Approved
Aug. 29, 2013

LAS POSITAS COLLEGE

College Council

May 16, 2013
2:30 p.m., Room 4129

MINUTES

Voting Members Present:
Quorum = 9

Position	Name	Present		Position	Name	Present
President (Chair, Non-Voting)	Kevin Walthers	X		**VP Academic Services**	Janice Noble	X
VP Administrative Services	(vacant)			**VP Student Services**	Diana Rodriguez	X
Academic Senate President	Sarah Thompson	X		**Academic Senate Vice President**	Elena Cole	X
Classified Senate Co- President	Frances DeNisco	X		**Classified Senate Co-President**	Todd Steffan	X
Student Senate President	Cherry Bogue			**Student Senate Vice President**	Ignacio Cortina	X
Planning&Budget Comm. Chair	Bob D'Elena	X		**Facilities Comm. Chair**	Scott Miner	X
CEMC Chair	Thomas Orf	X		**Staff Development Comm. Chair**	Michael Sato	X
Sustainability Comm. Co- Chairs	Rita Carson			**Inst. Effectiveness Comm. Chair**	Rajinder Samra	X
CLP FA Site VP	Jane McCoy	X		**LPC SEIU VP**	William Eddy	

Others Present: Sharon Gach.

1. **Call to Order** – The meeting was called to order at 2:35 PM by Dr. Walthers.

2. **Review and Approval of Agenda** – The agenda was reviewed and approved as drafted.

3. **Review and Approval of Minutes of March 27, 2013 and Meeting Notes of April 18, 2013**– The minutes of March 27, 2013 were reviewed and approved (McCoy/D'Elena). It was noted that there was no quorum at the meeting of April 18, 2013, therefore only meeting notes were taken and posted on the website.

4. **Old Business**
   a. **"NIKE" Art on Campus/Update -** Marilyn Flores presented an update on the Art Committee's work. (Note: the Committee title "NIKE Site Art Committee" refers to a plot of land owned by the Defense Department for a NIKE missile site, which was sold and the proceeds donated to our College District.)

There are several types of art to be chosen, in several phases, as Dr. Flores showed on her handout (see chart attached to these minutes). The items and phases are:

- The first item to be purchased will be a major sculpture acquisition.
- Then, Phase I has 2 sections:
    - a) The essence of Athletic Movement, to be placed in Building 2500
    - b) The Celebration of the Arts, several pieces in and around Bldg. 4000
- Phase II:
    - a) Inspiring Knowledge through the Arts, Tutorial Center
    - b) Random Acts of Art, Bldg 2400 hallway
- Phase III:
    - Engaging and Celebrating Students through the Arts, Bldg 1600, Student Services & Administration Bldg.

To begin the process the Art Committee recommends the acquisition of a large piece of sculpture by Napa sculptor, Fletcher Benton. Members of the committee will visit his work site in Napa to choose a specific piece which is already completed. Mr. Benton is providing a piece of his work at one-half the usual price, which he sees as a donation of one-half the cost to the college. After the site visit a college-wide poll of which piece to purchase will be held by the committee. The piece will be placed on the lawn north of Bldg 2400 in the 'Campus Boulevard' area.

The NIKE Arts Committee includes:

Deanna Horvath, Co-Chair & PHTO faculty
Marilyn Flores, Co-Chair & Dean of ALSS
Bill Paskewitz, ARTS/ARHS Faculty
Candace Klaschus, HUM Faculty
Janet Brehe-Johnson, SPCH Faculty
Janice Cantua, Classified A & R
Paulina Reynoso, Student

Each Phase "Selection Sub-Committee" will be different, and will include the NIKE Committee Co-Chairs, the area Dean, 2 members from the NIKE committee; and one faculty member, one Classified member and one Student Senate representative for each project area.

Questions/Answers and Discussion included:

- The cost of all the pieces of art will be about $500,000; the 1st phase is the least costly.
- For the PE Bldg images, the committee will grant a stipend to submissions chosen; the Committee will pay to mount the pieces.
- The PE Department input was that they didn't want images/sculptures on the outside of 2500. In the interior hallways, there are already some walls recessed inward, and lighting is already there, which will be ideal. Installations will be on several of these types of walls.
- The Fletcher Benton sculpture will likely be the most expensive piece, however it is affordable since he will donate one-half the cost to the College.

