College Council Meeting Minutes
April 7, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alison Kuehner  Gari Browning
Bunny Klopping  Sally Scofield
Rae Halliwell  Paul Belasky
Kelly Wilmeth  Lenore Landavazo
Yvonka Headley  Kathleen Schoenecker
Dave Schurtz  Ron Little
Alex Lebedeff  Shairon Zingsheim
Jeff O'Connell  Mike Holtzclaw

MEMBERS ABSENT: Leta Stagnaro  Tom Harchous
Ron Travenick  Sonam Babu
Mat Weber

OPEN MEETING:

1. Approval of March 12, 2014 College Council Minutes

   • Passed without objection to approve the March 12, 2014 College Council minutes.

2. Ad Hoc Committees: Function & Process

   • College Council (CC) has created ad hoc committees in the past to deal with issues, such as smoking on campus, printed class schedule, student success/equity, etc.
   • Ad hoc committees have done commendable work and laid foundation for future. Sometimes these groups come to recommendation or sometimes not. Smoking & class schedule - expectation for a lot of research & fact finding. May not be fair to ask committee members to do that research.
   • Sometimes bring in outside folks to consult. How to make those groups more effective. Have done a lot of hard work but want to make the process more clear, improved direction.
   • Proposing a standing fact-finding committee, headed by Mike Bowman, but made up of CC representation. Solid tie to evidence, assistance of consultants. Then bring recommendation to broader group for discussion.
   • Take away wording from CC by-laws that says task forces. Right now we have sub-committees and ad hoc committees. Task forces went away and/or morphed into standing committees. Suggesting that as we move into new strategic plan or try to complete objectives not completed, research committee would make recommendations.
   • Ad hoc committees could be more flexible; suggesting formation of group to gather data, sift through research, and then broad based body (CC) would discuss.
     o Comment: Try to either appoint people to committees who do not have vested interest and, if standing committee, suggest people recuse themselves if the decision would have impact how you do your work or how you would have to change your work. Possibility that you may not be objective.
     o Question: Will committees be balanced? Suggesting that these will be shared governance.
o Question: Why would the fact-finding committee be a standing committee? Maybe better to create fact-finders based on interest or knowledge base. Lose opportunity for flexibility. Keep Mike Bowman as organizer but fluid with regard to other participants.

o Response: Some who have passion about an issue have the burden of gathering data. Create a group that doesn't have vested interest. Bring information to CC and then discuss.

o Question: Didn't we used to have a Research team? Reply: Yes, it existed to look at research (environmental scan / came up with gap analysis, for example), but it's not the same as this.

o Question: Would this be a sub-committee of CC? We could structure it with a broader base, advisory to Mike. Proposal is to create a standing committee for research purposes.

- When we did have people assigned by Faculty Senate, there were people who had an interest in research.
  
  o Comment: Advocate that we don't create a new committee since it's difficult to find people for the committees we already have now. Though it can be a challenge to have people with strong views, are we trying to make everyone happy? Too much intention around pleasing everyone, and maybe it's healthy to have opposing views.
  
  o Response: Do see that people who are passionate about a topic have an interest, but if those are the people who have to gather the data, it can be a burden.
  
  o Comment: Having gone through this process recently, yes, gathering research was cumbersome. Trying to find time to meet, assign tasks, do research, discuss & make recommendations. Data coming in from interested parties (Sally, for example, who's on list-serves and has an abundance of information). Need to balance information; challenge of making unbiased presentation. Source where all of that could be filtered through would be enormously helpful.

- Expertise important (campus security, health center, etc.) hugely useful discussion, but going to all the other schools' websites, union groups, etc. a lot of work and a lot to sift through. Then, should the person who has a strong opinion be the one who presents the information?

- Good point -- is it fair to give all this complicated work to an ad hoc committee? Could we be more efficient?

- If there's research we determine the college wants to do, concrete, easily done but time consuming - those are tasks a research task force could most easily do. Personal research, going out to constituent groups and providing that feedback is a secondary piece of the process that is time consuming.

- Opinion pieces/research still coming in regarding smoking, for example.

