Chabot-Las Positas Community College District
Chancellor's Council
Tuesday, November 8, 2022
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
ConferZoom
Meeting Minutes

Present: Ron Gerhard, Miguel Colon, Jamal Cooks (for President Sperling), Dyrell Foster, Dave Fouquet, Joel Gagnon, Heather Hernandez, Jean O'Neil-Opipari, Susan Sperling, Sarah Thompson, Rachel Ugale, Chasity Whiteside

Guests: Theresa Fleischer Rowland, Wyman Fong, Kendra Grinnage, Maisha Jameson, Owen Letcher, Amy Maltagliati, Dionicia Ramos, Rajinder Samra, William Kossow, Erik Zell

Chancellor Ron Gerhard called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

I.   **Review and Approval of Agenda**
The agenda was approved as presented. **(Thompson/Gagnon) All in favor.**

II.   **Review and Approval of the October 11, 2022 Meeting Minutes**
There was a motion to approve the October 11, 2022 meeting minutes with a correction on page 3 of changing "advantage" to "disadvantage". **(Thompson/Whiteside) Cooks abstained.**

III. **Enrollment Assessment Project**
Dionicia Ramos gave a quick overview of the enrollment assessment project. At the last Chancellor's Council, Kennedy & Company and their team provided an update on the project's data gathering and engagement plan. Phase one is the current enrollment strategy and operations assessment, which included staff interviews, student focus groups, data analysis and a competitor analysis. The student focus groups informed the development of a student survey that closed at the end of October. Phase two is an audit of our current technologies and how well they support our enrollment strategies.

Amy Maltagliati and Kendra Grinnage, from Kennedy & Company, shared some high-level themes that are emerging from their research and analysis. AMaltagliati stated

today's presentation includes: project overview and goals, stakeholder interview themes, student focus group themes, data analysis update, and next steps.

The original goals of this project are to get a better understanding of the operations behind enrollment and the business processes that support enrollment, but doing it with a lens of equitable practices and how different groups of students may be impacted differently, as well as a lens of technology from a student and staff perspective. Both phases one and two are complete with collecting data, but have not fully finished analyzing all of the pieces. Feedback is being pulled together now. The feedback form on the website will be turned off at the end of the day.

Interviews took place with Chabot College, Las Positas College, and Information Technology Services to understand the questions: What is happening? What areas do staff feel like enrollment was going really well? What areas are they looking to try to see different opportunities for growth? What challenges exist? What students are are being impacted?

After all of these interviews, four focused themes were found, which include: resources, ownership, prioritization, access and awareness. The communication around these four areas are important as well.

Many feel there is a lack of human resources and how that negatively impacts a department's ability to support students. This is not uncommon to receive as feedback. The big themes are not uncommon for higher education institutions.

Ownership was another specific theme around questions about who oversees a project or technology. There was a lack of clarity on who the responsible party is with regard to projects. It makes it hard for things to move forward if departments are not clear of the decision makers.

There is a lack of clear prioritization of enrollment and technology goals. There is a wide array of priorities and everyone is not sure what order those should happen in.

The last theme speaks positively about staff. There is a lot of desire, especially from the counselors and individuals that work one on one with students, to understand who the students are and how can they best be supported. Once students are connected to the right department, they are successful, but how can we support the students that do not know how to get to those departments.

Kendra Grinnage discussed the student focus groups. In total, 28 students were included, with three different segments of students: first time students, returning/transfer students, and low-income students. What was heard from students is that completing the application was fairly straightforward, but once they submitted the application and

transferred into the initial enrollment process, there were some technical issues and problems with access to support. Students who had designated support to assist them with the application and enrollment process felt fewer pain points than those students who were navigating on their own. This came up quite a bit with the first-time students who had a family member to help.

Feedback regarding Class Web is that it feels outdating and difficult to navigate. The formatting is overwhelming. The technology feels inaccessible to them and they may walk away from the process.

Students who engaged with Counseling gave great feedback. The counselors were wonderful resources for them, but there were access issues getting appointments with those counselors.

The fourth point is about technical and communication delays. If a pin reset or Zone mail password reset occurs, students found they hit roadblocks when they had to reach out to the college. This can be a barrier of entry to these students. One student mentioned that the process is like having a really good map, but the road is really bad. The website shows the steps needed, but it is difficult to follow the pathway in a smooth way.

