



## **Chabot-Las Positas Community College District**

### **Chancellor's Council**

Tuesday, May 12, 2020

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

District Office, Green Room

Conference Call

Meeting Minutes

Present: Ron Gerhard, Noell Adams, Dyrell Foster, Miguel Colon, Dave Fouquet, David Rodriguez, Susan Sperling, Sarah Thompson, Rachel Ugale, Chasity Whiteside, Yvonne Wu Craig

Guests: Theresa Fleischer Rowland, Bruce Griffin, Owen Letcher, Guisselle Nunez, Doug Roberts

Chancellor Ronald Gerhard called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

#### **1. Review and Approval of the April 14, 2020 Minutes**

The minutes from the April 14, 2020 meeting were approved as presented. **(Adams/Wu Craig) All in favor.**

#### **2. Board Policies/Administrative Procedures (standing item)**

Chancellor Ron Gerhard asked Ms. Kelly Costello to explain the presentation of the board policies and administrative procedures. KCostello explained that, as with past meeting agendas, the agenda shows all board policies and administrative procedures that will be presented for a first and second reading. The links on the actual agenda point to the current, board approved, web posted BP or AP. When the agenda is sent to Council, all backup materials that show track changes are included within the email as an attachment. This month, another agenda with all supporting materials in one PDF document was sent to Council, clearly labeled as first reading and second reading.

- **First Reading**

- BP 4024 Program Revitalization/Discontinuance**
- AP 4024 Program Revitalization/Discontinuance**
- BP 4025 Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education**

- iv. [AP 4025](#) **Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education**
- v. [BP 4100](#) **Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates**
- vi. [AP 4100](#) **Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates**
- vii. [BP 4070](#) **Auditing and Auditing Fees**
- viii. [BP 4060](#) **Delineations of Functions - Noncredit**
- ix. [BP 4050](#) **Articulation**
- x. [BP 4040](#) **Library and Learning Support Services**
- xi. [BP 4030](#) **Academic Freedom**
- xii. [BP 4027](#) **Travel Study Programs**

RGerhard mentioned that the board policies and administrative procedures shown here are ready for a first reading with Council. These BPs and APs fall under the VC ESSS. VC Theresa Fleischer Rowland mentioned that the process is to look at what CCLC is sending as a legally required update and then track changes are incorporated. Ms. Roanna Bennie has been working on these. RGerhard stated that the first readings will not have a second reading until September, due to the meeting schedule. Chabot Classified Senate President Noell Adams suggested that BP 4100 be reviewed and recommended scheduling another meeting to move the process forward more quickly. It was mentioned that last May there was discussion of cleaning up the language. There is another issue with the language where students are being awarded based on degree applicable course work. There are other revisions that should also be made, and it should be addressed earlier than September. CC Academic Senate President Miguel Colon asked why the language, “rely primarily on the academic senates,” is struck. It was stated that comparisons were made with the templates that came from the League. RGerhard stated that the language should not be stricken. Those changes will be made. Also, changing the paragraph that starts with “upon application” will be changed with appropriate language and fitting proactive awarding into the paragraph. NAdams stated that with the language, it will be impacted by staffing levels and technology resources. It is advised to not tie our hands behind our backs with this policy. NAdams also asked about the 12 units for the certificate. Was this removed by the recommendation of the academic senates? RGerhard stated that this was based off the League’s template. If it is not legally required under the references stated, do we include? Does it diminish or take anything away from the colleges if the language is taken out? LPC Academic Senate President Sarah Thompson believes that one of the reasons is because with the process of creating ADTs across the state, the articulation agreements, if you are following a CSU ADT path, all classes across all colleges are essentially equal. Suppose you have a student that must relocate. Are we not going to let them graduate from our district? NAdams stated that certificates could be as few as 10 units at Chabot. It may be a little bit different talking about certificates. We cannot graduate a student from Chabot unless they have 12 units from Chabot. RGerhard stated that the question that comes to mind, given that the language was struck, since it was not in the League’s template, it is not legally required. That requirement is a local requirement that we have imposed upon ourselves. Those strike

changes will be eliminated. There was quite a bit of tweaking on AP 4100. BPs and APs 4025 and 4100 had the most changes through the League's advisory service. These are just first readings. Are there any questions or comments?

FA President Dave Fouquet wanted to look at 4030 because of Academic Freedom piece. RGerhard stated there is reference to the FA contract within BP 4030.

