OPEN MEETING:

1. Approval of February 24, 2014 College Council Minutes
   - Passed without objection to approve the February 24, 2014 College Council minutes.

**Discussion not on the agenda**
   - Due to the presence of members from the accreditation site visit team, Alison Kuehner began the meeting with an overview-description of College Council & its role as advisory to the President.
   - No questions from the visiting team, so the meeting returned to the published agenda.

2. No Smoking Update
   - College Council member Kelly Wilmeth provided PowerPoint presentation detailing ad hoc committee’s review of smoking/no smoking considerations.
   - Sensitive topic; strong feelings in both directions.
   - Personal decision for people; some who are smokers may find it difficult/embarrassing to discuss.
   - Review of ad hoc committee members & those who consulted. Considered reaching beyond the group but decided that ample opportunity had previously been provided. Ad hoc committee included:
     - Kelly Wilmeth – Student Services / Management; Mat Weber – ASOC President; Bunny Klopping – Faculty
     - Sally Bratton – Health Center consultant; Steve Osawa – Campus Police consultant; Leigh Ann Elizondo – CSEA Representative
   - Review of questions explored. Handout containing research / compilation of information regarding what other schools are doing. If you are interested, electronic version available.
   - Consideration of "free" – free from tobacco, nicotine, smoke? All have implications and inclusion of all products broadens the discussion.
   - Challenges -- even "what is smoke", smoke free except for... cafeteria grill smoke, etc.
• Strong feelings from campus police that if no fines are imposed, no real enforcement possible.
  Chart available to consider what other schools are doing. Issues with tiered fines. Campus police
  would then have to track, if tiered fines. Options other than fines or tickets, not explored.
• Designated area(s) for students/employees to smoke? Opinions mixed on ad hoc committee.
• Student enforcement vs. college personnel enforcement discussion.
• Smoking in your vehicle? Windows up or down? Campus police most vocal on this topic. Cars as
  private property, but tires they sit on are on our property (technically). Campus police feel smoking
  should not be allowed in cars. Committee agreed to disagree.
• Giving a student a ticket very different from giving an employee a fine or discipline if they leave for a
  break and don't have enough time to get back to their work station.
• Review of resources/research. Opinions very biased, depending on author of the article/study.
• Recommendation: Smoke free and fine system.
  o 1st offense = warning; 2nd offense = $25.00; 3rd offense = $50; 4th or more = $75
• Committee consultants from campus police and health center -- this recommendation largely reflects
  a compilation of their views.
• Not 100% agreement on any points. Very difficult, complex topic.
• Concerns & discussion points reviewed:
  • Tried to discuss fines and the "money part" of how that would work, but decided it was beyond
    purview of ad hoc committee.
  • Started the process thinking about health -- the health of the campus -- and education about healthy
    lifestyles. Providing protection for people who have health concerns; trying to represent that as best
    they can.
  • Line drawn -- lifestyle issues; smoking an electronic cigarette in a car is not a risk to anyone else.
  • Enforcement a campus police issue.
  • Kelly spearheaded this effort and did lion's share of the work.
• Comment: CSEA president
  o CSEA concerns are not to address larger societal issue of smoking. Reminder that wages,
    hours, and working conditions are negotiable. CSEA not involved in making a
    recommendation regarding smoking procedure.
• Kelly Wilmeth distributed handout / sign-up list for those interested in receiving an electronic version
  o Student comment: Trying to look at what angles to consider - protecting people from things
    they don't want in the atmosphere. How far does smoke travel? Protecting people and not
    taking away freedoms. E-cigarettes/vaporizers; not a lot of good research; not regulated yet.
  o Comment: A big discussion regarding if FDA considering e-cigarette vapor is safe/not safe.
    Not determined yet. Can depend on brand name; until control from FDA and how defined,
    don't know what kind(s) are more or less harmful.
  o Comment regarding E-cigarettes - should remain flexible. Anecdotal story regarding
    personal experience with cessation devise helping.
• Fines, progressive fines. Discussion regarding how to operationalize fines.
• In the handout, most schools that have fines have progressive fines. Osawa agrees that would be a
  challenge, but will figure out how to implement. Not excited about it, but he will determine process.
  Campus police will support whatever the college decides.
• A lot of discussion about providing a designated area, how far can smoke travel, and a non-smoker's
  right to the most direct path of travel.
• PowerPoint and packet link will be made available; info to be put on CC website.
• **Recommendation:** Take back to constituent groups; continue discussion for next meeting or two.
• Many people may think this has already been decided. Need some clarity and direction; change
  signage regarding what's decided.
• Overall, until administrative procedure comes out, slightly touchy issue.
3. Diversity Study

