



Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

Chancellor's Council

Tuesday, March 8, 2022

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

ConferZoom

Meeting Minutes

Present: Ron Gerhard, Miguel Colon, Dyrell Foster, Dave Fouquet, Heather Hernandez, Kyle Johnson, Jean O'Neil Opipari, Theresa Pedrosa, Nathaniel Rice, Sarah Thompson, Rachel Ugale, Chasity Whiteside

Guests: Daniela Ballif, Tracy Coleman, Bruce Griffin, Owen Letcher, Jonah Nicholas, Dionicia Ramos, Kirti Reddy, Estella Sanchez, Sheri Moore

Chancellor Ron Gerhard called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

I. Review and Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented. **(Pedrosa/Johnson) All in favor.**

II. Review and Approval of the February 8, 2022 Meeting Minutes

KJohnson asked about the future agenda items listed in the minutes. Three BPs/APs were requested but not on this agenda. Will they be included at a future meeting?

Chancellor Gerhard stated they are on our list to be brought back.

There was a motion to approve the February 8, 2022 meeting minutes.

(Johnson/Pedrosa) All in favor.

III. Student Enrollments and Matriculation Process Review

RGerhard stated that last week, the state released their P1, which is essentially enrollment numbers coming out of the current academic and fiscal year. Shown was a four-year snapshot of FTES, which included fiscal year 2018-19 – summer of 2018, fall of 2018, and spring 2019. The state reported a bit more than 1.1 million full time equivalent students. The blue bars represent what 72 districts reported in terms of the FTES and the orange bar represents what the state funded. 2018-19 is the first year that the SCFF went into place. As you can see, the amounts districts were funded were slightly above what the district reported as FTES. In 2019-20, there was a similar pattern, and then 2020-21, districts started reporting a sizable drop in enrollment year over year. In terms of what was funded remained constant, because

ultimately stability provisions kicked in which means that districts were funded from their hold harmless or stability funding or funded based upon their revenue prior to a drop in enrollment. More recently, this current academic year, the FTES has dropped even more. Looking at 2021-22, 41 of the 72 districts are in stability funding. This means they are funded under the student-centered funding formula, but a calculation of a previous year. There are 28 hold harmless districts that are funded off our enrollment and revenue in fiscal year 2017-18. Like us, our district would be significantly, for the most part, harmed because of the student-centered funding formula. There are three districts that are funded on the current calculation of the student-centered funding formula.

Looking at the raw numbers at a statewide level in terms of the FTES, and comparing the current year, there is a total drop of 17% FTES since 2018-19. The biggest drop is from 2019-20 year, going into the 2021 year. Our trendline follows the statewide average (during the COVID period). We have a consistent pattern with about an 18.5% reduction in FTES.

The state has experienced a drop in enrollment of total FTES by a little below 200,000. It is important to put that in perspective in terms of that is not just numbers. The largest district in the state is Los Angeles County Community College District. So, those numbers represent an equivalent of taking two LACCD's out of our system in terms of lost enrollment.

While we've seen this data, our IR departments have done an incredible job doing some institutional research on this at a more granular level. The loss of enrollment seems to not correlate or show any relationship with the application trends and patterns that we are seeing. Looking at our first-time incoming student applications, we see different patterns than actual enrollments. Looking at Chabot, fall 19 to fall 20 to fall 21, there is a modest increase in applications from 19 to 20, but a huge increase from 20 to 21. At LPC, fall 19 to fall 21, there is an increase, but there was a bit of a dip in fall 20. These conversations have sparked a lot of discussion. There is a lot of speculation in terms of why we are seeing a 30% increase in applications but seeing continued reductions in enrollment that we are reporting to the state. It is now time to bring in a confident outside group who is familiar with California Community Colleges and our student marketing recruitment, application, enrollment, and matriculation processes to analyze our practices and identify points where we are losing students from inquiry to application, to application to enrollment and then from enrollment to matriculation. There has also been a request asking that moving forward and engaging in this exercise, an equity audit is also included.

