



# Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

## Chancellor’s Council

Tuesday, November 12, 2024

3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

District Office Conference Room 1

### Attendees:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ron Gerhard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dyrell Foster	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aubrie Ross
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mona Abdoun	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joel Gagnon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chasity Whiteside
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safiyyah Forbes (for Jamal Cooks)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Heike Gecox	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ashley Young
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Virginia Criswell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Angelo Mercado	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Katrin Field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Theresa Pedrosa	

**Guests:** Jennifer Druley, Theresa Fleischer Rowland, Wyman Fong, Owen Letcher, Jonah Nicholas, Melinda Trammell  
Zoom: Heather Hernandez, Suzanne Kohler, Jason Maxwell, Elsa Saenz, Patricia Shannon, Rachael Tupper-Eoff

### MINUTES

Chancellor Gerhard started the meeting at 3:01 p.m.

#### 1. Review and Approval of the November 12, 2024 Agenda

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

#### 2. Review and Approval of the October 8, 2024 Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the October 8, 2024 meeting were approved with a minor name update. **(Pedrosa/Young) Whiteside abstained.**

#### 3. Information and Discussion Items

##### 3.1. Compressed Calendar

Ron Gerhard discussed this topic in general terms and to provide a space and a forum to answer questions. A two-page FAQ document was handed out, which was also emailed out about a week and a half prior.

There was a lot of great work done by the AACC, led by Theresa Fleischer Rowland and Jason Ames, related to a compressed calendar. Last spring, the recommendation was not to pursue it at that time. The question that is coming up at this time is why are we discussing this now? Ultimately, what was not discussed by the AACC are the financial benefits of a compressed calendar for the colleges, so that is one of the reasons we are evaluating it now.

When the state came out with their advanced apportionment report, we are in hold harmless based upon the advance of about \$17 million dollars. This number is based off of stale or old data. This does not include our increase of 12% in FTES year over year. This does not include the 1501 students in fall at Chabot that are getting a promise grant, which is more than the number getting a promise grant in 2023. This is similar to Las Positas with about 400 more promise grants.

In the SCFF, being on hold harmless means that we are held flat or constant. We are not getting ongoing revenue dollars in the form of COLA. Essentially, we are living off of a flat budget but, in the meantime, our expenses are not flat. We do have cost increases, with health and welfare, step increases, etc.

RGerhard presented a spreadsheet simulator, produced by Jonah Nicholas, and it is meant to simulate the student-centered funding formula. We are plugging in our own data within it to figure out how much we are in hold harmless.

The SCFF funds this portion of our revenue based upon a three-year rolling average of our FTES. We have had a 12% increase year over year. This is something to celebrate. The DEMC target for 2024-25 is 16,272. Right now, we are on a trajectory to get close to our targets of 16,272. That makes our three-year average 14,990. This leaves us in hold harmless by \$8.5 million, without the assumption that we have any increases or gains in our supplemental, meaning our Pell and Promise Grants, but we already know we have gains in those areas. It also assumes that we do not have gains in the number of awards or degrees conferred, but we know we have increases there too.

An example was used with SCFF and supplemental going up to 8%. That would leave us at \$6 million in the hole. If we were ambitious and input 12%, we would be \$4.7 million in the hole. Another example is an 8% increase in supplemental and success and a 10% increase in enrollment; we would still be in the hole \$2.7 million. We will still not receive COLA next year. How many years will we be in hold harmless and be in a situation where our revenue is flat/capped, but our expenses are still increasing? We already have a structural deficit, and everything is on the table at this point. We have worked incredibly hard to make sure we are competitive when attracting and retaining talent. Every year that we are on hold harmless, we cannot keep up with and compete with other districts.

We do not have an enrollment management issue. We have a funding issue. We do not have the funding to put on schedule to even accommodate another 10% year-over-year increase in enrollment.

Ashley Young stated that if we do not allow for any FTEF for any growth, it means we are going to be turning students away. They will go to other colleges, and we are going to lose them not just for next year, but for two years. RGerhard stated our closest competitors are Ohlone and DVC and they both have compressed calendars. AYoung stated if we are not getting any FTEF for an intercession, then there is no point in having one. RGerhard stated that this is not the only solution. If we need more FTEF for a winter intercession, we need to figure that out.

Katrin Field asked what the number would look like if we had a winter intercession. RGerhard stated that JNicholas's educated estimate is that we would like to have our three-year rolling average up north of 16,000. The best way to do that would be if we had the option to offer a winter intercession and that it would generate somewhere around a thousand FTES. Right now, the fill rate at LPC is 93% fill rate and at Chabot it is 85%. If we were trying to target 1000 FTES we would need 320 to 330 sections spread out over both colleges.