- Round two of evaluation of disaggregated data regarding staff. Special populations, retention & success rates provided by Mike Bowman, Executive Dean of Research & Planning.
- Regarding staff ethnicity -- is it appropriately aligned with student and/or community population, state-wide averages? Suggested that we compare against the 21 colleges in the Bay 10 area, based on common geography.
- At request of College Council, Bowman created four spreadsheets to detail classified, full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and administrators. Breakdown of information and how it compares with geographically similar colleges.
- What strikes Mike is:
  - In almost every area, college staff has a different racial/ethnic breakdown than the district.
  - Need to consider the longevity of employees as compared with immigration rates.
  - Wonderful place to work where people come to work and stay. You can't change hiring practices overnight.
  - Classified -- compared our %s to median % of 21 colleges in the district. Keep in mind student/district breakdown.
  - For example, African American staff exactly the same as the median for the Bay 10 colleges; only 4.3% of residents in our district
  - Asian classified staff 25.6 compared to students (40.3%), district (47.9%)
  - Review of other classifications of ethnicities. For example:
    - White population
    - 39.2 classified staff
    - 30.7 of the district
    - 21.5% students
- Is this a good thing or a bad thing?
- Classified and adjunct faculty are the categories you want to consider first. The most turnover and the most opportunity to hire from a more diverse pool.
  - Question: What kind of hiring pools do we have out there for different ethnic groups?
  - Where can you find educational attainment connected with ethnicity? For different ethnic groups, how many would qualify to be faculty? Response: Difficult to find data (searching) and still important to consider.
- Of note, full-time faculty (FTF) almost 67% white. As high as that is above student enrollment, not particularly unusual. Slow responding numbers when FTF slow to resign/retire.
- Request for more data. Who do we attract and who do we hire? Interesting information to look at. Would be interesting but applicants not required to declare ethnicity. H/R to see if they can crunch numbers and provide them to Mike.
  - Comment: Interesting exercise, but we have to be careful. Trying to compare your staff to the district composition is not appropriate. what might be interesting is to look at faculty/administration, often doing a national search. Adjunct/classified, not going to get people moving here to work. May more accurately reflect local applicants. would be inappropriate to say we are trying to model district proportions. More appropriate to say we are striving for diversity. Recognizing the other sorts of diversity that Ohlone has that are not represented in typical data: deaf, born in other countries. Not traditional differences.
  - Comment: More and more cultures blending -- how people decide to check which box since there are multi-ethnic people. Reply: Yes, we do capture "non declaring" but also "I don't fit into any of these categories" (multi-ethnic). "Unknown" among students seems to be high.
- Will come back to this discussion and more data during future meetings.
4. College Council By-Laws Updates

- Review of proposed changes to College Council by-laws (2\textsuperscript{nd} reading):
  - Any responses from constituents?
    - CSEA: Maybe keep task forces language for possible future use?
    - History of task forces was 8+ years ago, formed for temporary functions. Trying to clean up committees, so almost all committees now report to College Council and have CC representations, Faculty Senate committees, etc.
  - Some of the previous task forces morphed into committees. Decision not to have previously existing task forces since obsolete. Language we're proposing eliminating.
    - Concern is if CC is a body of shared governance and we develop task force in the future, want to be sure future task forces will still fall under shared governance. Way to protect shared governance process. Proposing "when task forces used"... to protect from future possible changes.
    - Maybe keep "iii" to make sure shared governance/constituent groups appoint for membership. Open to constituent groups to keep membership/representation.
  - The way CC has been operating, we convene ad hoc groups. What we're hearing is that CC could create a larger body -- a "task force" and the concern is that shared governance should still apply to that working group.
    - Assumption that when removing antiquated language, that doesn't change anything else. If task forces are part of shared governance, and if you take language out what if future leadership is less concerned with "shared governance". Goal of retaining language is to protect representation.
  - Recommend we not approve the proposed language and revisit language with revised language at a future meeting.
  - What exactly is a sub-committee, task force? Define those groups.
  - Table discussion to next meeting to allow more time for feedback/discussion.

5. Heard it Through the Grapevine

- Comment regarding parking concern. When you come out of the north entrance, parking Lot D says "additional parking" and points to Mission Blvd. Misleading/confusing and needs to be moved. Supposed to show that there is more parking in D.
- Comment: Employee of the month; never anyone in that spot (this month, it’s a Newark faculty member). Maybe a lottery for special parking spot?
- President's spot going away after the site visit; will become 45 minute loading/unloading spot.

ADJOURNED: 4:00 p.m.

**Future Council Meetings (2014 / Spring & Summer):**
Fremont Campus / Room 7101, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m. unless otherwise noted

April 7, 28
May 12
June 9
July 14