DFouquet mentioned that the applications are being shown at each college but is curious about the actual enrollment numbers were out of those applications received. A second question is about the earlier chart regarding funding versus what was reported. In terms of what is funded, that does not show our hold harmless funding because our funding is higher than those orange bars, so what do those bars represent? RGerhard stated that our total computation revenue, or what we are

funding off, is what the orange bars represent. The data was pulled directly from the state chancellor's office apportionment reports. Under the hold harmless provisions, we are funding at the higher amount. The funded numbers that are coming from the state apportionment reports do not reflect the actual amount of funding we are receiving because of the hold harmless provisions. The point of this graphic is really the blue lines to show the actual enrollment reductions and tying that to having a conversation about how that may tie with the patterns that we are seeing with incoming new student applications.

RGerhard answered the first question about enrollment data, and we do not have that at this time. It is believed that this was a reason we were anxious to implement Recruit and Advise. SThompson mentioned that the only way to proceed thoughtfully is if we track these applications. The people that we need to contact are the ones that applied and either tried to enroll and gave up or didn't enroll because those are two different types of information. In terms of, what we have been saying for years, is that our onboarding process has been very cumbersome and not very supportive. Tracey Coleman is in the room, and she is on the actual committee that devised and coordinated the survey of our black students to show where the sludge is. That is where our information is coming from, and we have been discussing it for years. This is a systematic challenge that we have so it is good that we are on the precipice of offering up some solutions or fixes for this.

HHernandez asked if something changed at the high school level and more students are completing applications. But this reminds me of all the work that goes on under guided pathways and the onboarding processes. Are the groups that are working on guided pathways at both colleges going to be included in this work. RGerhard stated that we would need to engage folks and guided pathways and student services in that inquiry. KJohnson stated that he is thankful that someone brought up high school and enrollment there as well. There is a bad stigma on community colleges, and we need to address that issue. DFouquet made a comment on what another community college did with their class schedules, which featured headshots of former students from the college, and it stated where they transferred to or what they were doing career wise. That was a nice approach to combat that community college stigma.

RGerhard stated that a committee will be pulled together to work across the district on this. We will ask for representatives. SThompson stated that part of the reason there is a stigma is when you look in popular media, what is our representation? It shows our faculty as incompetent and our students as unmotivated. We also need to show the accomplishments of our staff as well and be proud of ourselves and then communicate it to our surrounding community.

IV. COVID-19 Update

OLetcher gave an update. The state of California has announced the smarter plan that moves us beyond pandemic and into endemic. As part of that plan, they follow the CDC guidelines to establish CDPH guidance, which then become Cal/OSHA guidance, on mask wearing. The new guidance changed the metrics for which the

county was evaluated, which is now the number of inpatients with COVID-19 patients. The metrics under the case rates changed again by establishing a low, medium, and high. Last Thursday, Alameda County went back into the medium category. Alameda County Public Health Officers announced that while they would follow the guidance of CDC and CDPH, they were still strongly recommending mask wearing in schools and other higher risk areas. They would still require masks in healthcare facilities, congregate living facilities, assisted living homes, and other elements like jails and prisons.

Case rates in different parts of the county are at different levels. We are overall in the medium category and are expected to stay there for a little bit longer than a week, based on case rates that are being reported to the county.

We are currently in week three of no student athletes testing positively. Last week, we had one reported case. That is the lowest number we have had in a while. The dashboard is continuously being updated.

DFouquet stated that Alameda County shows a spike in covid cases over the last two weeks. OLetcher stated that is the same information that the county is giving. The indicated that there may have been one lab that is delayed in reporting so the actual numbers may be affected based on the date the reports are received.

KJohnson stated that we should proceed with caution on stating that we have zero cases at the school because there are cases that I know of now. Keep in mind, that we need to use our words carefully. The cases still exist.

RGerhard stated that the county felt the need to fall in line with the state and there was emphasis on stressing that this move is going from strict indoor requirement to a strong recommendation for education. We continue to analyze our own data and to figure out what is the path forward for our district. That includes the possible continued mask mandate for some period.

DFouquet asked to make a change on the dashboard by breaking it down by building on the two campuses. He would also like the current data without having to scroll.

HHernandez asked if the dashboard includes students or just employees. OLetcher stated that it includes all students, employees and contractors working at the colleges, if it gets reported.

