



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

COMMITTEE: COLLEGE COUNCIL

MEETING DATE: March 20, 2019

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

ATTENDEES: Tammeil Gilkerson, Rudolph Besikof, Vicki Ferguson, Derek Pinto, Chuen Chan, Diane Chang, Ann McMurdo, Karen Tellegen, Blanca Montes de Oca, Fred Bourgoin, Eleni Gastis, Mark Rauzon, Kim Glosson, Barbara Yasue, Evelyn Lord, Dagnachew Sibhat, Adele Friend, Blake Johnson, Stephen Corlett, Rupinder Bhatia, Amy Marshall, Max Bernal, Gary Albury, Clifton Coleman, Marla Leech, Rebecca Bailey, Phillippa Caldeira, Suzan Tiemroth-Zavala

ABSENT: Chungwai Chum, Terrence Fisher, Glenn Pace, Kimberly King, Shirley Brownfox, Heather Sisneros/Pinar Alscher, Chris Weidenbach

MINUTES: Maisha Jameson

HANDOUTS:

- Meeting Agenda
- College Council Minutes – 2.13.19 Meeting
- 2018-19 College Council Attendance Log - as of 2.2019xlsx
- 2019_0211_Laney_Distance Ed_Plan_v9 - DRAFT
- Budget Allocation Rubric FINAL Proposed 03062019
- Budget Development Presentation - College Council March 2019 (002)
- College Council 2018-19 Membership & Schedule- DRAFT as of 2-8-2019
- College-wide Planning Retreat Flyer - 4.12.19
- Criteria for We Rise Awards - 2018-19
- FPC Update, March 14, 2019
- LAC Charge and Membership Update Spring 2019
- Proposal - Student Success Equity Committee
- 5 Year Plan Sections → Introduction of 5 Year Plan Draft 03072019, Executive Summary 03072019, Revenue 03072019
- Proposal - Student Success Equity Committee
- SEM COMMITTEE Propose New Charge & Responsibilities - 3.2019 - Final Proposal
- Strategic Enrollment Management Plan - March 13 2019
- Business Dept. Proposal --. PDJ-Fall Innovations_18-Amy Ward, UB & LAUSD Branches News Recap ADDENDUM June 2014, Union Bank Student Run Branch Proposal 03_20_19
- College Resource Priorities → Classified, Facilities, IELM, Technology

NEXT MEETING: April 17, 2019



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

Item	Discussion/Decisions	Action Item
I. Welcome & Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FRED BOURGOIN CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MARCH 20, 2019 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA. VICKI FERGUSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. 	
II. Approval of the Council Minutes - February 13, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FRED BOURGOIN CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 13, 2019 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES. RUDOLPH BESIKOF SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED. ABSTENSION – ANN MCMURDO. 	
III. President’s Report	<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 Facilities Planning Committee’s proposed Policy on the Use of Motorized Scooters on Campus. ○ President Gilkerson accepted the College Council’s recommendation to approve moving forward with the resource prioritization process using existing rubric criteria. ○ President Gilkerson accepted the College Council’s recommendation to approve the resource committee prioritization rubrics for the College’s technology, classified position, and IELM resources. ○ President Gilkerson accepted the College Council’s recommendation to approve the revision of Laney’s Non-Discrimination Statement. ○ President Gilkerson accepted the College Council’s recommendation to approve that the College consider a Safe Car Parking Program specifically for homeless Laney students, that external funding be explored to fund the program (ex. revenue from other facilities rentals), and that the FPC bring a proposal back to the Council for consideration. <p><u>Announcements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College wide Planning Retreat – To be held on 4/12 (all day) – Provided an overview of the Retreat agenda. • All Staff Employee Appreciation Event – To be held on 5/16 in the afternoon. Staff awards to be presented here. 	
IV. Recommendation to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vicki Ferguson presented on this item. 	



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

<p>Approve the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overview was provided on the work of the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee and how the development of the plan was a collaborative effort involving all constituents, led by faculty, and includes the student voice/input. The original plan that was presented has been updated with feedback from all groups. The Plan has already been approved by all constituent groups via the senates. • It was noted that the Faculty Senate plans to submit a number of agreements for recommendation that intend to ensure follow-up on implementation of the Plan. • It was affirmed that the Plan is not simply a response to the ACCJC, but rather a hard core commitment to making things better. The development of the Plan has been in progress for over a year now. • The VPSS spoke to the different sections and components of the Plan and noted that it is also tied to Laney’s strategic goals. • It was noted that it is in the collective interest of the College to embrace shared responsibility for enrollment management, in the same way that is required for our Strategic Plan and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). • ELENI GASTIS CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE LANEY COLLEGE STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN. BARBARA YASUE SECONDED THE MOTION. ONE VOTE AGAINST THE RECOMMENDATION – MAX BERNAL. ABSTENSIONS – ADELE FRIEND & DAGNACHEW SIBHAT. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED. 	
<p>V. Recommendation to Approve the Proposed Change to the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee’s Charge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rudy Besikof presented on this item. • An overview was presented on the updates made to the Committee’s charge. What was previously noted as the committee’s charge was really the committee’s goals (as confirmed at that time). The Committee’s responsibilities are included as well. • RUDY BESIKOF CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE’S CHARGE. FRED BOURGOIN SECONDED THE MOTION. FRIEDNLY AMENDMENT: ADD “SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION” TO THE SECTION THAT LISTS THE PURPOSE OF THE COMMITTEE. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend proposed language for the Committee’s new charge before updating the PGOM with the change.



