



COLLEGE COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, January 26, 2006

Don Bautista

3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

DRAFT

Present: B. Baldwin, A. Callahan, N. Canter, J. Hawk, G. Ho, L. Jenkins, B. Murphy, O. Patlan, B. Seabra, P. Setziol, D. Shannakian

Absent: R. Covington, C. Espinosa-Pieb, R. Griffin, R. Hansen, L. Hearn, A. Khanna, A. LaManque, J. Miner, M. Winters

I. Burning Issues

◆ The Santa Clara County Human Rights Commission met on Tuesday, January 24, conducting major public hearings regarding the De Anza arrests following Colin Powell's appearance. The sheriff's dept. shared an edited videotape of activities which might have persuaded those on the commission that the arrests were legitimate. A representative for the demonstrators spoke and his failure to adhere to time limits, resulted in the meeting being cancelled. No resolution was reached. There has been no decision from the District Attorney's office whether they will proceed with prosecution.

The case raises long-range issues of how we plan, prepare and respond to these incidents.

◆ B. Murphy urged College Council members to access California state budget information on www.cbp.org which provides a detailed on-line analysis.

◆ The Community College League of California is hosting a legislative conference on January 29 & 30 where more budget information will be provided.

II. The College Council minutes of January 19, 2006 were reviewed.

Amendments were noted in the Burning Issues section, paragraph 3 to reflect the community college initiative vs. the bond campaign statement. In Section III. Noel Levitz, first paragraph, "...similar to an early alert system" phrase was removed. Due to lack of a quorum, the minutes were not approved.

III. Bond Review/Major Capital Construction Review

J. Hawk provided a macro view of the 1/24/06 draft 7.0 bond list which includes reduced project costs to meet \$490MM (from \$549MM). This is the district's attempt to pare down the list to a level that the Board will support. J. Hawk provided an overview of the document and explained the major categories in detail, requesting college council review and feedback.

P. Setziol requested clarification about the educational information system which is the district's admin system composed of HR, Finance and Student Information systems. Discussion followed regarding the purchase of bundled systems, providers, open software and refresh timetables. Because of our size and complexity there are perhaps 3 or 4 options/providers available to us.

B. Murphy posed three questions for college council members to reflect upon.

1. At the macro level – does this reduction across the board makes sense?
Would we prefer to swap property acquisition (\$40MM) for a specific project?
2. Should we develop internal rankings on the campus level? Is there a preference for one set of projects vs. another, i.e., Creative Arts project vs. campus project?
3. With regard to the Mediated Learning Center (which has been part of the Facilities Master Plan since 1999), what might we move into this building?

The following discussion ensued:

- Are district allocations based on a formula? (60/40)? Past practice? Size of institution?
- User groups (Instruction and Student Services) can provide suggestions to J. Hawk as to timing of projects and perhaps what can be delayed.
- Instead of prioritization, rank projects by year 1, year 4, and year 8 as costs become clearer. How likely are the lower priority items to be completed? Level of differentiation?
- Ranking the complexity of all needs – what makes sense?
- Elimination of property acquisition (\$40MM) limits the ability to expand elsewhere.
- Growth projections to validate construction projects

We need to develop a solid set of projects with an assigned aggregate dollar amount at the micro level. Chancellor's staff and bond council will review further.

Major Capital Construction Review – Budget Transfers #45 and #46

J. Hawk outlined the Measure E budget transfers, however due to lack of a quorum, College Council was unable to approve them. The issues of security and second level construction management review were raised.

IV. Environmental Management Plan

K. Sullivan and A. Presler provided an environmental management presentation from the College Environmental Advisory Group. The presentation included an overview, history, importance of the program and role of college council. Their powerpoint presentation is attached as part of the minutes.