Aubrie Ross asked what the enrollment is at Ohlone and DVC. Contra Costa's enrollment is down significantly. Ohlone's fall is up 3-4%, but they are receiving a drop off in their special admit high school students.

ARoss asked if we are paying part-time faculty for a winter intercession like we do for a summer session, and will the benefit cover the amount that we are paying the part-time faculty? JNicholas stated that the payments for intercession will be the same. The challenge is going to be what the VPIs think they can offer and what we can fill. We will look at that and determine if it will generate enough to be worth the investment.

Last week, the California Department of Finance came out with their bulletin. It looks like COLA for next year is projected at 3%. For us, that is about \$5 million dollars. If we receive it one time and they take it away next year, we might receive COLA the following year, but we lose the compounding interest year over year if we do not get off hold harmless. That original \$5 million would be gone forever.

Katrin Field asked if there is any data regarding student demand for a winter intercession. Is there any data on what classes would be in demand to offer? RGerhard stated that the data we have is what enrollment is like in other districts with a winter intercession. This would be a first for us, so it is kind of experimental. KFields stated that she understands that we all want the district to be on solid fiscal ground. She asked if we are currently discussing the possibility of bringing on the compressed calendar and not discussing what happens? Has it already been decided to bring on the compressed calendar and to not discuss the impacts?

JNicholas mentioned the demand is a little bit of a science. One of the key components is figuring out the time for the registration period in a way that it falls after the registration period for the spring semester. One of the major fears is that we do not want to cannibalize the spring semester FTES by bringing on a winter intercession. There are ways to try and mitigate that. We need to isolate what the true demand is of an intercession and find what impact it could make. We need to minimize the impact of the spring semester.

RGerhard stated that given the size and the magnitude of this challenge, compressed calendar has to be a part of the solution. It is not a matter of if, but all options are on the table. If there are other options that we have not discussed, please bring them to the table.

ARoss asked if it is a for sure thing when it will be starting. RGerhard stated that there is a time sensitivity. It would be in our best interest, under the circumstances, for it to start as soon as possible. That is how it is being evaluated right now. There are many conversations with the VPIs and ITS Department. ITS is instrumental in this with the calendar, but also with financial aid processes. Our Financial Aid Director at LPC brought up that having an intercession would create another opportunity for more promise grants to be awarded. That process needs to be done in ITS. Those are the conversations that are being had now.

ARoss asked if there is a definitive timeline. Folks at LPC are saying that they need time to work on calendaring. RGerhard stated that is legitimate. In the next week or two, we will have a

draft calendar to share with our union leadership. Jason Maxwell asked when the soonest is for implementation. RGerhard stated that until we have that calendar marked up, we cannot give anything concrete or definitive. As soon as those calendars are complete, we will get it to you to start having those conversations. Theresa Pedrosa asked if we are going to start from the beginning. RGerhard stated that we will use the data from the previous discussions in the Alternate Academic Calendar Committee and data from the research group.

AYoung asked if we only have projected growth to 370 next year, we will not get off hold harmless the following year either. We need to have more growth. RGerhard stated that with fill rates at 93% and 85%, we do not have capacity facility wise or otherwise. We would be talking about more FTEF. JNicholas stated that there is a push that a change could come with the three-year average. There are external factors that come into play with the California Community College System. Maybe we try to get ahead of that. RGerhard stated that the Board of Governors is advocating that the state modifies the SCFF to advantage districts that are growing. If a district is growing, it should not be held down by a three-year rolling average. There seems to be general support. It would need to go through the Assembly, the Senate, and be signed by the Governor.

KFields asked if there are any plans now to also set money aside to fund this. Classified professionals take most of the brunt of this change. How do we make sure that our well-being is kept in mind? We have \$11.5 million in our budget for vacated positions that are currently funded but not filled. We are finding most departments have skeleton crews. Classified professionals are very unhappy right now. For that reason, we want to see a commitment from the district.

JNicholas stated that impacts bargaining needs to take place. The district, in so far as we are committed to getting additional FTES, knows that going hand in hand with that is the request of classified professionals, so that is certainly part of the overall funding. RGerhard mentioned that as an example, a second scheduler at LPC is currently being advertised and will be a huge part of supporting this. Echoing everything that JNicholas stated we know that this is going to have an impact on Student Services, Admissions and Records, Counseling, Financial Aid, our lab techs, our instructional assistants, and other departments. JNicholas stated that something that could be shared with classified members is that the vast majority of intercession courses/sections would most likely be run as online asynchronized courses.

