



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

COMMITTEE: COLLEGE COUNCIL

MEETING DATE: April 15, 2020

LOC./TIME: Via Zoom, 2:00-4:00pm

ATTENDEES: Rudy Besikof, Vicki Ferguson, Derek Pinto, Mark Fields, Diane Chang, Gary Albury, Alejandro Acosta, Hope Lane, Karen Tellegen, Blanca Montes de Oca, Larena Baldazo, Clifton, Fred Bourgoin, Mark Rauzon, Kim Glosson, Barbara Yasue, Kimberly King, Francis Howard, Kathy Ma, Evelyn Lord, Nate Failing, Tammeil Gilkerson, Ann McMurdo, William Trego, Heather Sisneros, Stephen Corlett, Rupinder Bhatia, Marla Leech, Felipe Wilson, Peter Crabtree (Guest), Michael Mejia (Guest), Beth Maher (Guest), Amy Marshall (Guest), Suzan Tiemroth-Zavala (Guest), Karl Seelbach (Guest), Laura Bollentino (Guest)

ABSENT: Sarah Backes-Diaz, Terence Williams, Armani Traylor

MINUTES: Maisha Jameson

- HANDOUTS:**
- Meeting Agenda
 - College Council Meeting Minutes – 3.4.20 Meeting
 - Accreditation Update
 - College Resource Priorities: Facilities, Technology, Classified Staff, IELM, Budget Augmentation Funds
 - College Council Goals for 2019-20
 - Guided Pathways Proposal

NEXT MEETING: May 20, 2020

| Item | Discussion/Decisions | Action Item |
|--|--|-------------|
| 1.1 Agenda Approval <i>Presenter: Tammeil Gilkerson</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LARENA BALDAZO CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE APRIL 15, 2020 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA. VICKI FERGUSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. NO ABSTENSIIONS. | |
| 2.1 President’s Report – Final Decisions made on Recommendations from Previous College Council Meeting <i>Presenter: Tammeil Gilkerson</i> | <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 Tentative Discretionary Budget for FY 2020-21 ○ President Gilkerson accepted the College Council’s recommendation to approve the Laney College Instructional Equipment & Library Materials (IELM) Resource Re- | |



COLLEGE COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>Prioritization for FY 2019-20.</p> | |
| <p>2.2 President’s Report – General Announcements <i>Presenter: Tammeil Gilkerson</i></p> | <p><u>COVID-19 Update</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pres. Gilkerson expressed appreciation for everyone who has risen to address the COVID-related challenges we are experiencing. Special thanks to our IT and custodial staff, our remote coaches and our Public Information Officer (PIO). • We are ware of the digital divide and the hardships that many are facing, as well as the role race and class plays in how this pandemic is experienced. • Reminded everyone that the physical campus will remain closed until June 30. Limited access will be granted for essential needs, services and instruction. • 1000 Chromebooks were delivered to District last week. District IT staff are working to get them ready for tracking/distribution. Laney College will be receiving 400 of these Chromebooks for our students. A District-wide survey went out to students to assess tech needs. Close to 600 Laney students have confirmed that they need support. The identified need is far greater than the amount we will receive. Still waiting to hear when the District will get the remaining 8000. • Submitted a proposal for a grant to the Stupski Foundation that, if awarded, will provide laptop computers and internet service for up to 720 students. Should hear about this soon. • The Student Life and Educational Success units are working on a process for providing emergency grant aid to students. These funds will provide gift cards for groceries (in place of food pantry). This is through the State Equity funds. The CARE Act should provide \$3mill. to Laney, and half of those dollars are to go directly to students. • We have also received the Catalyst grant, which will go to provide support to undocumented students. • There has been no decision made thus far on refunds for student fees. • Late start classes have started. Working to plan for remote instruction for the long term. Once we come back to in-person instruction and services, things may look different. The new normal may include things like caps on students in classes to ensure social distancing, etc.. • While away from campus, we are continuing to keep participatory governance active. | |