V. Board Policies/Administrative Procedures (standing item)

a. Collegial Consultation Board Policy/Procedure Update

RGerhard stated we have not received any feedback from the constituencies on our conversation regarding the working draft of revised BP 1300 Collegial Consultation. The goal for our next chancellor's council meeting is to bring back

a version that incorporates feedback based upon what we have received. We can then start moving that forward.

b. Second Reading

RGerhard stated that there are four APs and one BP coming back for a second reading. The Student Senate Presidents were thanked for working with TFleischerRowland to work through the melding of the different feedback that was received from both campuses into these working documents.

1. **AP 5015 Residence Determination**
2. **AP 5020 Nonresident Tuition**
3. **BP 5040 Student Records, Directory Info, Privacy**
4. **AP 5040 Student Records, Directory Info, Privacy**
5. **AP 5041 Student Records – Preferred Name and Gender**

There was a motion to recommend moving forward these administrative procedures and board policy. **(Johnson/Thompson) All in favor.**

KJohnson thanked the group for taking in some of the feedback provided and looks forward to working on those other APs and BPs to ensure protections for LGBTQ+ students. RGerhard stated that those are the three KJohnson was referring to at the beginning of this meeting.

VI. College Resolutions

SThompson shown three resolutions. AS 5 Resolution in Support of Changing Student Forms and Procedures to Eliminate Inequities has not been read to the Board yet.

AS 5 Resolution in Support of Changing Student Forms and Procedures to Eliminate Inequities

WHEREAS, Las Positas College has a diverse student body and seeks to provide more equitable and inclusive practices to the forms and procedures utilized for college access; and

WHEREAS, our diverse student population is composed of students from marginalized and disproportionately impacted groups, often impacted by language, laborious processes, and forms, and requiring extraneous documentation; and

WHEREAS, many of the students and faculty identified areas in the current college and district processes including registration, CLASS-Web, Counseling access, admissions and records processes, and financial aid processes that inhibit many student's abilities to enter and participate successfully in the college system; and

WHEREAS, Las Positas College seeks to make changes to these systemic processes that impact student access, success, equity, and achievement by providing processes that consider all students; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Las Positas College Academic Senate supports the engagement of the Chabot Las Positas Community College District and the hired consulting firm to analyze and provide recommendations and/or actions to simplify or eliminate forms and processes that inhibit equitable student access and college success; let it be further

RESOLVED, that the Chabot Las Positas Community College District will provide the Las Positas College Academic Senate's areas of concern, as identified by faculty and students, to the hired consulting firm to investigate and review.

RGerhard asked SThompson to share the origins and is interested in the further reading. SThompson stated that this has been on the radar for years. TColeman stated that we were really looking at any area to find out which areas would inhibit them from being successful. We dug a bit deeper to find out from more of the disproportionately impacted groups because we feel that more so they may have challenges reading some of the documentation, understanding how to clarify it, having access to actually putting the application process through, getting access to people to discuss how to move forward, so all of these were mentioned in the survey and it was affirmed that they were having challenges in those areas and that inhibited them from getting forward in the process of enrollment and being successful to completion. Some students dropped out and did not come back through the application process because it was too frustrating to them. There were approximately 121 students surveyed. We took this information to really affirm what we wanted to push forward to have the consultants look at to see how we can better serve our students, so they have access to our colleges.

NRice wanted to ask if the accessibility side of the form access is going to be looked at as well, not just the content, but how that content is accessed and filled out. SThompson stated yes.

SThompson also read the following resolution.

AS 4 Resolution in Support of a Policy for Translation Services

WHEREAS the Las Positas College has a diverse student body and seeks to provide an inclusive, learning-centered, and equity focused environment; and

WHEREAS our diverse student body is composed of many students whose primary language is not English and/or who have parents for whom English is not their first nor primary language; and

WHEREAS a majority of AAPI students in Alameda County are International Students, immigrants, or have parents who are immigrants; and

WHEREAS Las Positas College seeks to make the campus welcoming and accessible to everyone, regardless of their English language proficiency; now therefore be it

RESOLVED that the Las Positas College Academic Senate supports a policy requiring the translation of print and digital materials into common non-English languages; let it be further

RESOLVED that the Las Positas College Academic Senate supports a policy making point-of-need in-person translation services available in common non-English languages; let it be further

RESOLVED that the Las Positas College Academic Senate supports making funding available to systematize these services, making them a normal practice in support of all of our students who need them.