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

<p>VI. Recommendation to Approve the Proposed Change to the Learning Assessment Committee's Charge, Responsibilities and Membership Composition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rebecca Bailey presented on this item. • An overview was provided on the proposed changes and the reasons for the changes. The proposed change is to refer to what used to be the committee's mission, as the charge, and what used to be the committee's charge, as the committee's responsibilities, to ensure that it is aligned with the other committee entries within the Participatory Governance Organization Manual. • It was confirmed that as the Committee has been making changes, that those updates have been approved through the faculty senate, given that the committee is a sub-committee of the senate. • Concern was shared about combining the counseling and the library representation together into one representative within the committee's membership composition. It was expressed that these are very different roles in terms of function. It was asked if these reps can be separated out? Rebecca Bailey shared that numerous departments are not listed out separately (and have been lumped together) in order to keep the committee to a reasonable size, and that both Counseling and Library have courses, yet also provide other services, and hence are similar in this way. The Faculty Senate approved this change. If any additional changes are made, they will need to go back through the Faculty Senate. • FRED BOURGOIN CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE LEARNING ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE'S CHARGE, RESPONSIBILITIES AND MEMBERSHIP COMPOSITION. CHUEN CHAN SECONDED THE MOTION. ONE VOTE AGAINST THE RECOMMENDATION – EVELYN LORD. ABSTENSION – ANNE MCMURDO. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED. 	
<p>VII. Recommendation to Approve the College's Resource Priorities * Facilities * Technology * Classified Positions * IELM Funds</p>	<p><u>Facilities Resource Priorities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen Corlett presented on this item, yet noted that the Facilities Planning Committee was not ready to present this as a recommendation for the Council. • It was noted that the list of resource requests were presented list to the committee last week, yet they didn't get full participation of committee. (had quorum + 1). Noted that the committee was concerned about the amount of time to do complete the prioritization work given various challenges. • Discussion ensued about the issues that caused complications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The College's facilities resource priorities will be brought back to the Council for review at the next Council meeting. • The College's technology resource priorities



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

	<p>with the prioritization of the facilities resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The College’s facilities resource priorities will be brought back to the Council for review at the next Council meeting. <p><u>Technology Resource Priorities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rupinder Bhatia presented on this item, yet noted that the Technology Planning Committee was not ready to present this as a recommendation for the Council. • Concern was expressed about the method of rating/ranking the technology resources. • Discussion ensued about the issues that caused complications with the prioritization of the technology resources. • The College’s technology resource priorities will be brought back to the Council for review at the next Council meeting. <p><u>Classified Staff Position Resource Priorities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rudy Besikof presented on this item. • The prioritized list of Classified Staff positions was presented for Council review and vote. • VICKI FERGUSON CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED LIST OF CLASSIFIED STAFF POSITION PRIORITIES. FRED BOURGOIN SECONDED THE MOTION. ABSTENSIONS – DIANE CHANG, DAGNACHEW SIBHAT & ADELLE FRIEND. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED. <p><u>Instructional Equipment and Library Materials (IELM) Resource Priorities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fred Bourgoin presented on this item, yet noted that the IELM Prioritization Committee was not ready to present this as a recommendation for the Council. • Concern was expressed about the limited time for the committee to complete the prioritization work and noted that the Committee ranked everything, yet did not consider cost. This becomes an issue given that the amount of funding is a known and finite amount that needs to be allocated out. The IELM funds/requests are a unique resource to address given that the amount of funding provided to the College differs every year and should be spent within the current fiscal year, as the funds are needed across departments at the beginning of the school year. • It was noted that the amount of IELM funding for this year was \$105K. The carryover amount was \$150K. 	<p>will be brought back to the Council for review at the next Council meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The College’s instructional equipment and library materials resource priorities will be brought back to the Council for review at the next Council meeting. • Schedule a more in-depth Council discussion at a future meeting regarding the timeline for resource prioritization. • Derek Pinto to verify the amount of IELM funds that were allocated to the District vs. Laney and send this information out to the Council. • The BAC will go through the resource requests to determine where duplication occurs, and will address this issue so that requests are not prioritized for funding twice. • To delete the request for Machine
--	---	--



