



Chabot-Las Positas Community College District
Chancellor's Council
Tuesday, February 12, 2019
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
District Office, Conference Room 1
cccConfer Available

**A
G
E
N
D
A**

1. Review and Approval of the October 9, 2018 and November 13, 2018 Meeting Minutes
2. IEPI Update (BGriffin/GNunez)
3. Board Policies/Administrative Procedures (standing item)
 - a. BP/AP Schedule Update
 - b. AP 6305 Reserves
 - c. AP XXXX Participant Support Costs Policy
4. Joint Recommendation of the Classified Senates on the Classified Professional Development Block
5. Shared Governance Policy Working Group Update
6. Future Agenda Items

Next Meeting: March 12, 2019 from 3:00-4:30pm
District Office, Conference Room 1



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

Tuesday, February 12, 2018

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

District Office, Conference Room 1

Meeting Minutes

Present: Ron Gerhard, Roanna Bennie, Susan Sperling, Ph.D. (phone), Noell Adams, Dave Fouquet, Mon Khat, Melissa Korber J.D., Cindy Robinson, Lylah Schmedel (phone), Rachel Ugale, Yvonne Wu-Craig (phone)

Guests: Bruce Griffin, Guisselle Nunez

Interim Chancellor Ronald Gerhard called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

1. Review and Approval of the October 9, 2018 and November 13, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Adams had one minor verbiage change on the October 9th meeting minutes under #4 Shared Governance Policy Working Group Update. Mr. Fouquet pointed out a typo on the November 13th meeting minutes under #3 Funding Formula Committee Composition. SCOFF should be SCFF. The October and November Chancellor's Council minutes were approved with changes. **(Adams/Bennie)**

2. IEPI Update (BGriffin/GNunez)

CTO Bruce Griffin and PRMG Director Guisselle Nunez presented the District IEPI Project. Mr. Griffin mentioned that the District was approved for \$200,000 to support innovation and effectiveness. There has been some redistribution of funds based on the current environment.

- Enrollment Management - \$10,000
The District will begin researching options in light of the Student Centered Funding Formula. It may be possible to supplement market research and focus groups.
- Communications Consultant & Trainings - \$25,000
\$5000 was used for a District Administrator training in 2018. Available funds will be used across the District.
- Consultants to Enhance District Research Function - \$20,000
Reviewing consultant options to enhance district research function.
- Technology Planning Research - \$36,500

- Consultant has been hired, engaged in research and writing the plan has begun. There may be some additional dollars from this area that can be redistributed.
- Consultant for Review of ITS - \$9,000
This area called for hiring a consultant for an ITS review. This was written before the SERP took place. A new CTO has been hired since and Mr. Griffin shared his background in the education as well as his consulting experience.
 - Student Focus Groups - \$35,000
Ms. Nunez distributed handouts regarding student focus groups. This gives a better understanding of the behaviors and technology use from our students. There were six online focus groups with about twelve groups per session and the focus was technology. Feedback starts on page 18 and shows the feedback for ClassWeb usage. Students want one log in/portal that gets them in the zone.
 - Site Visits - \$40,000
The scope was changed. The original proposal was to have three site visits with senior leaders from the District Office and six stakeholders. Banner will have some changes down the road. Instead of attending site visits at other colleges, the funds have been redirected to allow double the number of attendees to attend pertinent conferences. Funding has been made available for the colleges as well.
 - Tableau Reporting Software Licenses - \$24,500
Tableau is a tool that displays dashboard reporting on the web. The number of licenses will be reduced to allow for the purchase of additional software requested by the College Institutional Researchers.

Mr. Dave Fouquet discussed an issue that came up with OEI. One of the programs that comes with Canvas is called Proctorio, which takes control of the computer. Students are worried about invasion of privacy. Ms. Melissa Korber mentioned that nine students came to the Academic Senate regarding Proctorio and from a faculty perspective there are many discussions being had at Las Positas. Mr. Griffin stated that he wants to make sure that he defers to the control that exists from the campuses distance education. This could go to the Technology Committee, but items that are within the colleges' purview should be treaded carefully. Ms. Lylah Schmedel stated that the key concern is the privacy and safety of students. Surveillance is the primary concern. Students met with Ms. Roanna Bennie regarding holding a meeting to bring faculty, classified professional staff, and students together to discuss all views.

Ms. Noell Adams thanked Mr. Griffin and Ms. Nunez for the update.

Zoom rooms were discussed, which could be created to leverage the platform that is already in use into a physical location. It would allow people to call in from the college and meet virtually.

Mr. Gerhard asked about the date the expenditures need to be made since the conferences are scheduled for the spring. Mr. Griffin understood that the money needs to be spent by October.