AS 3 Equity Minded Hiring Principles and Practices

WHEREAS, Education Code §87360 Hiring Criteria 1 , Subdivision (a), states that applicants for faculty and administrator positions demonstrate, as a criterion for hiring beyond the state minimum qualifications, “a sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students”, that is included in all job announcements and assessed during the applicant screening process, per the requirements of Title 5. §§53022 and 53024; and

WHEREAS, current faculty screening and selection practices at Las Positas College may emphasize discipline-specific hiring criteria at the expense of assessing job applicants and candidates on their abilities to “demonstrate a sensitivity to and understanding of the diverse academic, socioeconomic, cultural, disability, and ethnic backgrounds of community college students”; and

WHEREAS, at its November 10, 2021 meeting, Las Positas College Academic Senate approved LPC Equity Statement 2 as a consent item so that LPC’s Equity Statement can be included in all future job listings; and

WHEREAS, at the November 19, 2021 Equity-Minded Hiring Principles and Practices webinar 3 , the Equity and Diversity Action Committee of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) with the Association of Chief Human Resources Officers (ACHRO) provided specific information, resources, and strategies to help Las Positas College work towards being culturally responsive and increasing diversity in faculty hiring practices 4 in addition to

increasing and supporting historically marginalized and underrepresented faculty on campus; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Las Positas College Academic Senate endorses and recommends implementation of the Equity Minded Principles and Practices from the ASCCC-ACHRO5 into LPC's faculty hiring practices; let it be further

RESOLVED, That the LPC Academic Senate recommends the district, LPC administration, Faculty Association, Classified Senate, faculty, staff, and students collaborate on making this happen for upcoming future hires.

KJohnson read a resolution that was passed earlier this year and read to the Board of Trustees.

Las Positas College Student Government
Resolution 02-2022
Resolution to Promote Inclusive Language

WHEREAS, Las Positas college provides an inclusive, learning-centered, equity-focused environment that offers educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer degree, and career-technical goals while promoting lifelong learning, per Las Positas College's Mission Statement;

WHEREAS, The Las Positas College Student Government's (LPCSG) mission is to support Las Positas College in making the campus a safe, positive, and equitable space for all students, per the LPCSG Mission Statement;

WHEREAS, Having gendered terms in existing collegewide documents, including Las Positas College Student Government documents, forms, and statements promotes exclusivity in a systematic way;

WHEREAS, Using gendered terms to describe large groups of people promotes exclusivity in a systematic way. Additionally, referring to an individual using gendered pronouns without confirmation or asking can be hurtful to the mental health of this person;

WHEREAS, Using gendered-inclusive language means speaking and writing in a way that does not discriminate against a particular sex, social gender, or gender identity, and does not perpetuate gender stereotypes, per the United Nations;

RESOLVED, The student legislative body of Las Positas College hereby finds, determines, declares, orders, and resolves as follows:

- 1. That the Student Government of Las Positas College actively uses non-gendered terms to refer to large groups of people;*
- 2. That the Student Government of Las Positas College removes all gendered language from its official documents, forms, and statements;*

3. *That the Student Government of Las Positas College urges all faculty, staff, administrators, and students:*
 - a. *To use non-gendered terminology to refer to large groups of people,*
 - b. *To respect the right for a person to choose their pronouns,*
 - c. *And to consider creating gender-inclusive language in-class instruction, course syllabi, and other documentation when applicable*
4. *The Student Government of Las Positas College asks all individuals that attend these public meetings to respect the use of non-gendered terminology when addressing the Senate and its guests unless referring to a specific individual(s) with declared pronouns.*
5. *That this resolution shall take effect immediately and expire June 1, 2022.*

Las Positas College Student Government

Resolution 03-2022

Resolution to Expand Student Rights When in Quarantine Due to COVID-19

WHEREAS, the COVID-19 pandemic has affected us all in a significant way, including students academic experience here at Las Positas College; and

WHEREAS, students exposed to COVID-19 and any of its variants are required by college policy to enter into a quarantine period; and

