College Council

September 15, 2011
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

MINUTES

Present: Kevin Walthers, Renee Pegues, Bob Kratochvil, Jeff Baker, Eric Harpell, Todd Steffan, Sarah Thompson, Jane McCoy, Jacob Park, Amir Salehzadeh, Rajinder Samra, Marge Maloney, John Ruys, Elizabeth Hopkins, Nadiyah Taylor, Jennifer Adams

---

1. **Welcome & Introductions** (added to agenda)

2. **CCN Equity Point Person** (moved near beginning of agenda)
   Elizabeth Hopkins, representing Campus Change Network (CCN), provided some background on this initiative; she also reviewed the reflection questions and participating committees. Dr. John Ruys presented an update about changes being implemented for the second year of the program; the questions have been revised so that they are more open-ended, and there is an added "anonymity" piece. Dr. Walthers suggested that the group think about incorporating "equity considerations" into each agenda to integrate equity perspectives and issues into all discussions.

3. **Review of Charge & Membership**
   The group reviewed its charge and membership. There was consensus about the accuracy/relevance of the College Council charge. Sarah Thompson noted that the names/titles given to things should reflect what's actually approved (e.g. if a set of statements is approved as the "Strategic Goals," we shouldn't confuse things by later/elsewhere referring to them as the "Institutional Goals" or the Institutional Strategic Goals").

   With regard to the membership, Dr. Walthers noted that there seem to be two groups of members on College Council: those who participate because of their position (ex-officio) and those who serve because they have been elected as a Committee. The group discussed whether it is necessary to the work/charge/intent of College Council that committee chairs serve on it as voting members. If it is, does that stray from the notion of having a structural balance between the number of administrators, faculty, staff, and students? Ultimately, the Council members opted to revisit this topic at a future meeting.

4. **Old Business**
   a. **Nike Funds – Update on "Art on Campus" Initiative**
      Dr. Walthers displayed and reviewed an "Art on Campus" update that Dr. Manwell prepared prior to his retirement. The President will ask the two initiative Chairs – Deanna Horvath and Scott Miner – to provide an in-person to College Council at a future meeting.

b. Participatory Governance Handbook

Jennifer Adams displayed and reviewed a draft of the new Participatory Governance Handbook. She briefly outlined some of the document additions, which were based on discussions/recommendations from College Council. The intent is to get the Handbook very near the point of completion, share it with the constituency groups, and then convene a work group to do screening and editing. Vice President Kratochvil suggested adding information about LPC's sustainability efforts and "paperless" meetings. Noting the templates included in the Handbook, Eric Harpell conveyed how helpful it will be to have an easy-to-find and centralized repository for such items.

5. New Business

a. ASLPC Resolution

Amir Salehzadeh distributed and reviewed the ASLPC resolution regarding a proposed increase to the Student Activity Fee (from $5 to $10). He provided some history, including the work that the ASLPC and Associated Students of Chabot College (ASCC) have done on the issue, explained the reasons behind the proposal, and gave examples of the things these funds support. Vice President Kratochvil noted the correlation often seen between campus life activities and student success. Sarah Thompson added that – when the ASLPC has future resolutions – they can also send it to the Academic Senate, who can pass a resolution in support of the original resolution. Dr. Walthers recommended the inclusion of all relevant details in the paperwork: reason for the increase, why $10 was selected as the new fee amount, and what the ASLPC will use the additional revenue for.

The College Council members reached consensus in support of the ASLPC resolution. Next steps in the process involve the President's Office sending the resolution to the Chancellor's Office; it will be accompanied by a Board Recommendation for the October 18th meeting. ASLPC will also bring the resolution to the Chancellor's Council meeting on October 4. Student Services and the ASLPC will set up a meeting to coordinate all the places where this change needs to be reflected (e.g. Class Schedule, website, etc…).

b. Academic Senate Proposal for Staff Development

Sarah Thompson presented details of the Academic Senate's recommendation to restructure "the governance of Classified Staff and Faculty Professional Development" and "split the standing committee into two separate Senate subcommittees." The recommendation is based on the following elements:

- "Professional development is a 10+1 item, yet the Academic Senate has no current role/ say over policy and decision making in the current governance structure.
- The use of flex days are critical for the college to stay abreast of changing Title V regulations and other state mandates – coordination with the Senate is essential.