Much of the information that came from the focus groups become the foundation for questions to follow up on in the student survey. AMaltagliati stated that there is a lot of overlap between the concerns brought up from staff versus the students. So, there is a lot of awareness of those issues.

RGerhard asked if students identified what initially brought them to the college and decided to attend. KGrinnage stated that a lot of the returning and transfer students stated that they have been in the area for years and attended in the past or had family who had attended. The college is close by and some students mentioned that the college was on their transit routes and there is easy access for them to get to and/or is close to work. The students seemed to be familiar with the colleges. AMaltagliati stated that the feedback shows that it is very community based.

AMaltagliati discussed the data-driven inquiries about enrollment. At a high level, they are really trying to understand:
- How many students apply, how many register, how many stay enrolled to census?
- What trends are we seeing year-over-year?
- Do students register in the same term they apply for?
- Are certain student populations struggling to enroll more than others?
- Are certain student populations struggling to stay enrolled more than others?
- How do the student success steps impact initial registration and overall enrollment?

- How does this data align with the themes we have heard from our interviews with stakeholders and focus groups with students?

The next steps include competitor analysis and market research. A student survey was sent out to over 7,000 students. The three populations of students included currently enrolled students, formerly enrolled students, and students that applied but never registered. Enrollment forecast is the final piece to look at and understand where students are being lost from an internal perspective, but also what other colleges they may be going to.

The first draft of the recommendations will be done this month and circulated through the Chancellor and the Senior Leadership Team. The recommendations will then be shared more broadly in the new year.

IV.   **COVID-19 Update**
Owen Letcher mentioned that the only anticipated updates are two updates from the State. The first is from Cal OSHA, which is either adoption or rescission of the emergency temporary standard at their December meeting. February 28, 2023, the Governor has identified that as a date where the state of emergency related to COVID-19 will end.

RGerhard asked about the impacts of what Cal OSHA decides. OLetcher stated that the expectation is that Cal OSHA will adopt the standards that we have been under related to the pandemic, requirements for reporting, and following the county guidelines, but it will be likely less than what we have been under to date. The expectation is that contact tracing would go away. The change from the Governor is a funding component, where there will not be new funding available based on the emergency declaration that was made.

RGerhard shared the county's dashboard with cases over time. The most recent date of the county is posted as of November 1st, which the case rate shows 1,859. The case rate data remains relatively low compared to last year. Council was asked to share any insights on how their constituencies are feeling.

Dave Fouquet mentioned that this is a big topic in the local bargaining groups. There are some districts that are asking what the policy is going to be moving forward. Most of the districts have dropped masked mandates at this point. A couple of districts have lifted their vaccination mandate as well. Because of our vaccination mandate, it does hamper our ability to bring students to campus for visits from the local high schools.

RGerhard stated that Contra Costa has a board agenda item this week to consider dropping their vaccination mandate. It does impact our colleges. This was discussed at a CEO meeting last Friday with Peralta, Contra Costa, CSU East Bay and Ohlone.

Jean O'Neil-Opipari mentioned that classified on campus have mixed feelings. In speaking to the feeder schools, they will not bring an organized group to campus because

if one student cannot go, none will go. SThompson asked if CSU East Bay is also having the same issue, or is this just the Community Colleges.

HHernandez stated that the membership was in favor for removing the mandate for students. They feel like the vaccination numbers are pretty high in Alameda County. Many people want to keep the signs up in their areas to ask people mask in their areas. It is difficult to mandate the service areas.

SThompson looked up information on UC Davis's vaccine mandate and who it applies to. Most of the verbiage is for faculty, staff and enrolled students. It is required of people accessing university facilities and programs. Is it possible that the high schools are going to the UCs because they are not requiring it for visitors? KCostello mentioned that her daughter is currently touring UC Merced and CSU Fresno and the students were not required to be vaccinated nor were asked about their vaccination status.

JGagnon stated that the diligence being taken is appreciated, but there are people who are really anxious about the effects on enrollment.