WHEREAS, students in quarantine do not have access to in-person instruction, testing, or experiments/labs; which impedes a student's opportunity to have access to an equitable education; and

WHEREAS, faculty policies on making up attendance, assignments, quizzes, tests, midterms, and labs all vary, even within departments; and

WHEREAS, the Las Positas College Student Government acknowledges a faculty member's right to have academic freedom within their course to a certain extent as determined by the United States Supreme Court; and

WHEREAS, Las Positas College provides an inclusive, learning-centered, equity-focused, environment that offers educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, and career-technical goals while promoting lifelong learning, per Las Positas College's Mission Statement; and

WHEREAS, the Las Positas College Student Government's (LPCSG) mission is to support Las Positas College in making the campus a safe, positive, and equitable space for all students, per the LPCSG Mission Statement;

RESOLVED, the Student Government of Las Positas College finds, determines, requests, or orders, by a majority vote, the following:

1. That the Dean of each department ensure that full-time and part-time faculty are aware and knowledgeable on protocols surrounding COVID-19 exposure
2. That the Dean of each department urge full-time and part-time faculty to align their policies regarding COVID-19 quarantine procedures for students
3. That the Las Positas College Student Government determines that additional rights for students are required:
 - a. Not be immediately penalized for missing or late assignments with assigned start and due dates that fall within that student's quarantine period.
 - b. Not be dropped from classes due to absences and mission assignments, pending the proof of a positive COVID-19 test
 - c. Be allowed an opportunity to complete missing assignments, quizzes, and final that require in-person attendance
 - d. Be given a reasonable time, a minimum of three weeks upon returning to class after quarantine to complete assignments, labs, presentations, essays, projects, quizzes, and exams.
 - i. Students with DSPS accommodations on file are allotted additional time based on their needs and recommendations by the Disability Resource Center
 - e. Have the right to request hybrid modalities if they need or wish for remote instruction during their quarantine period
4. That this resolution shall go into effect immediately upon approval

Las Positas College Student Government

Resolution 04-2022

Resolution to Reprioritize the Las Positas College Facility Master Plan

WHEREAS, the COVID-19 pandemic has affected us all in a significant way, including a student's academic experience here at Las Positas College; and

WHEREAS, the existing Facility Master Plan, finalized and approved in 2018, was addressing facility issues that existed at Las Positas College pre-pandemic; and

WHEREAS, post-pandemic learning has changed how students prefer to learn, in that some students prefer to stay online for college courses. The issue of not having enough classrooms on campus is an issue of the past; and

WHEREAS, the COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated systemic issues across this nation, including issues at our college that we are actively trying to address. Additional resources are required by minoritized student returning to campus; and

WHEREAS, safe spaces for students to engage and interact with each other is required for those who are choosing to return to campus; and

WHEREAS, Las Positas College provides an inclusive, learning-centered, equity-focused environment that offers educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, and career-technical goals while promoting lifelong learning, per Las Positas College's Mission Statement; and

WHEREAS, the Las Positas College Student Government's (LPCSG) mission is to support Las Positas College in making the campus a safe, positive, and equitable space for all students, per the LPCSG Mission Statement;

RESOLVED, the Student Government of Las Positas College finds, determines, requests, or orders, by a majority vote, the following:

- 1. The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District and the Las Positas College shared governance system re-evaluate the existing Las Positas College Facility Master Plan re-prioritizing the need for a Student Union and Multi-cultural resource center*
- 2. The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District and the Las Positas College shared governance system ensure student leaders are involved in these conversations*
- 3. The Chabot-Las Positas Community College District looks and identifies additional ways to finance future expansions of student-centered facilities*
- 4. That this Resolution shall take effect immediately upon approval by the Las Positas College Student Senate*

SThompson stated that LPCSG should get broad feedback. Classes are scheduled based on student demand, but also on student success. That must be a part of the equation. The convenience of online education is great, but when you have classes that have anywhere between a quarter and 50% attrition, but the face-to-face classes do not have that level of attrition, or you come into issues of transfer ability because some classes you absolutely must take in person for them to transfer, all of those things affect the decisions on which medium to offer classes. A student union would probably do a lot for building community, but you don't want to have your argument be that we can offer plenty of online classes to make room for this. KJohnson mentioned that the next building that is supposed to go up at LPC is an Art and STEM building. Both of those programs exist so in theory demolish the 700 and 800 building and replace it with a newer looking building to build more offices for faculty, but we already have existing classrooms that can be used for those classes. SThompson would like to make sure KJohnson gets the right feedback.