- The Committee has planned to cover each area of the campus.
- The Committee will keep some funds for future pieces, and will leave some money for repair and maintenance of pieces.
- Can a piece be submitted relating to Veterans? Yes, and the Committee has already met with Todd Steffan, Director of the Veterans First Program.
- The Committee is focusing on Bay Area and community artists, and encourages students, faculty, and community members to submit.
- There was discussion of the counties that the Committee is considering as from the 'local area', and the Council suggests adding Sonoma County to this list; Dr. Flores will suggest this to the Committee.
- There was discussion of the location of the Fletcher sculpture, and it was requested to place this higher on the slope of the lawn, toward Bldg. 2500, so that activities such a Ultimate Frisbee could still use the lawn.
- Since Chabot College already worked with a consultant to meet the Division of State Architect compliance, we now also have a link to that, and the cost to submit to the State Architect will be somewhat less.

b. **Active Shooter Task Force Recommendations -** Mark Tarte, chair of the Active Shooter Task Force which started work in February 2013, reported on research and recommendations of the Task Force. The Task Force heard from experts in the areas of police, fire, EMS, and health care.

Mr. Tarte also mentioned that until May 24th, we have a window of opportunity to obtain a grant from PoliceGrantsHelp.com for School Resource Officers. Ms. Sarah Wilson of this organization has offered to write the grant for LPC for a nominal fee of $1000. The Task Force strongly recommends that we go after this grant and utilize Ms. Wilson.

Mr. Tarte summarized that the Active Shooter Task Force dealt with three areas of study for an Intervention/Prevention Program Model: Mental Health, "Columbine" locks and window coverings, and armed law enforcement on campus.

The Mental Health aspect of intervention/prevention is coming along well with the Student Health Center, Counseling Department and DSPS programs. However the Task Force recommends that some Health Center hours, as well as making sure Counseling and DSPS, be provided on Fridays when there is no Health Center coverage and limited Counseling and DSPS services.

In order to improve the campus infrastructure it would be necessary, per Tim Nelson, District M&O Director, to hire a consulting firm to conduct a survey to determine how many "Columbine" locks and window coverings will be needed. After that is determined locating funding and a bidding process would take place to accomplish this, thus being a lengthy process.

Regarding the study of armed law enforcement on campus, there is one clear practical recommendation, from a list of 4, from the Task Force:

> Contract with the Livermore Police Department for a system patterned after their successful School Resource Officer Program. Four officers would give us coverage from 7 AM to 11 PM each weekday, and from 8 AM to 8 PM on Saturdays. Special events

would have to be discussed and arranged in the contract. We would require four officers to have one on duty during day and evening classes and also to cover day off and vacation relief. The cost and other details are on the attached recommendation.

The other three Task Force study items were shared by Mr. Tarte. The ideal situation, regardless of cost and time constraints, would be a district-wide police department made up of post-certified and sworn police officers, supplemented by campus safety officers. However, the time to accomplish this task is approximately one year, which, in the opinion of the taskforce, is too long to wait. Seventy out of the one hundred twelve California Community Colleges utilize this method. The time delay to establish this is why the Task Force recommends the contract with the Livermore P.D. for a speedy and effective method of Intervention and Prevention.

The other ideas from the Task Force were: A district-wide contract with the Alameda County Sheriff's Department patterned after the contract between ACSO and the Peralta Community College District; and having existing Campus Safety Officers given "Powers to Arrest" authority and training under Section 832 of the California Penal Code to include firearms.

Mr. Tarte responded to many questions and gave information on police response times, the procedures instituted after the Columbine incident, current SWAT situations, local P.D. response rates.

A round table comment session included these:

- A good guy with a gun doesn't stop a bad guy with a gun.
- We all need to know how to respond. An armed police officer isn't going to stop a tragedy; they would only make the types of calls the current officers now make.
- An armed officer is not going to save everyone, however will lessen the casualties.
    - Mr. Tarte stated that for every example one gives there are more examples of armed officers saving more peoples' lives in total.
- You want it if you need it, but it is hard to find the funding .
- In an emergency, an *immediate* response is great, 2 minutes is good; 6 minutes is very iffy for Livermore P.D. (who don't know the campus either) .
- If we are 'just' thinking about money -- on the cheap, you get what you pay for.
- I appreciated the active shooter training, I am very uncomfortable with this discussion as people should inherently feel safe. The thought of guns on campus truly bothers me.
    - Mr. Tarte: How do you respond to fact that I have broken up a fight with 2 people, and 1 assailant was armed with a knife? In addition domestic violence is becoming more prevalent than one would expect, is in the parking lots, and even coming into the classroom. A shooting incident is not in isolation, things are happening every month at campus which could escalate at any time.
- If we had armed officers who were not our campus safety officers I would somehow feel better about that; would want the armed persons to look different and be distinct.
- I am not a big fan of guns, but would like to think we have someone closer than 6 minutes away to prevent a larger tragedy.
- The CSUs and K-12 schools have the lock-down trainings and I think we should do that also. An armed officer will not be able to save us all; we need to be physically able to protect ourselves and our students.