COLLEGE COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>3.1 Approval of the March 4, 2020 College Council Meeting Minutes <i>Presenter: Tammeil Gilkerson</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FRED BOURGOIN CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MARCH 4, 2020 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES. KIMBERLY KING SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED. ABSTENSION: DIANE CHANG, PETER CRABTREE, EVELYN LORD CORRECTION TO ITEM 4.6 – Should be 135 smart classrooms, not 165. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make the requested correction to the March 4, 2020 College Council meeting minutes. |
| <p>4.1 Recommendation from the Facilities Planning Committee to Approve the Laney College Facilities Resource Prioritization for FY 2020-21 <i>Presenter: William Trego</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An overview was provided of the Facilities Planning Committee’s (FPC) facilities resource prioritization process. The list of the aggregate scoring was shared. Also included was a list of challenges experienced. The FPC will follow- up with the Institution Effectiveness Committee in this regard. FRED BOURGOIN CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE TO APPROVE THE LANEY COLLEGE FACILITIES RESOURCE PRIORITIZATION FOR FY 2020-21. KIM GLOSSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. | |
| <p>4.2 Recommendation from the Instructional Equipment & Library Materials (IELM) Committee to Approve the Laney College IELM Resource Prioritization for FY 2020-21 <i>Presenter: Fred Bourgoin</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An overview was provided of the IELM Committee’s Instructional Equipment & Library Materials resource prioritization process. It was noted that the College is not yet aware of what the funds will be for next year, making this resource hard to prioritize given this unknown. A draft of the raw rankings of the IELM priorities were presented. RUDY BESIKO CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT & LIBRARY MATERIALS (IELM) COMMITTEE TO APPROVE THE LANEY COLLEGE IELM RESOURCE PRIORITIZATION FOR FY 2020-21. KIMBERLY KING SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. NO ABSTENSIONS. | |
| <p>4.3 Recommendation from the Technology Planning Committee to Approve the Laney College Technology Resource Prioritization for FY 2020-21 <i>Presenter: Rupinder Bhatia</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that there have been no changes or updates from the version of the prioritization that was presented to College Council in March as a first read. KIM GLOSSON CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE TECHNOLOGY PLANNING COMMITTEE TO APPROVE THE LANEY COLLEGE TECHNOLOGY RESOURCE PRIORITIZATION FOR FY 2020-21. FRED BORUGOIN SECONDED THE | |



COLLEGE COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. NO ABSTENSIONS.</p> | |
| <p>4.4 Recommendation from the Budget Advisory Committee to Approve the Prioritization of Budgetary Requests to be Funded from the 2020-2021 Budget Augmentation Fund <i>Presenter(s): Derek Pinto & William Trego</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that there have been no changes or updates from the version of the prioritization that was presented to College Council in March as a first read. • FRED BOURGOIN CALLED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO APPROVE THE PRIORITIZATION OF BUDGETARY REQUESTS TO BE FUNDED FROM THE 2020-2021 BUDGET AUGMENTATION FUND. KIM GLOSSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. ABSTENSION: EVELYN LORD. • Concern was about the possibility of low enrollment in the fall. Suggestion made that we start advertising for next academic year now and that we may need to invest more in the PIO’s budget for outreach and marketing. Response: Pres. Gilkerson asked the VP of Administrative Services and the Budget Advisory Committee to consider strategies to take in times of emergency. Made need to reassess what has been approved as a part of the budget augmentation, to possibly pivot funding to cover new costs that have arisen as a result of the pandemic. May be coming back to the next College Council meeting to recommend pivoting some of the funding given the situation. | |
| <p>5.1 (First Read) Recommendation from the Classified Prioritization Committee to Approve the Laney College Classified Staffing Resource Prioritization for FY 2020-21 <i>Presenter(s): Alejandro Acosta & Peter Crabtree</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overview was provided of the process used for prioritization of the Classified staffing priorities. Shared some challenges with the process and universal rubric used for prioritization. It was noted that any rankings associated criteria #4 related to assessment was completely omitted. • Noted that there were some cost estimates that were not accurate and hadn’t taken into consideration recent negotiations between SEIU and the District re: benefit costs. • It was suggested that more training may be needed for those who are completing the program review forms in order to provide better justifications for their resource requests. • Noted that the PIO position received the highest ranking score. Spoke to how this was not to fund a new position, but rather to change how the position is funded, i.e. moving it to fund 01. | |
| <p>6.1 Update – Laney’s Accreditation Institutional Self</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2nd draft of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) was published in Canvas. Communication went out to those that have been involved in its development. | |