HHernandez discussed the collegial consultation board policy. If we are not getting any feedback, is it because we are not putting any forward or is it because we do not have the time. Can we set a goal for ourselves to get this revised before the summer? RGerhard stated that there are certain areas related to collective bargaining and 10+ one matters to make some slight tweaks or modifications to. We know that there are certain areas that the existing working draft will need to be modified. Those will

show up in next month's Chancellor's Council. It will be sent out ahead of the April 12th meeting, so folks can see any changes made.

SThompson gave an update that she gave a keynote on the recommendations for the modifications of the SCFF at the FACCC's Advocacy and Policy Annual Conference. A week prior, she presented at the SCFF Equity Coalition. It was incredibly well received. FACCC is going to do a professional video of the presentation so that it can be added to their homepage. The other keynote that was Daniel Walker, who happens to be a board member of the California Endowment. He wants to have the endowment give more money to the community colleges and was very interested in the SCFF proposal process. DFouquet asked if the funding is state or private? SThompson stated that it is the California Endowment, which gives away \$500 million every year, and they give to healthcare, education, and arts. They try to make their donations equitable across the different education systems, but they have fallen short in terms of their funding of projects at community colleges. There was excitement about the SCFF modifications. DFouquet stated that SThompson is a member of the FACCC Board of Governors, as the FA representative to the Board of Governors, because our local faculty association is a contract member of FACCC. It's important to point out that we just appointed SThompson to that role for another two-year term so she will be on the Board of Governors for 2022-24.

RGerhard mentioned that in 2018, our district took the lead to advocate for reform to the supplemental allocation. At the time, based on enrollment, our district would have received a reduction in about \$6 million. The great work of our institutional research folks pinpointed that the reason for that is because students who live and go to school in high cost of living areas are least likely to be eligible to receive a federal Pell grant or the states Promise Program. Recognizing that, we reached out to the Bay 10 and formed a SCFF equity coalition. It has grown to 17 members. Speaking on behalf of that coalition, I presented the updated version of the white paper that we did in 2018, that created even more of a framework and more conclusive data around the inequities and modeled out to alternative approaches and what that would look like for the next three years for every district across the state. The first alternative was one we've been advocating for three years on, which is using Perkins instead of Pell. The second approach is what Rajinder Samra came up with in terms of using a HUD fair market rental value as a kind of a proxy for cost of living within regions of California. While we're in the final throes of finalizing the final report, we will disseminate it to all our leadership across the district.

The approach that used the HUD fair market rental value as a proxy for cost of living was the approach that the coalition felt most comfortable with in supporting. That approach is what was presented this weekend at the State CEO Symposium, which is essentially a meeting that happens once a year where all the CEOs of Community Colleges come together and discuss hot topics and emerging issues. The result of that presentation included districts that supported and understood this three years ago continue to support this advocacy effort, whether they are a hold-harmless district. Districts that are those winning district in the Central Valley and Inland Empire

continue to voice concern in terms of reshuffle the deck, meaning redistributing money away from them to districts like ours. I think the big step was at least no one is disputing the evidence, the data, or the facts that this structural inequity exists. That was the biggest takeaway from this weekend. This coming board meeting, we are doing a presentation of where we are at and what the future looks like in terms of advocacy.

VII. Future Agenda Items

- COVID-19 Update
- Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 1300
- BP 5500, AP 5500, AP 3430, BP 3410

DFouquet asked what the best venue would be to discuss a question regarding 4/10s. For a faculty member who is teaching, obviously if teaching online, it could be synchronous or asynchronous. For a class that is taught asynchronously, that works gets done at any time of the day or week. A question came up from someone teaching a class synchronously. The campus is closed on Fridays, but is there any reason the synchronous instruction cannot be held on Fridays? RGerhard mentioned he will get back to DFouquet regarding that question.

VIII. The meeting adjourned at 4:28 p.m.