3. Board Policies/Administrative Procedures (standing items)

a. BP/AP Schedule Update

The District's review of the policies and procedures should be done on a six-year cycle. Mr. Gerhard mentioned that this came to his attention after working on the colleges' midterm report. One of the recommendations being written to is board policies and keeping them current. The CLPCCD Board Policy and Administrative Procedure Continuous Review Cycle document was shown which indicates the chapters and the year they each need to be updated. Council should be prepared to review the policies and procedures that are due from now through August. Ms. Robinson asked if the district uses an outside entity for review. Mr. Gerhard stated that the League has a subscription service that generally sends out revisions to policies and procedures every fall. Those revisions should be incorporated, but anyone from any group can recommend a change or modification. The recommendation would come to the Chancellor's Office for a legal and compliance review. It would proceed to the Senior Leadership Team, Chancellor's Council for a first reading, and then taken back to the colleges for constituency feedback. The feedback would come back to the Chancellor's Office and be reviewed at Chancellor's Council for the second reading. It would be recommended to the Chancellor to move forward. Board policies go to the Board of Trustees for a first and second reading. Administrative procedures move forward to the Board of Trustees as an information item.

b. AP 6305

Mr. Gerhard showed Administrative Procedure 6305, which is a revision of an existing procedure on reserves. This is coming from Business Services because the references were out of date. There was a task force or subcommittee from PBC that supported the increase of the reserve from 5% to 8%. This is brought to Chancellor's Council for a first reading. It will come back to the March meeting for the second reading and then to the Board of Trustees as an information item.

Mr. Fouquet mentioned that in the past, during the recession, the District was spending down the reserves and had to borrow to pay for a year. A special midterm update had to be completed. If the reserves are dipped into, it would be imagined that the ACCJC wants the district to get back up to the approved level. Would the commission hold the district accountable to hold an 8% reserve or would it be the normal 5%? Mr. Gerhard stated that the answer is both. The first piece is that the fiscal review committee looks for the 5%, which is reviewed annually. This work is

independent of the visiting team. Those that are reviewing our compliance would look for the 8% because it is one of the District's Administrative Procedures. If below 8%, it should be determined why and if it was a planned or known event that made the district go below the threshold. If the district goes below 8% and has evidence to support that it was a planned departure from the procedure and the Board approved the plan, we can demonstrate that we are still meeting the standard.

Ms. Robinson asked what the point is to set the standard at 8%. Mr. Gerhard stated that the thought was to make sure the district has resources for the next downward cycle. It could be used to pay the bills until budget cuts and reductions can be planned in a more thoughtful plan instead of just slashing the budget.

Council was asked to send any feedback to the Mr. Gerhard and Ms. Abad.

c. AP XXXX Participant Support Costs Policy

Mr. Gerhard showed the draft of a new administrative procedure which has to do with participant support costs. The word policy should be stricken. This is coming forward because it is becoming a requirement of NSF grants and any grants that are received from federal sources. The procedure is more compliance related and it does not impact the district on how we operate or conduct business. It speaks to institutionalizing some federal grants and it relates to participant support costs in particular. Ms. Yvonne Wu-Craig mentioned that participants are defined as non-employees. Typically, this would be used in a situation to support students or other faculty from another university to attend a conference at Chabot, to support travel and stipends. We are currently a pending NSF recipient. The procedure will be given a number before the second reading.

4. Joint recommendation of the classified senates on the classified professional development block grant

Ms. Noell Adams mentioned that in the Budget Act of 2018, community colleges were granted funding via the classified professional development block grant. Districts are allocated funding as reported through MIS data as of Fall 2017 for full-time equivalent classified, supervisory and confidentials. Based on our district's reporting, we would receive \$74-75k. A meeting took place with Mr. Ron Gerhard and the three classified senates to discuss how the funds would be allocated.

Mr. Gerhard stated that the conversation focused on how to spend the money in a way to support classified development. Initially, it was thought to allocate the funding by location based on FTE count, but the classified senate leadership supported the idea that it would be good to have an event that would bring together classified from across the district. An event designated as a classified professional development day with speakers brought in was suggested. The notion was largely embraced and supported but there are concerns in terms of logistics. Finding a venue and time of year that has little to no impact on students is

suggested. Ms. Adams stated that this is one-time funding and it is not an ongoing project. Ms. Korber mentioned the amount of work that went into the expansion of the resources in the area of professional development and would like to see this project continue. Mr. Gerhard stated that this conversation is evolving and may become a reality if done in a thoughtful planned manner that does not significantly impact the services to our students.

5. Shared governance policy working group update

Ms. Adams reported out where the working group is currently. The first drafts of the revision of the Board Policy and Administrative Procedure were developed. The plan is to share it with the working group by the end of next week. Ms. Korber stated that there are some good models and now that there is a draft, it may get to the March meeting. It is anticipated to not hit snags with Academic Senate. If the draft comes to the March Council meeting, it will be a first reading.

6. Future Agenda Items

- Board Policies and Administrative Procedures

Mr. Fouquet asked about the VC of Educational Services and Student Success recruitment and questioned if the position is paid for through district office funding. Mr. Gerhard stated that the position was split funded by the District Office and Contract Education. The job description will not change and there has been a general recognition that there is a need for someone to continue the work. There is a greater emphasis on the need for this position regarding the policies at the state level.

The timeline for the permanent Chancellor position was questioned. Mr. Gerhard stated that both he and Ms. Bennie are serving as interims and there is a need to put forward a calendar to make sure the correct processes are followed between now and the end of the time on both contracts. The Board has not finalized a calendar yet. Ms. Korber stated that people at LPC are really enjoying the stability that this longtime interim creates. It is a little concerning to spend time and energy on a recruitment when things are moving along well right now. Mr. Gerhard mentioned that input can be provided.

It was also noted to bring the hiring procedure manuals to a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

Next Meeting: *Tuesday, March 12, 2018*