COLLEGE COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Evaluation Report (ISER) Efforts <i>Presenter: Rudy Besikof</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For every Standard, there are now conclusions and some preliminary cataloging of evidence. ○ Have begun to identify some actionable improvement plans. • Spoke to the Quality Focus Essay (QFE) part of the ISER. This is focused on the College’s initiatives that are directly lending to student learning. Three have been identified thus far: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work with implementing the Guided Pathways planning. 2. Distance education as it relates to CTE (received a grant to develop CTE curriculum). 3. Address students’ basic needs. • To be tracking data on this (ex. retention and success rates). • Currently vetting the ISER through the shared governance committees/senates. The plan is to submit the draft of the ISER to the May College Council meeting as a First Read. The final draft will be submitted to College Council in the fall. • Will be firming up revisions and edits through-out the summer • To be brought (hopefully) two additional times for reads in the fall. | |
| <p>6.2 Update - Guided Pathways Assessment Highlights <i>Presenter: Suzan Tiemroth-Zavala</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The goals for Guided Pathways (GP) at Laney College were shared. The overall focus is communication and planning. • The GP Scale of Adoption Assessment Report was presented at the Department Chair’s Retreat. Faculty identified their preferred areas of interest. • Working to ensure that the areas of interest are visible around campus. • Working to redesign the student portal. Need to be intentional in resigning our website and how things are now organized differently given GP. • Beginning to design the pathways over the summer. • Turned in the Scale of Adoption Assessment in March. This looks different this year given new plans for AB705 and the student funding formula. • The next step projects will implement a lot of the things we have planned for as it relates to GP. | |
| <p>6.3 Update - Laney's Resource Prioritization Process <i>Presenter: Tammeil Gilkerson, William Trego, Rupinder Bhatia</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pres. Gilkerson held a meeting with the resource committee leads and they shared their challenges experienced as it relates to the prioritization and budget augmentation processes. These included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Challenges with applying all of the criteria within the “Universal Rubric for Prioritization” to all of the various resource requests | |



COLLEGE COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More training needed for those completing the program reviews and resource requests ○ Mis-characterization of various resources (esp. as it relates to technology and facilities requests) ○ Timeline too tight to allow for a comprehensive review, and hence consideration of, all requests ○ Not all of the College’s supplemental/categorical funds are included for consideration through the budget augmentation process in addressing the College’s overall needs ○ Possible disconnect between the program review/resource request process and resource prioritization process ○ Insufficient justifications provided for many resource requests ○ Unreliable cost estimate information ○ Whacky data ○ Possible need to separate the innovative or initiative level fund requests vs. the requests for things that we need to exist/operate ● One consistent issue has been time constraints as it relates to reviewing/validating the program reviews, and then also for the resource committees to prioritize the various resources. ● President Gilkerson shared a process for resource prioritization that she witnessed being used at a College she served on an Accreditation visit for. Program review resource requests are reviewed/prioritized at the Dean level first, in order to create a division plan. The Division Plans are then funneled up to the VP level to inform the VP-Area Plans. The VP-Area plans are then submitted to the various resource committees to prioritize the resources. The resources then come to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and College Council for final recommendation for approval. Conversations held about whether we need to entertain implementing a tiered process such as this one. ● Pres. Gilkerson will attend the IEC meeting to discuss this matter and solicit feedback. Will be asking if the IEC wants to be a part of a smaller workgroup of the resource committee leads (William Trego & Rupinder Bhatia) to assess the current process and discuss possible recommendations for improving it. ● It was suggested that the departments are provided the opportunity to prioritize their requests as well. | |
| <p>6.4 Update - Communication Protocols & FAS</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The District has limited the access to the FAS list-servs to only a handful of key positions through-out the District. A message was sent out by our College’s PIO that outlines the ways in | |



COLLEGE COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES **FINAL**

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Listserv Access <i>Presenter: Tammeil Gilkerson</i></p> | <p>which Laney will respond. A request was made for everyone to remain patient as we make this transition. The Yammer app network will allow for all District staff to post information that they were able to via the FAS listserv. Can post to Yammer through your email. Information can also be sent to the PIO to send out to FAS. Working to develop a system to get information out about our shared governance committees. Concern was expressed by faculty about how this change has affected their ability to communicate with each other.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PIO will be sending out a weekly email with FAS messages. She also will send weekly emails re: events. There is concern about oversaturating our community with messages and the resulting effect of many not reading the messages. | |
| <p>7.1 College Council Business – Check-in on College Council Goals for 2019-20 <i>Presenter: Tammeil Gilkerson</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus on this discussion was related to the College Council’s Goal #3 and the consideration of reinstating the voting rights of the shared governance committee reps. who sit on the Council. • The reasons and rationale for the original removal of the voting rights of the shared governance committee reps was provided. • It was suggested that there are some who feel like the union reps should have a vote on the Council, and that taking away their vote takes away their voice. • It was suggested that the Council should consider entertaining a different framework for who gets a vote. Because the committee leads are usually faculty, there are always more faculty represented on the Council. Would like more classified representation. • It was suggested that if members had more voting rights, they may be more inclined to attend. • To confirm when the Union Reps lost their Council voting rights. • To bring this discussion back to the Council. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To confirm when the Union Reps lost their Council voting rights. |
| <p>Meeting Adjournment</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FRED BOURGOIN CALLED A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 15, 2020 COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING. MARK RAUZON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY. | |

Meeting Adjourned 4:00 pm.