- Mr. Tarte: It is the little stuff that escalates to big stuff and causes more intense problems, and we still need the right to arrest to prevent larger things escalating.

Dr. Walthers offered to fund additional Active Shooter discussion and trainings along with mental health trainings and the facilities/doors/windows analysis, using the President's Discretionary Facilities funds. He offered co-curricular funds to hire the grant writer mentioned in the Task Force memo to see if we could receive the PoliceGrantsHelp.com grant.

Dr. Walthers asked if this sounded reasonable to the members, and all agreed**. It was Motioned, Seconded and Approved to apply for the grant and see what it entails; if the grant is received to bring this back to the Council and make additional plans (D'Elena, McCoy).**

Mr. Tarte will work with Campus Safety Officer Prather to start the grant today.

Dr. Walthers thanked Mr. Tarte and the Task Force for a great job.

Dr. Walthers would like to make sure training continues for Active Shooter, Prevention, Mental Health and reporting, through as many avenues as possible such as Town Meetings, or Staff Development opportunities. Dayna Barbero is planning mental health trainings for all employees on how to deal with people in crisis situations, and table top exercises by the Safety Department are planned.

c. Planning Task Force Findings – Planning TF Chairperson Sarah Thompson reported on the final recommendations of Planning Task Force .

<u>Division Meeting Feedback and TF Actions</u>

Ms. Thompson said that a round of proposals for the Charge and Composition of the proposed Integrated Planning Council (IPC) had circulated to this week's Division meetings and the Planning TF would review them at its meeting tomorrow.

As a result of feedback from the April 19th Division meetings, the Planning TF removed the recommendation to have Accreditation in the Integrated Planning Council, moving from the Integrated Planning ~~and Accreditation~~ Council (IPAC) to an Integrated Planning Council (IPC).

The TF now recommends that Accreditation be put back under the supervision of the CC, with a sub-committee headed by the ALO, our VP of Academic Services.

Ms. Thompson mentioned that in the CC meeting packet several documents were included which were discussed at the April and May Division meetings, and she then explained some of the feedback from Division, ASLPC and Classified Senate meetings:

- Regarding the Revised Draft Composition:
    - Some students requested to have equal representation (4 students), however in the view of the Planning TF the number needs to remain 2, due to a serious concern over ability to meet the quorum.
    - Classified Senate will see if 4 representatives need to be on the IPC. Their concern is that CC also needs a representative and how to staff all the seats. They wish to keep 4 seats open for Classified Senate for now; the Planning TF agrees.

- The TF believes it would be good to have a permanent Co-Chair rotation with Administrators and Classified, but believes we don't have administrator capacity in numbers currently; so for now the TF recommends revolving co-chairs .
- To ensure that all tasks get done Ms. Thompson said that recommendations from the Planning TF to the College Council about things to think about and revitalize for the CC, include:

- **One task was orphaned so it is recommended to add to CC oversight: The need for a liaison person/persons to DBSG**
- Since one Division meetings asked 'why does College Council even exist?', perhaps we should present its function at Convocation or College Day.
- Regarding Accreditation, the Planning TF suggests creating an Accreditation Sub-committee of CC, which would meet at a different time, and start the planning summaries.
  - One task would be to integrate accreditation plans into program review, and coordinate PR upward into Accreditation documentation, etc.
- Review the composition of College Council. What personnel are needed for which tasks? Who is needed for sharing information among the various committees and groups?
  - For Chairs of College committees it is hard to add more work when they are not receiving reassigned time for their efforts. This has been mentioned as an undue burden.
  - Dr. Walthers mentioned he likes the idea of our CC functioning more like our DO board with one working meeting and 1information sharing meeting. We would need to decide who needs be at each of the meetings.
  - ***It was noted that Quorums are essential for all CC, IPC, and Committee meetings. This is a critical year for getting the work done.***

<u>Urgency to Create the Integrated Planning Council</u>

Ms. Thompson mentioned the timing problem with the creation of an IPC as it has to go through these steps in the future – We need to vet the proposal/draft through all Senates and due to how slow our logistics occur, we would be lucky to have an IPC by sometime in the Fall of 2013. The Planning TF urges the CC to continue working continuously until the IPC is established.

d. College Council, Next Steps - Dr. Walthers presented the Memo attached to these minutes for each CC member to review. There is no action needed on the memo today, it is just for consideration as he is departing LPC in June.

