





**Chabot-Las Positas Community College District  
Chancellor's Council**

Tuesday, September 11, 2018

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

District Office, Conference Room 1

Meeting Minutes

Present: Susan Cota, Ed.D., Susan Sperling, Ph.D. (by phone), Roanna Bennie, Mon Khat, Melissa Korber, Noell Adams, Cindy Robinson, Dave Fouquet, Rachel Ugale, Mike Alvarez, Yvonne Wu Craig (by phone)

Absent: Lorenzo Caballero, Lylah Schmedel, Joanne Bishop-Wilbur, Pedro Ruiz, Karen Metcalf

Guests: Rajinder Samra, Wyman Fong

Interim Chancellor Susan Cota called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

**1. Welcome and Introductions (SCota)**

Dr. Cota gave a brief update on the Chancellor's search. An email has been sent out that gave information about the Chancellor's search website. More reports will come. There are brochures available to hand out at conferences.

This is the first council meeting of the new academic year. Introductions took place around the table.

**2. BP and AP Update (KJohns)**

Vice Chancellor Johns discussed the process of updating the Board Policies and Administrative Procedures. Board Policies are placed on the Board of Trustees agenda for a first reading and again for approval. Administrative Procedures are approved by the Chancellor, but brought to the Board for information. These come to Council to make sure that all of the constituents have reviewed.

**• Second Reading on Board Policy and Proposed Administrative Procedures**

**i. Board Policy 4029, Hours and Units (new)**

VC Johns mentioned the change is small in terms of content, but big in terms of the number. In order to respond to regulation with the state, a new board policy was

written on how units for instruction are calculated. There are state and federal regulations on how to calculate. There is not a need for a new board policy, simply a minor change in wording.

**ii. Board Policy 4240, Academic Renewal**

There will not be a new board policy, but simply minor changes to the existing policy. The revision permits a student to apply for academic renewal at Chabot or Las Positas if they have completed equivalent coursework at another accredited institution.

Under the administrative procedure, there was one recommended improvement. At the very end of the paragraph, *accredited institution* was changed to *regionally accredited institution*. Ms. Adams noted that the words Las Positas and/or Chabot were crossed out. The VP of Student Services brought this up at the ESS committee and the intention is to allow the use of units from other colleges.

**iii. Administrative Procedure 5530, Student Rights and Grievances**

VC Johns mentioned that she did not realize how much work this AP needed until it was pointed out by the work group. There are no suggested changes since the first reading. Ms. Korber asked who served on the committee. VC Johns will send out the members' names, but it consisted of administrators, faculty and student activities.

• **First Reading of Administrative Procedure 6750, Parking**

VC Johns discussed the electric vehicle charging stations. The District is spending a little over \$40K per year to keep the stations running. Under other policies, the District should try and recoup expenses, as well as keep things upgraded. The charging stations have apps that one would upload and be charged the correct rate. There is a need to have the possibility of charging people. This administrative procedure would not create a fee, but only open up the possibility for the colleges to have such a fee. The usage has been tracked and some vehicles sit at the charging station for many hours. There was some discussion of putting parameters on the amount of time a vehicle can sit in the charging stall. The community can use it but there is still a requirement to have a parking permit at each of the colleges. There is some concern regarding the time restrictions due to class times, etc. This should be brought to the facilities committee.

Mr. Alvarez stated that this policy could read open ended by allowing everyone to be charged, not just the people charging their vehicles. Ms. Johns stated that is not the intention. The money charged would go back into the parking funds at the college.

There was question on the intent of vehicles parking head in. This will be looked into further.

VC Johns also brought up one more policy item that needs work. Participation and Governance polices are old and tend to separate the groups. VC Johns asked that the council

take it on. A smaller working group will be formed. VC Johns will send samples to the group before her departure.

### 3. Presentation of Draft Resolution on Goals to Meet Statutory Requirement (KJohns)

VC Johns distributed the draft resolution for the adoption of vision for success goals. The resolution is a piece of the trailer bill that is part of the funding formula. It requires colleges to develop local goals for the Vision for Success. These goals have to align with our comprehensive plan goals. Our version should be adopted and brought to the Board of Trustees so it can be reported on by January of next year. If we adopt a mirror of the state goals as our goals, there is not much explanation needed. Our trajectory in the past has been to not create challenging versions of the goals. Council should go back and talk to their respective groups and discuss why it has been decided to not move forward with more challenging goals. These are 5-year goals, but it is not clear if our five years has to match the state's five years. VC Johns believes that the timeline is 5 years from when the resolution is passed.

Mr. Fouquet discussed that the state needs to receive some feedback on the flaws of the funding formula. If the flaws in the formula are not corrected, there are going to be cases of needing to reduce the services that we provide to the students and cripple the ability to reach our goals for the Vision for Success.

Ms. Korber asked if the Board of Trustees will decide the timeline or will the timeline be added to the resolution. VC Johns mentioned that it could be included, but if it is not, the date it is signed would be the date it starts. It was suggested that we may want to use the 2017-18 data to show the progress we have made since then. Mr. Samra mentioned that when the state goals were set, they were ending in 2016-17. He suggested using 2017-18 as the start time, with an end date of 2022.

Ms. Adams asked if the Board needs to have a first and second reading since it is a board resolution. The input from the field would need to come before then and assuming if everyone agrees to have a start date in the resolution, would it be come to the October Council meeting? Dr. Cota mentioned that this should be discussed with the colleges. If it is decided to have a first and second reading, it will shorten the timeline. She does not believe there is a need for a first reading. College Presidents will bring back feedback to the Senior Leadership Team.

Mr. Samra stated that cautiously aligning the goals to the state goals is good. He is unsure how they arrived at some of the stated goals. Mr. Fouquet asked if this is making us lower our bar of standards. This District does not have to lower the bar. We are a high performing group.

#### **4. Final Comments**

Dr. Cota gave one last update. At the last DEMC meeting, there was discussion about the new funding formula. At the same meeting, there was discussion of possibly expanding DEMC. Dr. Cota, VC Fong, VC Gerhard, Tom Dewitt, Tom Orf, Jeff Drouin, and Dave Fouquet met to discuss this idea. Dr. Cota has consistently heard a common theme at different venues that the two colleges need to come together. Mr. Samra mentioned that it would be great to identify folks that work closely with each of the factors we are currently looking at. There is a need to make sure that each college has parallel processes and that coding is similar. Ultimately, this will bring the two colleges closer and more bonded, especially when discussing the funding formula. Dr. Cota mentioned that DEMC is not the group that should have this conversation. A new committee can be created and should include faculty, classified, and administration. If an item comes from the meeting that needs to be negotiated, the item will need to be pulled. This should be an ad hoc committee for two to three years. VC Gerhard may need to chair the committee at the District level. The researchers at each college could possibly co-chair. There should be a merge of instruction and student services and counseling should be heavily involved. Feedback was requested. Ms. Korber stated that this almost resembles the existing ESS committee. There are a variety of topics, but maybe it is just an ad hoc committee that keeps everyone in the loop and report directly to the Chancellor. Ms. Bennie stated that it is important that the same message is being report districtwide. It would intersect with PBC and ESS. Dr. Cota mentioned that a charge is currently being developed, but encourages the idea of a counselor from each college serving on the committee. Dr. Sperling believes this is a wonderful idea.

Ms. Adams requested that the districtwide committee chairs could send agendas to the heads of the senates. VC Johns will get this information out to the IPBM committees.

#### **5. Future Agenda Items**

- *Vision for Success Goals*

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Next Meeting: *Tuesday, October 9, 2018*