V. **Board Policies/Administrative Procedures (standing item)**

a. **First Reading**

1. **BP 2015 Student Members**
RGerhard stated that, based upon board discussion, this is being brought back from Student Trustee Patino's work at the State level, giving our student trustees more authority and more responsibility in terms of advisory voting and an ability to make motions. This is the second of two board policies that have been modified to support our student trustees. The other policy is on the board agenda for next Tuesday, which increases the compensation from $100 to $400 per month.

2. **AP 3253 Total Cost of Ownership**
3. **BP 3500 Campus Safety**
4. **AP 3500 Campus Safety**
5. **BP 3501 Campus Safety and Access**
6. **AP 3501 Campus Safety and Access**
7. **BP 3505 Emergency Preparedness Plan**
8. **AP 3505 Emergency Preparedness Plan**

OLetcher stated that items 2-8 include updates from CCLC, with very little changes, if any.

b. **Second Reading**

1. **BP 2340 Agendas**
2. **BP 2410 Board Policy and Administrative Procedure**
3. **BP 2430 Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor**

4. **AP 2430 Delegation of Authority to the Chancellor**
5. **BP 2725 Board Member Compensation**
6. **BP 3300 Public Records**
7. **AP 3300 Public Records**
8. **BP 3580 Sustainability**
9. **AP 3580 Sustainability**
10. **BP 4070 Auditing and Auditing Fees**

    TFleischerRowland stated that there are further edits included, reflecting further discussion at the last Chancellor's Council. This is permissive language. Because the colleges have not had auditing in the past decades, this is an opportunity for Las Positas College to pilot this effort. The expectation is not to have Chabot College offer auditing, but it is an option for the colleges.

11. **BP 6540 Insurance**

12. **AP 6625 Art, Exhibits and Displays in Public Places**

    MColon asked that AP 6625 be reviewed. It states that "the Governing Board shall approve any permanent, larger, public artistic display or installation… in excess of $30,000…" It then states, "The Board of Trustees will review and approve art projects to ensure that they are in keeping with the CLPCCD mission." The two paragraphs seem to conflict with each other. RGerhard stated that this procedure will be tabled until December. OLetcher mentioned that this was reviewed with representatives from each campus's committee. One suggestion would be that the dollar value be set at the board authorized limits. It will be tabled and wait for suggested edits and recommendations.

    There was a motion to move items 1-11 forward, while tabling AP 6625.
    (Cooks/Thompson)

c. **Discussion/Information**

1. **BP 3715 Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice**

    MColon stated that there is a trustee whose actions clearly constitute hate speech. Legally, we cannot say you cannot be hateful, but there is a precedent for regulating what can be said with regards to hate speech directed at students. There is interest in looking at the idea of having our policy on harassment not only apply to managers and a subordinate, but also apply to our trustees. We are trying to protect our students. While we cannot fire trustees, there are things that we can do. Recourse is limited to censure. Maybe when you censure them, their stipend is cut. RGerhard stated that there is not anyone on here that hasn't been impacted and aghast at what has occurred.

    SThompson stated that there is this incongruity between our expectations of behaviors of our employees to their expectations and behaviors of our board. But rather than dictate to the board how this applies to them, maybe we ask that the board craft a statement themselves of how this applies to them. This a board

problem and they are the only people that can censure or address the issue at the level required. It was requested that the board evaluate BP 3430 which outlines expected conduct for all our employees.

RGerhard showed BP 2715 Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice. BP 3430 is specifically geared towards employees of the district. BP 2715 sets the minimum expectations of standards in terms of employee behavior. If a board member is found to be in violation of the code of ethics or standards of practice, what is the recourse? With elected officials, they are in that position by being voted by the electorate. The only way a sitting trustee can be removed from that position is by a recall or by being defeated in the next election when they are up in the cycle. When there is a complaint filed with the board, it triggers a process where it will be referred to an ad hoc committee. The ad hoc committee goes into fact finding to determine what happened and what potential code violation has taken place. In the worst-case scenario is censure, which is a public admonishment of the board as a whole. It is a public statement, but does not remove them from office. There may be some reference to this policy on the next board agenda. This will also be an ongoing conversation with Chancellor's Council.

VI.   College Resolutions
No resolutions were discussed.

VII.   Future Agenda Items
- Enrollment Assessment Project

VIII.   Next Meeting: December 6, 2022

The meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.