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The College’s IELM resource priorities will be brought back to the Council for review at the next Council meeting. • Question asked → What amount of IELM funds were allocated to the District vs. Laney was? Derek Pinto to verify and send this information out to the Council. • The Co-Chair of Technology Planning Committee noted that a lot of the items listed on the IELM resource request list were also on the technology resource request list. Asked should these request be considered by both committees? It was decided that the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) will go through the requests to determine where this duplicating of requests occurs, and will address this issue so that requests are not prioritized for funding twice. • To delete the request for Machine Technology given that the request can be covered by categorical funds. • Questions were asked about how the use of the funds are evaluated after they have been expended. It was noted that this assessment has been built into our Program Review process. • Concern was expressed about funding for the Library’s needs not being taken off the top of these funds, as is done in other institutions. • President Gilkerson provided commendations on all of the committee work that was done to get us this far. Shared that there were process and timeline issues that were experienced, along with unforeseen circumstances that caused complications and delays. Acknowledged that there are areas in which we need to grow, and that this process has shown us how we can do better next year. Noted that the Council will need to have a more in-depth discussion at a future meeting regarding the timeline for resource prioritization. For example, should we consider using the previous year’s priorities for current year’s prioritization. 	<p>Technology given that the request can be covered by categorical funds.</p>
<p>VIII. (First Read) Laney Distance Education Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suzan Tiemroth-Zavala presented on this item. • Provided an overview of the Plan and highlighted some important aspects of the plan. Noted that it aligned with the ACCJC standards, as well as the District’s Distance Education Plan. • Confirmed that the Plan is a student-centered plan that focusses on learners and equity. • It was noted that there is no online tutoring, counseling, financial aid services or orientation as of now. All of this - including a system for early alert recommendations and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All to provide feedback on this draft of the Laney Distance Education Plan. • This item will be brought back to the Council for a Second Read/Vote at the next College Council meeting.



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

	<p>follow-up (to ensure it's happening) - is worked into the Plan so that we can create more equity within our online offerings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline and budget included. • Lots of professional development is written into the plan to help narrow the achievement gaps our students are experiencing. • The Plan has been approved through the Academic Senate. • It was noted that distance education is not mentioned in the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan, and this is a major problem. • Asked all to provide feedback. 	
<p>IX. (First Read) Proposal for a New Integrated SSSP & Equity Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vicki Ferguson presented on this item. • Shared that the discussions began a year ago about integrating the SSSP, Equity and BSI (Foundation Skills) Committees given the focus on integrating these initiatives at the State level. • New name of the Committee → “Student Success and Equity Committee”. • The drafted/recommended committee charge, responsibilities and membership composition was shared. • It was noted that the Foundation Skills Committee decided to remain separated. • Concern was expressed that the committee chairs are both within Student Services, and shared that instead we need to integrate these functions. • Asked all to provide feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All to provide feedback on this proposal to integrate the SSSP and Equity Committees. • This item will be brought back to the Council for a Second Read/Vote at the next College Council meeting.
<p>X. (First Read) Business Department's Proposal for a Public/Private Partnership with Union Bank</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kim Glosson presented on this item. • An overview of the proposed public/private partnership with Union Bank was provided. The Business Department feels this is a partnership that would benefit our students, as it clearly establishes pathways to student success, particularly for Business Students. • Union Bank is interested in creating a student run branch at Laney College. They already have several student-run branches at other institutions. • Union Bank assumes all the costs and will provide the staffing of security and a branch officer. • Would hire Laney students to run the branch. The intent is for our students to be offered jobs after graduating as well. • The plan is for this to be a multi-phased project – Phase# 1: Get the project complete, and Phase #2: Union Bank to donate funds to the food pantry and wardrobe closet (with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All to provide feedback on the Business Department's proposal for a public/private partnership with Union Bank. • This item will be brought back to the Council for a Second Read/Vote at the next College Council meeting. • To send out the actual Union Bank