Heather Hernandez mentioned that for the lab techs, it would be the length of the day and in some cases into the evening. Services have to go along with the classes, so if we do put on the intercession, even though it would be mostly online, there are so many departments that will be impacted. We have so many funded vacant positions and it is hard to wait multiple months or even up to a year. There is no guarantee when people change departments or find a new job that we will fill those positions. All of this has been discussed in many venues in the past, and vacant positions remain. If you want this to be successful, we really have to plan for staffing.

Chasity Whiteside asked what the timeline is to allow business processes to align and allow the time to get the work done. RGerhard stated that once we have that mocked up calendar, we can have those conversations. Right now, it's theoretical.

Virginia Criswell asked about the state's approval application packet. RGerhard stated that we have not formally started to put that packet together because the first thing is we have to start developing the calendar. The next step in that process is impacts bargaining over the calendar. Then it goes to the Board of Trustees with the packet for approval. Contingent upon our Board approving, it would then go to Sacramento for approval.

Dyrell Foster asked if there was a draft already created by the taskforce or would the VPIs start from scratch. TFRowland stated that the Alternative Calendar Committee went through a number of scenarios that ended on a generic year that would show a 16.4 term length multiplier that created the basis of the foundational. From there, we can take it to a precise calendar year and lay it out. To JNicholas's point, if in this hypothetical, we have a return on investment in a winter intercession, we still need to run the numbers to make the case for and need to make sure we have at least a three-week intercession. Students told us that they would like to see a bigger break between December and January, so if the student is not opting for the intercession, that could happen. The committee did great work and there are a lot of foundational documents that can be used. JNicholas stated that the AACC was charged to look at a compressed calendar, but specifically not to look at an intercession. For full transparency, the spring semester would almost certainly start later than it does now.

JMaxwell stated that we discussed trying to be competitive with other colleges. Monterey Peninsula College addressed the fact that when they moved to a condensed calendar to address the same issues, they still saw this swirling that was occurring where students were primarily enrolling in other community colleges. It did not give them the edge they thought it was going to give them in terms of enrollment.

JMaxwell added that in thinking about a winter intercession, and looking into more CCCs, there are several that do offer laboratory intercession in person intercession courses. That is something we could look into. It is good to remember that there are many iterations of a condensed academic calendar. They range anywhere from 16 weeks to 17.5 weeks and those intercessions can occur anywhere from December 16<sup>th</sup> to January 15<sup>th</sup> as well. There are four that offer completely asynchronous remote modalities for that period. If we are thinking about piloting something, that might be a nice window. It allows us to inquire about student interest in specific programs to help us develop an intercession as we need.

#### **4. Board Policies and Administrative Procedures**

##### **4.1. Policies and Procedures Reference Updates Only**

The following reference only updates were presented. This is an information only item.

4.1.1. [AP 2710](#) **Conflict of Interest**

4.1.2. [AP 3250](#) **Institutional Planning**

4.1.3. [BP 6340](#) **Formal Bids and Contracts**

##### **4.2. First Reading of Board Policies**

RGerhard presented the following board policies. This is the first reading of these policies.

- 4.2.1. [BP 2015](#) **Student Members**
- 4.2.2. [BP 3250](#) **Institutional Planning**
- 4.2.3. [BP 3420](#) **Equal Employment Opportunity**
- 4.2.4. [BP 3433](#) **Prohibition of Sexual Harassment Under Title IX**
- 4.2.5. [BP 6700](#) **Civic Center and Other Facilities Use**
- 4.2.6. [BP 6800](#) **Occupational Safety**

#### 4.3. First Reading of Administrative Procedures

The following administrative procedures were presented for a first reading.

- 4.3.1. [AP 2110](#) **Vacancies on the Board**
- 4.3.2. [AP 3433](#) **Prohibition of Sexual Harassment Under Title IX**
- 4.3.3. [AP 3434](#) **Responding to Harassment Based on Sex Under Title IX**
- 4.3.4. [AP 3435](#) **Discrimination and Harassment Complaint Procedures**
- 4.3.5. [AP 3540](#) **Sexual and Other Assaults on Campus**
- 4.3.6. [AP 6340](#) **Formal Bids and Contracts**
- 4.3.7. [AP 6700](#) **Civic Center and Other Facilities Use**
- 4.3.8. [AP 7400](#) **Travel**

#### 4.4. Second Reading of Board Policies 1.09

The following board policies were presented as a second reading.