<u>Summary Memo from Dr. Walthers</u>

He recommended that the Integrated Planning entity discuss how program review works in relation to allocation, accreditation, etc., early in the fall. He believes the Program Review Committee representative should be added to CC.

It needs to be decided who shall read the program reviews; the PR Committee recommends that due to best practices everyone on the oversight committee (CC, or a TF) should read the full program reviews.

It was noted that program reviews will be done by the end of October, summaries done by the end of January, thus the review reading is spread out and is less of a time crunch to read all reviews in one month. The IPC or a new TF could be tasked with reading the PRs instead of CC.

Perhaps the PRC and SLO Chairs should attend the August or September CC meeting. The ALO will have the timeline for next accreditation over the summer, which will also dictate much work. Walthers felt that any TF or subcommittee structure should be made more formally.

Program Review and SLOs to Place into the Planning Work

Elena Cole responded that there is so much work if we cannot get the IPC running immediately she asks that the Planning TF make a recommendation where PR and SLO Committees should report for Fall. She expressed concern and time is very short to document our structure for accreditation.

Walthers said that during the summer administrators can streamline all these questions and put a recommendation in place for Convocation Week.

College Goals

It was noted that we make sure that we add to the list Revise College Goals. Dr. Noble has already created the mapped standards chart which outlines tasks, and should be easy to follow, however difficult to get approved.

It was asked if we suspended the college goals, or just some KPIs. Mr. Samra confirmed that we deleted 94 KPIs at the February College Council meeting, leaving 22 to accomplish.

Task Force Could Become an IPC

Elena Cole suggested that CC in August create a Task Force that could be the 'bones' of an Integrated Planning Committee later in the year. If we present this at Convocation to give a clear sense of what the needed goals are, this could work.

It was asked if we could create this sooner, and call an emergency CC meeting before the end of May in order to get the TF formed for Fall to hit the ground running. It is also imperative to get onto the stakeholders' radar that they may have to meet on some Fridays.

Summary of Must-Do Tasks for Planning

Dr. Noble summarized the discussion, that the CC feels it must:

1. Update the Goals and the Mapped Standards Chart.
2. Increase the number of times the CC meets to two per month.
3. Discuss the composition of the CC.

- If we don't have an extra College Council meeting the Planning TF ends today.
- Add to the Charge for CC, how PR fits in to Planning.

Dr. Noble suggested that each meeting of the CC do a 'discussion plan/agenda', and if the discussion turns out to be too lengthy that would tell us that the CC would need to add

a new TF to help in all the tasks. Use of the 'Footprint for Annual Planning' could be helpful. The members felt that the IPC goals sound good; use of the Footprint could help a lot.

Need to Keep Momentum for Integrated Planning

Ms. Thompson asked that since the TF has momentum and feedback now, why delay three months to do the next work? The TF is a strong working group and this is the month that campus members volunteer for next year's committees. Therefore, announcing the continuation of the TF could affect on which committees faculty choose to serve. If the TF is continued, since the CC agrees that the IPC goals are good, the TF can continue to work on this over the summer.

It was mentioned by several members if the TF ends, its work is stopped and the momentum is lost. However, if the TF goes forward over the summer, time has been gained to plan for the restructuring needs for all of the tasks mentioned above.

It was suggested to encourage faculty and staff to work on the Integrated Planning even if no reassigned time is available. If time on Convocation Day doesn't work out, College Day is available for the Integrated Planning discussion; the Council agrees this would be a good alternative.

Discussion continued on whether to continue the Planning TF through the summer or fall. It was felt to be very useful to extend the TF to Convocation to be able to recap their work, research and information for the College as a whole. It would be good to also to ask TF members to join a meeting of the CC at Convocation or on College Day.

It was agreed by consensus to extend the service of the Planning Task Force to Aug. 16th, College Day, and ask the members to make a presentation of the urgency of creating the Planning Task Force.

Motion: Add a Second College Council Meeting Per Month

It was suggested that the Council approve two College Council meetings per month, ad vote on this today.