- Factual data & constituent input.
  
  o Comment: We're an educational institution and should be considering research from reputable, objective organizations.
  
  o Question: Is there a need to create a standing committee? Our current structure of asking for volunteers and then having Mike engage and coordinate research effort. Keeping in mind that Mike is one person and not a whole research department.

- Suggestion is the standing research group provide recommendations and ad hoc groups would not "step up" randomly.

- President's concept is that we do have a research arm for the college; if we want recommendation, need to have constituent-based group. The research office would do the research but the committee would analyze the data and come up with recommendations.
  
  o Comment: Concern that this would be a lot of extra work for CC members. Reading a lot of data; need to take seriously since you'll be making recommendations. Making more work for a certain number of people?
  
  o Mike Bowman, how do you feel? It would be nice to have 2-3 others who like or would be willing to review research and then make recommendations. Maybe then standing committee would get more expertise, experience. CC would have discussions after review of data.

- Is it all data? When we do environmental scan, we take a broad brush/analysis. Not limited to demographics or one kind of data.
• Pros and cons, obviously. Discuss at a future meeting.

3. College Council By-Laws Updates

• Section 7 of College Council by-laws review ( Regarding committees).
• Sub-committee who reviewed CC by-laws included: Mike Holtzclaw, Jeff O’Connell, Dave Schurtz, Sarah Daniels
• Concern voiced by CSEA regarding the elimination of task force language from the by-laws. Should be some language included since we may have task forces in the future.
  o Suggestions sent to Jeff O’Connell. One of the ideas -- CSEA wants the spirit of the language around shared governance committees with representation. Suggesting taking language 7d3, and attach to 7a. This would read:

  The Ohlone College Council may establish one or more Council subcommittees, consisting of one or more Council members, with such duties and responsibilities as the Council deems appropriate. Membership of [task forces] is appointed by the constituency/representative groups.

• Question/Clarification
  o Do we appoint non-college council members to task forces? The idea is that the shared governance nature of appointments would be reflected in language for any sub-committee.
  o Sub-committees aren't necessarily just CC members.
  o Tech committee is a standing committee, for example. Task forces were temporary; put together for specific purpose. Talking here about something temporary by nature.
• Concern is to make sure that the shared governance/constituent groups’ representation is retained.
• Not taking action this meeting. Put proposals together and bring back to future meeting.

4. Frontage Property Update

• Review of PowerPoint presentation by VP Ron Little; longer presentation to Board of Trustees at next meeting (this Wednesday).
• Review of history of consideration of parcels for surplus; timeline. Total site area = 15 acres.
• Key principles:
  o Town center feel
  o High quality design
  o Link to Mission SJ community
  o Pedestrian connections between campus & Mission Blvd.
• Status of current RFP process
• Proposals received by District in January, 2013. Have been negotiating with Clarke Realty for some time.
• By law, have to go out for bids. RFP out and due this Wednesday. Expecting one bid and possibly one other.
• Review of business terms.
• 24-30 months to reach 95% occupancy. Hot market right now, in terms of apartments.
• Two very reputable, well financed, national firms likely to bid. Dr. Browning will make recommendation; table until special meeting on April 16th to accept or reject bids.
  o Question: What type of housing: 2/3 bedroom apartments with community center. Street level parking in back.
• City's process has environmental impact report, traffic study, etc. Neighbors have opportunity to share thoughts.
• Taxes: nothing out of pocket from district side.
  o Ohlone Indians -- what if they find something during construction? Response: Will have to follow regulations; will slow project down. There is procedure with City.
- Question: benefit to district is one-time $1M and when 95% capacity, we get $600,000 per year. General fund, unrestricted funds.
- Apartments (300). We have international students who live across the street. Can we have them not live there and occupy new apartments instead? Suggest we reserve for international students.

- Board gave President direction to create income stream. What constraints are we going to put on developer. Gave criteria to developers. Did not put too many caveats; took that approach. Controversy over number of units. Need certain level of income to make it a viable project. Will be decided on the 16th if this project will move forward.
  - Traffic? Have they gone that far? That's a city process. Opportunity for review, schools capacity. Eleven reports that have to be completed for City. This is the furthest we've gotten. Remains to be seen.
  - Height restriction? 30’, will not restrict view of campus.
  - Gates? Yes.
  - Maybe housing stipend International students could complete for as scholarship, for example. Maybe lottery?