- 4.4.1. [BP 1200](#) **Mission**
- 4.4.2. [BP 2200](#) **Board Duties and Responsibilities**  
MAbdoun asked if the word “citizens” can be changed to “members” to be more supportive of undocumented students, staff and faculty. RGerhard stated that he will need to check since it may be legal language.
- 4.4.3. [BP 2310](#) **Regular Meetings of the Board**

4.4.4. [BP 2315](#) Closed Sessions

4.4.5. [BP 2355](#) Decorum

4.4.6. [BP 2430](#) Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor change  
There was a note in the last paragraph that should be stricken.

4.4.7. [BP 2432](#) Chancellor Succession

4.4.8. [BP 2435](#) Evaluation of the Chancellor

4.4.9. [BP 2745](#) Board Self-Evaluation

4.4.10. [BP 3501](#) Campus Security and Access

MAbdoun asked if there is any BP or AP that addresses safety online or for online students such as addressing a code of conduct. RGerhard stated that we have a student conduct policy. It does not apply to this particular board policy.

4.4.11. [BP 3530](#) Weapons on Campus

4.4.12. [BP 4027](#) Travel Study Programs

4.4.13. [BP 4300](#) Field Trips

4.4.14. [BP 6740](#) Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee

Tabling BP 2200 and amending BP 2430, there was a motion to approve the board policies. (Pedrosa/Young) All in favor.

4.5. Second Reading of Administrative Procedures

The following procedures were presented for a second reading.

4.5.1. [AP 3501](#) Campus Safety and Access

4.5.2. [AP 3530](#) Weapons on Campus

MAbdoun asked if striking the word “employee” and adding the word “administrator” was intended in the following sentence. *“Bringing or possessing any dirk, dagger, ice pick, or knife having a fixed blade longer than 2 1/2 inches upon the grounds, unless the person is authorized to possess such a weapon in the course of his/her employment, has been authorized by a ~~district employee~~ Administrator to have the knife, or is a duly appointed peace officer, who is engaged in the performance of his/her duties, is prohibited on any district campus or at any district center, or in any facility of the*

*district.*” Oletcher stated that it was intended because it should be an administrator that would authorize.

A typo was also noted in the following sentence, “...*must exercise caution is using and storing the knife.*” The word “is” should be changed to “in.”

#### 4.5.3. [AP 4010](#) Academic Calendar

#### 4.5.4. [AP 4027](#) Travel Study Programs

There is a typo that should be changed from the word “free” to “fee.”

It was questioned what “development” means when it states, “No district equipment, supplies, computer and network use, or postage shall be used in the development, recruitment, advertisement, or operation of fee-based travel that has not been Board approved as outlined.” Does this mean that we cannot plan college resources to develop the program? JNicholas stated that from a liability perspective, if resources were used to develop the program, we are potentially endorsing it prior to board approval. AYoung asked what would happen if someone violated this policy. RGerhard mentioned that this is a real question. It cannot become a board approved program until someone conducts work on it.

RGerhard asked TFleischerRowland if the language is coming from the league. TFleischerRowland stated that she would go back and review. She also mentioned they were also looking at some best practice across other language. RGerhard asked what language would make this clearer. TFleischerRowland confirmed that this is our local language that came from the board policy, since this is a new procedure. There was a lot of consultation with the colleges. MAbdoun stated that she would think more about this. It was asked to table this procedure since it is a second reading.

#### 4.5.5. [AP 4300](#) Field Trips and Excursions

#### 4.5.6. [AP 5110](#) Counseling

#### 4.5.7. [AP 6740](#) Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee

Aubrie Ross confirmed that the pronouns moving forward would be changed to “they.” RGerhard mentioned that it was discussed at the last council meeting to use “they” instead of “he/she/they.” Since that meeting, there has been some discussion that some people do not identify as “they.” ARoss stated that “they” encompasses everyone. RGerhard stated that not everyone interprets it that way and the most inclusive approach has been to include the following pronouns, “he/she/they.”

There was a motion to table AP 4027 for further review, amend AP 3530, and approve the second reading administrative procedures. **(Young/Pedrosa) All in favor.**



## 5. Report out from the College Senates/Unions

Virginia Criswell gave the following report out for Chabot College Classified Senate.

