College Council Meeting Minutes  
February 9, 2015  

CEMMPBERS PRESENT:  
Alison Kuehner  
James Keogh  
Rae Halliwell  
Dave Schurtz  
Mike Holtzclaw  
Stephanie Foisy  
Leta Stagnaro  
Jesse MacEwan  
Terry Exner  

Gari Browning  
Jeff Roberts  
Sally Scofield  
Bunny Klopping  
Shairon Zingsheim  
Lenore Landavazo  
Kelly Wilmeth  
Ron Little  

MEMBERS ABSENT:  
Sonam Babu  
Ron Travenick  

Rowan Youssef  
Alex Lebedeff  

OPEN MEETING:  

1. Approval of December 8th and January 21st College Council Minutes  
   
   December 8th College Council minutes approved unanimously.  
   January 21st College Council minutes approved unanimously as amended, to revise text to read “You can opt in to share information or not on college applications” on page 3.  

New Employee Introductions  
Chief of Police, Safety and Security John Worley, Interim Bond Construction Robert Dias, and Confidential Assistant to the Vice President of Academic Affairs Michael Moore were introduced to College Council.  

2. Board Meeting Updates  

   • At the Board meeting on January 14th, the board heard an update on the strategic planning process, the recruitment process and hiring procedures, and an accreditation update.  
   • Board workshop on strategic planning process last week (1/28). The workshop was an opportunity for the Board’s input into strategic goals and process. Mike Bowman provided a review of the data and assessment processes. They also went through the gap analysis. There will be another board workshop on the strategic planning process after the college-wide summit.  

3. Measure G Update (Academic Core Buildings)  

   • Review of PowerPoint presentation, provided by Joel Heyne of Gilbane.  
     o Design is complete through the construction document level, submitted to DSA. Comments have been received from DSA.  
     o Building 2 will be wrapped in scaffolding soon and then put under negative pressure during the abatement process – the negative air pressure will control the airflow by providing filtered air. This process will then take place for Building 8 and then Building 1. Hard demolition starts June 1st.
After 100% of the design development process, the academic core project was over budget. A value engineering exercise occurred. This aimed to see where we could save money for the district – it did not impact any programs. The value engineering process resulted in approx. 4 million in savings, mostly in systems engineering (mechanical, plumbing, etc.). The target estimate is now $126.5 million (note this will be revised by the 2/11 board meeting to $126.7 million).

Revised exterior images of the academic core building project:
- Large lecture hall – plaster finish on the exterior, was originally going to have an artistic screen.
- Building 2 – no value engineering impacts to exterior changes
- Concrete finishes could be a value engineered savings, but not yet determined.
- Learning commons – no value engineered changes.

Interior images shown of the academic core buildings – medium lecture hall, learning commons

**Question:** On the medium lecture hall, will the window impact viewing the screen? **Response:** There will be motorized shades. **Comment:** With Building 7 and Newark, there have been HVAC issues.

**Response:** There will be efficient glass, limits to the glazing and limited western exposure windows. There will also be a new central utility plant as part of Building 1.

### 4. Budget Update

  - Huge bump in expenditures – almost all is related to negotiated settlements
  - Setting aside money for faculty medical allowance
  - Summary of all unrestricted general funds – not much has changed
  - **Question:** It looks like we still have $800,000 in the Bookstore buyback fund. I know it came up as a question last year. Is the budget committee considering what to do with this? **Response:** There was a discussion but no decision made. **Comment:** We shared a presentation with the budget committee about Follett successfully managing the bookstore. We could bring the presentation to you, though it would need to come from the budget committee first.

- **2015-16 Governor’s Budget Proposal** – review of PowerPoint presentation.
  - The Governor presented his 2015-16 budget proposal on January 9th – a very prudent budget, with conservative spending and focused on reducing long-term debt. The budget is increased 1.4% over last year.
  - There is a lot of one-time funding for education this year. Community colleges are slated to get almost 11% of Prop 98 funds. Up to 2% growth, however we’re waiting to hear about a final, adopted funding model to see how that might impact Ohlone.
  - Additional base allocation – one of the more volatile and less secure areas of the budget.
  - One-time money for student success – funding formula to be developed.
  - One-time money – reimbursement of mandated claims. Could be $400,000 to $500,000 for Ohlone.
  - Prop 39 – Ohlone’s share estimated at $150,000 to $200,000.
  - CalSTRS rates were set as part of the 2014-15 state budget. The rates that were signed into effect are in the presentation (see slide). The employer rate contribution will be up to 19.1% in 2020-2021. Currently we’re projected to spend $1.4 million. If we only increase for step and column and use current staffing numbers, Ohlone’s contribution would be $3.1 million by 2020-2021. CalSTRS contribution rates for employees will increase as well.
  - CalPERS rates are determined by board action. Ohlone’s estimated contributions (based on actuarial assumptions) were displayed on a presentation slide.
  - Both CalPERS and CalSTRS contributions were displayed in one graph – using estimates, a total current contribution of $3.2 million would become $6.3 million by 2020-2021.
  - If you compare every subsequent year – we’re spending $10.6 million more in employee retirement benefits. This is something we need to plan for when we put together next year’s budget and subsequent budgets. We also have an OPEB contribution.
  - **Question:** Is this information on the budget committee site? **Response:** Yes.
5. Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan