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

	<p>professional clothing for our students). They would also commit staff to work these programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that Laney is in a banking “dry-zone” area for opportunities. • Kim Glosson to provide the actual proposal to the Council so that the members can rank it based on the College’s values for public/private partnerships rubric. To send out the actual proposal up for consideration, along with the rubric for public/private partnerships. • If the Council approves the recommendation, we would be approving for it to go to the District (PBC) for consideration (Laney won’t be able to make final decision). • Locations to be considered for the bank → 1. Tower Lobby, 2. Student Center, 3. Business Lab in F Building. • It was noted that this could also be an opportunity to get some upgrades for the Student Center out of the agreement. • All agreements would be embedded in an MOU approved through Legal Counsel/the District. • ASLC President Dag Sibhat shared that he is overall supportive, yet feels student government should have been a part of the planning. Noted that the Higher One debit cards that Laney students use to access their financial aid funds won’t work for Union Bank. Response → Discussions in this regard started over a year ago. Previous ASLC President, Keith Welch was included in first meetings and was supportive. He agreed that the proposal should go through the department and be embedded within the curriculum before the College moved forward. • Timeline → Hoping to implement classes for the fall, and open the branch by spring 2020. This also depends on the assessment of space. • Asked all to provide feedback. 	<p>proposal, along with the rubric for public/private partnerships for the Council to rank it for consideration.</p>
<p>XI. (First Read) Budget Advisory Committee’s (BAC) Proposed Budget Augmentation Rubric/Process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Derek Pinto presented on this item. • The resource allocation procedure is a proposed mechanism to reallocate funds based on the College’s Strategic Plan and program reviews. An overview was provided of the Budget Advisory Committee’s process for instituting a 90% budget rollover and creating a 10% pool of the overall budget to fund augmentation requests. The BAC would review these requests based on the proposed criteria and make re-allocations. The maximum amount for requests is an additional 10% in order to restore any department’s budget to 100% of their original funding. To re-allocate any remaining (un-used) funds in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All to provide feedback on the BAC’s proposed Budget Augmentation Rubric/Process. • This item will be brought back to the Council for a Second Read/Vote at the next College



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

	<p>February. Expenses essential to College operations (ex. utilities) to be excluded. To ensure committee fairness, BAC members who have conflict of interest in considering particular requests will recuse themselves from voting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A summary of the rubric and ranking criteria was provided. • It was clarified that this is not a separate request process. All requests should be included, and will be pulled from the annual program updates/comprehensive programs reviews. • It was suggested that time be provided for discussion for all resource requests, and that this be included as a part of the process. • Given the timeline for budget development, College Council agreed to allow the BAC to move forward with using the proposed rubric, conditionally, for now until it is officially submitted for approval at the next Council meeting. • Asked all to provide feedback. 	<p>Council meeting.</p>
<p>XII. Update on ACCJC Five Year Fiscal Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fred Bourgoin presented on this item. • Siri Brown to release a complete draft of the Plan on Thursday for more feedback. • The budget is still to be confirmed by the District. • President Gilkerson asked for all to read the sections of the Plan that have been shared to-date and provide feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All to provide feedback on the ACCJC Five Year Fiscal Plan.
<p>XIII. Budget Development for 2019-20FY</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tammeil Gilkerson presented this item. • An overview to the Budget Development process was provided and the President shared how this process should flow in a healthy institution, ensuring integrated planning and institutional effectiveness. Shared what aspects of the budget development process that the District vs. College is responsible for. Spoke in details about how budget development works at the College. • President Gilkerson shared that she feels the process for resource prioritization should be moved-up so that it happens in the rears in order to allow more time for a meaningful review and prioritization of our college needs. To bring a recommendation through the committees and to the College Council to address timing issue. • The President will ultimately need to present the college wide needs, priorities and overall budget to the District's Planning & Budget Council. • Regardless of what happens with the College's budget allocation from the District, the College needs to plan and follow College's integrated planning processes anyway in order to communicate the college's needs. 	



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoke to how the college has already froze \$1.6M in positions and how she is working hard to have the District take a sizeable cut along with the Colleges. • It was noted that a decision was made by the Chancellor to freeze the hiring of any of the prioritized faculty positions until the Board of Trustees can confirm the financial situation of the District. Hence, we will not go out for fall hires. May be possible to go out for spring hires. 	
XIV. Kick-off of End of Semester Assessment Evaluation Report of Shared Governance Committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process to evaluate all of the shared governance bodies at Laney College will begin next month. • Maisha Jameson to get out the evaluations for all committees to the committee chairs to allow for the committees to begin the assessment process through-out the remainder of the month of April. Results will be tallied and returned to the committees so that they can add to their committee agendas in May. • To bring results of all committee evaluation surveys back to the May College Council meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maisha Jameson to get out the evaluations for all committees to the committee chairs. • Results to be tallied and returned to the committees so that they can add to their committee agendas in May. • To bring results of all committee evaluation surveys back to the May College Council meeting.
XV. College Council Business - Council Membership - Council Goals - Council Mid-Year Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This item was tabled given the lack of time. To place this item earlier in the agenda of the next Council meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To place addressing the “College Council Business” agenda item earlier in the agenda of the next Council meeting.
XVI. Meeting Extension & Adjournment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EVELYN LORD CALLED A MOTION TO EXTEND THE MARCH 20, 2019 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING FOR TEN ADDITIONAL MINUTES. VICKI FERGUSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. • FRED BOURGOIN CALLED A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 20, 2019 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING. STEPHEN CORLETT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. 	

Meeting Adjourned 4:20 pm.