*“In today’s report, we express our strong disappointment with the recent implementation of the compressed academic calendar. This decision disproportionately impacts students and classified staff, both of whom were excluded from the decision-making process. The compressed calendar shortens the academic period for students, potentially hindering their learning experience, while classified professionals will face increased workloads. We are particularly concerned about adequate staffing and the risk of burnout due to insufficient resources for this accelerated schedule. While we acknowledge the district's need for financial stability and support for student success, it’s critical to recognize that without proper support for students and classified professionals, the compressed calendar risks failing to deliver its intended outcomes. Shorter semesters do not guarantee enhanced enrollment or increased financial aid; in fact, they could create significant bottlenecks. We currently lack essential Bay10 data on graduation rates, course completion, student demographics, workload adjustments, and usage trends in support services. Additionally, we need comprehensive data on winter intersessions, including workload requirements, student demand, and necessary support services. We demand clarity on the proactive solutions the district will implement to avoid overwhelming workloads and the reactive measures to address unmanageable workloads for classified professionals. Furthermore, how will our commitment to wellness be put into action? While the compressed calendar may afford faculty additional time off, it unjustly overlooks the needs of classified professionals. This decision pressures us to conform under potential threats of layoffs, revealing a disparity that must be addressed. We firmly call on the Board to revise policies ensuring a more inclusive decision-making process in the future. Decisions affecting students and classified staff must involve all stakeholders to rebuild trust and morale in our community.”*

Aubrie Ross gave the following report out for Las Positas College Classified Senate.

*“In today’s report, we express our strong disappointment with the recent implementation of the compressed academic calendar. This decision disproportionately impacts students and classified professionals, both of whom were excluded from the decision-making process. The compressed calendar shortens the academic period for students, potentially hindering their learning experience, while classified professionals will face increased workloads. We are particularly concerned about adequate staffing and the risk of burnout due to insufficient resources for this accelerated schedule. While we acknowledge the district's need for financial stability and support for student success, it’s critical to recognize that without proper support for students and classified professionals, the compressed calendar risks failing to deliver its intended outcomes. Shorter semesters do not guarantee enhanced enrollment or increased financial aid; in fact, they could create significant bottlenecks.*

*We currently lack essential Bay10 data on graduation rates, course completion, student demographics, workload adjustments, and usage trends in support services. Additionally, we need comprehensive data on winter intersessions, including workload requirements, student demand, and necessary support services. We demand clarity on the proactive solutions the district will implement to avoid overwhelming workloads and the reactive measures to address unmanageable workloads for classified professionals.*

*Furthermore, how will our commitment to wellness be put into action? While the compressed calendar may afford faculty additional time off, it unjustly overlooks the needs of classified professionals. This decision pressures us to conform under potential threats of layoffs, revealing a disparity that must be addressed. We firmly call on the Management to revise policies ensuring a more inclusive decision-making process in the future. Decisions affecting students and classified staff must involve all stakeholders to rebuild trust and morale in our community.”*

Katrin Field gave the following report out for SEIU.

*“It is extremely disheartening that classified professionals and students were excluded from the decision-making process to adopt a compressed calendar and our members have been expressing their deep disappointment and anger. As those most directly impacted by a change to a compressed calendar, our input should have been solicited & valued. The lack of transparency after a majority of the 18-member AACC recommended a suspension of further steps towards consideration of a compressed calendar in March 2024, has already had a lasting impact on morale and trust and left the classified body feeling disrespected and marginalized.*

*Classified professionals will bear the brunt of increased workloads. Decisions of this magnitude must involve all stakeholders!*

*Our greatest concern is the lack of adequate staffing and the very real potential for classified professional burnout due to insufficient staffing to support an accelerated schedule and a winter intersession.*

*We understand the importance of financial stability in our District. We are the ones supporting student success on a daily basis to help increase SCFF funding. But without adequate support for classified professionals, a compressed calendar may not deliver the intended outcomes, potentially leaving the district short of its funding goals as shorter semesters do not automatically enhance enrollment or financial aid usage but could create a bottleneck.*

*While the compressed calendar will provide full-time faculty with additional time off improving their work-life balance, this benefit is not shared by classified professionals. We face pressure to commit to the compressed calendar including threats of potential layoffs. The decision seems to disproportionately favor faculty without considering the well-being of other vital members of the campus community.*

*What we need now from district & college management is:*

- *to provide us with proposed calendar/s and timelines*
- *to take proactive solutions to avoid overwhelming workloads for classified professionals*
- *to define adequate staffing (many departments run on skeleton crews)*
- *to commit & invest in classified employees' wellness*
- *to ensure our work/life balance by promoting flexible work schedules, telecommuting and supporting classified professionals to take their contracted paid leaves*
- *to take classified members feedback into account when making future decisions”*

**6. Future Agenda Items**

There were no recommendations for future agenda items.

**7. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

The next meeting is December 10, 2024, and will take place via Confer Zoom.