- Student athletes also come from out of state – are there restrictions regarding housing? At the end of the day, developers still want to rent the units.
- Suggestion that we set aside a number of apartments that could be offered first to Ohlone students. Developer gets the rents, but priority to Ohlone students.
  - Comment: At UC Berkeley, they make all sorts of demands on developers.
- Argument regarding reducing traffic could be dealt with at the City level. Would also reduce traffic. Many students live downtown and have to get here. Would benefit both. Not offering at reduced rate, just offering.
  - Can this go south? What if they go bankrupt, or cut down olive trees, for example? What’s our recourse? Response: They have to have all financing up front. Can't speak to what happens if all of the apartments not filled. They're financially responsible even if the units are not rented.
  - Can we hear about what may happen if the developer doesn't live up to their end of the agreement? At the end of the day, the improvements would become ours, if the terms of the lease are violated. That language is included in the agreement.

5. **Board Meeting Updates**

- Board meeting coming up on Wednesday, April 9:
  - Part of meeting will include joint meeting with FUSD to discuss proposed frontage property development. Some concern about Mission San Jose schools and that people who move here cannot count on attending Mission schools. Will be discussing frontage development; discuss, ask, and answer questions.
- At last Board meeting (March), Trustee Kevin Bristow resigned from the Board. Took a job at UC Merced. Next step is to fill vacancy; will appoint new trustee at May meeting. Applications due April 15th.
- Question: Accreditation news? No update on accreditation. Told we would have draft report for correction of errors by last Monday, but nothing yet.
6. Proposed College Council Meeting Schedule (Fall/Winter)

- College Council meetings currently scheduled through summer. Review of calendar of proposed future dates, with some questions/considerations.
- Discussion regarding CC retreat. Proposed amendment to CC by-laws states: Two College Council retreats will be held each year, as and when needed.
- Does fall retreat need to be held the Wednesday before Fixed Flex? Consideration of options.
- Work with staff development to schedule other workshops on different days?
- Issues with different days; consider Monday, August 18th?
- Also, made aware that the golf tournament this year will be held on a proposed CC meeting day. Alternate suggested.
- Sarah Daniels to distribute proposed calendar with some changes, for approval next meeting.

7. Heard it Through the Grapevine

- Comment was submitted to CC member stating “strongly disapprove of fines if caught smoking”.
- Additional background information has been submitted on smoking/non-smoking topic.
- Mailroom locked; notice came out of the blue. What are students supposed to do when they need to drop off assignments?
- Some incidents with things disappearing from mailroom. At Newark, mailroom is locked.
- Faculty Senate asked mailroom staff to come to recent Senate meeting but mailroom was closed and locked before discussion happened.
- Concern about faculty members who've told students they can leave materials in mailboxes and adjunct faculty who didn't know in advance about this decision. It’s so close to end of the semester, why not forego taking this step until next semester to facilitate communication?
- A lot of complaints from those who use the mailroom regularly. Leave door open as it has been for decades.
- Leta and Ron Little have been in discussions on this topic but they're not here to comment.
- Discussions regularly with faculty regarding mailroom security; DSPS tests, for example. Worry every day about mailbox access. Don't have time to deal with paperwork issues. Security a huge issue for DSPS.
- This was done so badly and with no warning. While we're trying to figure it out, keep it open.
- Books came from vendor and disappeared. Still, hardship for students, parents, faculty. Seems like drastic measure.
- Need discussion. Dealing with a couple issues. Not about the decision, but about preparation and process. Advance warning & planning.
- Impeding operations. Newark established process -- fine. Secure mailroom is important but need advance warning.
- Bottom line -- this is not how we're supposed to make decisions.
- What about having students submit work via Blackboard? Can't tell everyone to use Blackboard. How decisions made is important. This impacts a lot of people.

ADJOURNED: 4:25 p.m.

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

April 28
May 12
June 9
July 14