--	--	-------



# COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

<p><b>XII. College Council Business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Check-in on College Council Membership</li> <li>- College Council Mid-Year Report</li> <li>- College Council Mid-Year Evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As of this meeting, the Council has moved to the recently approved new Council membership composition.</li> <li>• The College Council Mid-Year Report was presented.</li> <li>• It was noted that there were few responses so the College Council Mid-Year Evaluation Survey. Maisha Jameson to send out the link to the survey again to secure a more broad response. Updated results will be shared at the next meeting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maisha Jameson to send out the link to the mid-year evaluation survey again to secure a more broad response. Updated results will be shared at the next meeting.</li> </ul>
<p><b>XIII. Meeting Adjournment</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VICKI FERGUSON CALLED A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 13, 2019 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING. STEPHEN CORLETT SECONDED THE MOTION. NO ABSTENSIONS. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.</li> </ul>	

**Meeting Adjourned 4:20 pm.**