- **Second Reading**

- i. [BP 3050](#) **Institutional Code of Ethics**
- ii. [AP 3050](#) **Institutional Code of Ethics**
- iii. [BP 3100](#) **Organizational Structure**
- iv. [BP 4010](#) **Academic Calendar**
- v. [AP 4010](#) **Academic Calendar**
- vi. [BP 4020](#) **Program, Curriculum and Course Development**
- vii. [AP 4020](#) **Program and Curriculum Development**
- viii. [AP 4022](#) **Course Approval**

RGerhard presented the second readings to Council. SThompson stated that these are on the agenda as new business this week for the LPC Academic Senate meeting. It was also mentioned that these are to be reviewed with Chabot Academic Senate at a future meeting. RGerhard stated that these will be carried forward for a second, second reading.

DFouquet brought up 4010 for review. It was mentioned that the Board of Trustees will annually adopt the academic calendar, but the calendar committee approves the calendar. TFleischerRowland mentioned that the process would be looked for in the administrative procedure. DFouquet mentioned that there are other specifics than the one referenced in Article 8E.1 and they should be added. RGerhard stated that the process could be added to the administrative procedure, but it has not been there in the past. DFouquet mentioned that he was just surprised that it does not incorporate Article A. RGerhard suggested that with the time available until the next reading, DFouquet could perhaps discuss with the FA. RGerhard stated that although these are on the agenda for a second reading, they have not had an opportunity to go through the senates, and they will be carried forward to the next Chancellor's Council.

### **3. 2020-2021 Meeting Schedule**

It was suggested to add meetings to the calendar during the months of June and July. MColon stated that the Academic Senate will be meeting during the summer, with a proposed full schedule. NAdams asked if it is possible to go to the Board of Trustees for a first reading, second reading and approval, all in one. It was also asked if there is insight as to how long Brown Act rules are going to allow for Zoom meetings. RGerhard has not seen any sunset date on the executive orders. Dates will be sent out for June, July, and August so that we can push those BPs and APs through to the board. 4100 is critical.

#### **4. Future Agenda Items**

- Board policies and administrative procedures.

DFouquet asked if further plans for COVID-19 will be discussed. RGerhard mentioned that there is a group led by VC Owen Letcher that is discussing future planning. There is a mix between facility constraints and requirements by the County and State. OLetcher mentioned that there is a 6-foot requirement for distance. He took general classroom sizes, 30x30 and 36x30, included space for the instructor and estimated the number of students for each classroom could be 12 and 16, respectively. These numbers do not drop off as dramatically in a wet lab or computer lab. Currently, we are not in the category of a business that is recommended for opening yet. Under the current Alameda County orders, any business that intends to reopen must submit a plan and have a phone call with the county. The question regarding staff expectations, we need to consider if we are going to require or provide an opportunity for cleaning between classes. SThompson asked about the type of cleaning and if we can incorporate that into student and instructor habits. OLetcher mentioned the possibility of having a cleaning station at the front of the classroom, with spray bottles. The reason for using bottled products is due to availability and the cost of wipes. It was asked who the representatives in the group are and it was mentioned that this is a preliminary group led by VC Letcher and Deans. The thought is to have the group put together the framework for the most likely scenarios with a smaller group so that the major critical pieces for each scenario can be put together. Whatever the plan is, it will have to be submitted to the county and be approved. MColon asked if anyone has seen the Cal State East Bay plan. It was mentioned that most classes will continue online in the fall for the whole California state system. RGerhard stated the taskforce is working on a timeframe of giving recommendations on Friday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>.

RGerhard stated that the Chancellor's Council Meeting calendar is an action item. The Chancellor's Council Meeting calendar is approved as presented with the understanding that there will be recommended additional dates for the summer that will augment the calendar. **(DFouquet/RUgale)**. All in favor.

VC Doug Roberts discussed recent budget communications. The projected date for the May Revise is May 14<sup>th</sup>. The Department of Finance came out with some projections. One of the numbers that is floated out is potentially an \$18 billion dollar shortfall for K-14. That is a big hit. They are looking at what kind of recovery are we going to have. It was asked if there is any sense of workload reduction. They are scrambling in Sacramento to figure out what to do. Hopefully, the May Revise comes out Thursday so that it can be included in the board presentation.

Director Guisselle Nunez gave a quick advocacy update. The CCLC task force voted on advocating a two-year hold harmless. This recommendation has gone to the State Chancellor. We will continue to add coalition members and we are talking to lobbyists as well. We are trying

to get support on the two-year hold harmless. They understand the situation we are in and see where the budget is going. DFouquet mentioned there is a scheduled SCFF Oversight Committee meeting on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, but no agenda yet.

The meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m.

Next Meeting: *TBD*