- Draft plan presented to College Council, questions encouraged.
- Plan is required by Title 5 and must be submitted to the Chancellor’s office. Every three years the district needs to look over the plan and repost it.
- The plan is fairly long – divided into 16 sections. Most of the sections are required by Title 5. An overview of some of the sections:
  - Sections 1 and 4 are pretty prescriptive – they’re definitions.
  - Section 5, on the EEO committee – this committee’s charge would be expanded to include diversity.
  - Section 6 outlines the complaint process – we already have this.
  - Section 8 – this training has been taking place already for many years.
  - Section 10 – Requires us to analyze our current workforce. This analysis is ongoing. We’re going to do a survey.
  - Section 11 – Not required
  - Section 12 – Recruitment and hiring procedures, these have been in place for the last three years.
  - Section 14 – Ideas for embracing diversity, many are in place – more to be done.
  - Section B of the appendix has best practices for maintaining institutional diversity.
- Will send College Council a “cheat sheet” list to assist in reviewing the document.
- We’re already here doing a lot of the work outlined in the plan. Very excited about the EEO/Diversity committee – many things will be under one umbrella. Question: Is that committee in place now? Response: No. Question: Will the committee report to College Council? Response: It will report to College Council. Especially if we’re going to add campus diversity as part of its charge. The group is not formed.
- Question: Was this plan due in June 2013? Response: Technically, yes. We’re not the only district struggling with this. The Chancellor’s office did not provide some of the data. About 1/3 of districts have their plans turned in. Question: There’s no penalty for turning it in now? Response: No.
• Review of strategic planning timeline. The student survey was collected and has been analyzed. Staff and faculty surveys will close on Friday (2/13).

• **Question:** Several faculty members are concerned that the information is too focused, that one could find out who's filling out the survey. **Response:** Their concerns are valid, however only one person will be reviewing these, someone who is not familiar with faculty. **Question:** Could we separate the data, to preserve confidentiality and still collect data? **Response:** We wouldn’t be able to disaggregate the data – i.e., this represents full-time vs. part-time faculty, Fremont vs. Newark employees. **Question:** Do we need departments listed, maybe just division? **Response:** We could just ask for division.

• **Comment:** We could ask “Do you feel safe on the Fremont campus?” or “Do you feel safe on the Newark campus?” That could still give an idea of where everyone’s located. **Response:** Giving a location as a separate survey question lets one determine how Fremont and Newark people feel on all issues.

• **Comment:** We could have an external company analyze the survey.

• **Question:** Maybe we can talk about this one before the next survey? If departments are an issue, they can certainly be left off of future surveys.

• We're in the process of reviewing the Educational Master Plan. The plan will go to Faculty Senate next week, and then a 1st reading for College Council on February 23rd.

• Important dates related to the strategic plan were announced – March 6th, community advisory meeting (breakfast). College Council will be invited to this meeting. Members will be asked to listen, not to provide input - there will be other opportunities to provide input. The campus-wide strategic planning summit will be held on Friday, April 10th. There will be pre-summit preparation meetings on March 12th and 13th. They will be an opportunity to hear the data presented and understand it, to come into the summit informed.

• **Question:** Are the student survey results shared with students? **Response:** We’ve not shared with students previously. The results will drive the topics of the student focus groups. The focus groups will be run by students.

7. **Accreditation Follow-up Report**

• Review of PowerPoint – 1st reading of report.

• 1st recommendation – this was achieved prior to receiving the accreditation letter.

• 2nd recommendation – Mike Bowman and the Student Services area have done significant work to find a data set for student services. The analysis needs to be data driven. There’s a set of data to determine that we’re meeting the needs of students. We’re going to have to show that we’ve sustained this and have continuously looked at the data.

• 3rd recommendation – this has been negotiated with UFO, and has been completed as well. It is referred to in Appendix F of the UFO contract.

• **Question:** When is the time to provide feedback? **Response:** Send it to Leta Stagnaro in an e-mail.

8. **Heard it through the Grapevine**

• **Question:** Some of the setup in the portables is very awkward. Have to teach from the back of the room. Conversation about this for future construction? **Response:** That’s good input. That’s something that we’ve heard about at Newark as well, even in the permanent classrooms.

• **Comment:** There is a chair shortage in the portables – for students, interpreters and captioners. About 10-15 chairs short, and there’s not an easy way to get chairs when we’re short. Something to consider for the future buildings – extra chairs. **Response:** There are supposed to be two chairs for interpreters in each of the portables. The new buildings are much different than the portables. **Comment:** It’s also a problem at Newark. **Response:** Please give the room numbers, it would be helpful.

ADJOURNED: 4:32 p.m.
Spring Semester Meetings (2015)
Fremont Campus / Room 7101, Mondays @ 3:00 – 4:30 p.m. (unless noted)
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