- Classified Staff should not have to ask for funding from a faculty dominated committee – nor should they have to get approval for their flex and professional development activities.
- The composition of the [new] Faculty Professional Development committee would need to have division representation (it already does) and [Board of Trustee] designates (as this 10+1 item falls under the category of "Mutually Agree") – the Classified Staff may keep their representatives if they so desire, although I am assuming they would probably want to staff their own committee first.
- The [new] Faculty Professional Development committee would still be responsible for tracking variable flex, processing conference requests and planning flex days, so the reassigned time would stay with this committee.
- The [new] Faculty Professional Development Committee would report to the Senate and to the College President.
- The Chair would no longer sit on the College Council; the chair instead would send reports through the Academic Senate President (unless it is deemed critical to college functioning for them to be there as it sometimes is with Program Review, etc.).
- The money for all Professional Development will stay in the President's Office, but will be divided before allocations are given to the two committees.
- The [new] Classified Professional Development Committee will outline a budget of needs at the beginning of the Academic year so that monies can be split as early as possible."

The Council members had considerable dialogue about this issue and any potential benefits or consequences, including:

- Release time for the Staff Development Coordinator
- Use of Staff Development funds for/by Administrators
- Requiring/expecting Classified Senate to request/justify their need for Staff Development funds each year

Jane McCoy expressed concern about the contractual implications, as this would require a change to the way some of these relationships/processes are outlined in the Faculty Association (FA) contract (p. 237). She also voiced an objection to things being done in this manner (i.e. outside of the negotiations process). Ultimately it was suggested that the FA work with Ms. Thompson to clarify the language, so that it addresses what she is trying to achieve and is in keeping with the contract. Dr. Walthers recommended that, once that has occurred, Ms. Thompson "re-package" the item as a formal proposal and bring it back to College Council for further review and a vote.

LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

College Council

September 15, 2011
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

6. **Coordination of Information**
   a. **Academic Services**
      Vice President Maloney reported that ACCJC will be holding a training session in November, and 7 reps will attend from LPC.

   b. **Administrative Services**
      No report

   c. **Student Services**
      Vice President Baker reported that Student Services has been working on the following items:
      - Focus on the "3Cs" (outlined during his Convocation presentation) related to student success
      - Looking at data from embedded Counseling
      - Considering a survey students regarding how best to communicate with them
      - Working on developing a staff/student resource guide to provide useful info about Student Services
      - Creating a sub-committee to address how students get served and navigate between various Student Services programs

   d. **Planning & Budget Committee (PBC)**
      No report

   e. **Facilities Committee**
      Committee hasn't held first meeting yet.

   f. **College Enrollment Management Committee (CEMC)**
      No representative present

   g. **Staff Development Committee**
      No representative present

   h. **Sustainability Committee**
      Eric Harpell reported that, although the Committee hasn't met yet, they have a hold-over issue from last year: parking for fuel-efficient vehicles. Currently, we have parking spaces identified on campus, but we do not have a policy for enforcement. Vice President Kratochvil explained that the list of "fuel-efficient" vehicles is quite extensive and, at this point, it would not be feasible for Campus Safety to enforce it and examine each car to determine its eligibility. The Council members talked briefly about possible ways this could be managed, recognizing that the College doesn't currently have the capacity/resources to take this on.

LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

College Council

September 15, 2011
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

i. **Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)**
Rajinder Samra explained that the IEC talked about: the Strategic Goals, Strategies, and KPIs; a re-cap of the Committee's work in 2010-11; and, going forward, who should be responsible for the prioritization of the Strategies. Vice President Kratochvil added an overview of the sub-group meeting, at which the group further discussed the role of Program Review and the linkages between planning and resource allocation.

j. **Student Senate**
No report (representative had to leave the meeting early)

k. **Academic Senate**
Sarah Thompson reported that the Academic Senate is working on the following items:
- Looking at all of our processes/mandates (SLOs, Program Review, AB 1440, etc...) to streamline, condense, and merge the so that the work is more meaningful and productive
- Creating a comprehensive, college-wide student success plan
  - Flex Day (November 1) is committed to getting conversations and work started
- Working on Midterm Report

l. **Classified Senate**
Todd Steffan reported that the Classified Senate has not held its first meeting yet.

m. **Faculty Association (FA)**
Jane McCoy reported that the FA is still in negotiations.

n. **SEIU**
No representative present

7. **Next Steps**

8. **Equity Perspective & Reflection** (added to agenda)
Dr. Walthers presented the CCN "Point Person" questions to the group. All in attendance agreed that the meeting had been equitable. Dr. Walthers noted that the students did a good job presenting their resolution about the Student Activity Fee. Mr. Samra stated that, with regard to the recommendation about the Staff Development Committee, it will be helpful to hear feedback from the Classified Senate.

9. **Adjournment**