It was motioned and seconded, and voted unanimously to create a second College Council meeting date each month; it is intended that the current date (3rd Thursday) shall be a work meeting for Integrated Planning, and a second date to be decided, will be for current College Council business. It was voted unanimously to accept this motion. (M/S: D'Elena / Cole).

It was then discussed whether to call a special CC meeting on the fifth Thursday of May, May 29. This would allow better preparation for Convocation Week. There was no decision on this, therefore the matter was dropped.

e. New Business

Substantive Change letters to ACCJC- Dr. Noble asked the Council to review the two Substantive Change letters to the ACCJC regarding:

Letter 1: Substantive Change in Transfer degrees for (Early Childhood Education, Geology, Math, Psychology).

Letter 2: A request of ACCJC to determine if we need to submit a Substantive Change Notice for our new Mission Statement. In the letter there is a full explanation of how it changed, and that the items removed to streamline the Mission statement were placed into the Vision and Values Statements.

It was Motioned, Seconded and Voted to send both letters to the ACCJC (McCoy/ Orf).

f. Area Reports and Decisions

In the interest of time Area Reports and Decision were not discussed.

g. Equity Perspective & Reflection: CCN Equity Point Person Questions

The Equity Perspective & Reflection questions were not discussed.

h. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Sharon V. Gach
Administrative Assistant to the President

Las Positas College
Recommendation from Planning Task Force
Integrated Planning Committee

The LPC community has shown a great preference for keeping College Council and adding a Planning Committee to our structure. The Planning Task Force modified its proposal by reducing the tasks of the proposed Integrated Planning Committee, and either keeping tasks with or adding tasks to College Council. There is the general recognition of both the committee members, and many in the general population that College Council will have to be revitalized and perhaps reconstituted in order to make sure that this committee is able to accomplish these tasks successfully.

The College Council is the College President's committee. The following is a recommendation to the President as to what needs to be identified and perhaps changed in the Committee:

1) **The purpose of College Council needs to be identified.** Different presidents have used this committee in a variety of ways – it would be helpful to have a specific reason for the existence of this committee. Is it to advise the President? For the President to communicate actions? For the College Community to exchange information? To manage the College's building block documents and accreditation?

2) **The following tasks for the committee have been identified by the Planning Task Force (most are already in the Committee's Charge):** Formulate, review and revision process for Mission, Vision, and Values statement; Formulate, review and revision process for College Goals; Review governance structure; Serve as a liaison to Chancellor's Council; Serve as a liaison to District Budget Study Group; and Coordinate the Accreditation Process (this might best be done by having an Accreditation Subcommittee of the College Council). The College Council can take on more tasks, of course, but these are the critical tasks for accreditation and district governance.

3) **We need to institute an Accreditation oversight committee.** If the oversight of accreditation process is not included in the planning committee's charge, they need to integrate our accreditation plans through summary level documents (similar to summary level Program Reviews) generated by another committee. We are required by ACCJC to integrate accreditation throughout the institution, so our practice of having it be the responsibility of one administrative office needs to change. Since the level of work changes from year to year, it might be best to have this as a subcommittee with varying composition.

4) **Who is needed for College Council Tasks as compared to who is needed for sharing of information?** One of the challenges of getting work done in College Council is that a sizeable number of committee members are chairs of committees. They already have a workload running their committees (often without reassigned time). Adding College Council work to their plate is a lot to ask, so the role of most members has become to share information rather than to coordinate action. It may be that a "Core" of College Council should be identified for intensive work, or that the committee meet twice a month, once for work, and another for sharing information. The composition also needs to be reviewed, as many committees do not sit on College Council. The voting structure also needs reviewing as multiple times the committee has not been able to make quorum.

5/14/13

M E M O R A N D U M

Date: May 21, 2013

To: LPC College Council

From: Dr. Kevin Walthers, President
Las Positas College

Re: College Council Planning for 2013-2014 Academic Year

Background

At the close of the 2011-2012 Academic Year, the College Council asked Dr. Janice Noble to provide two items:

1. A document to map accreditation standards to committees, and,
2. A plan to address the need to review the mission/vision/values statement, college goals and strategic plan (attached).

Each was provided to the Council at the September 20, 2012 meeting. In addition, the Council asked that IEC review KPIs for relevance and ability to adequately measure. Over the course of the year, IEC did review the KPI document and streamlined the indicators to reflect the College's current processes.

The process for addressing the planning process was delegated to the Planning Task Force, chaired by Sarah Thompson. The Planning Task Force arose from district-wide discussions at DBSG and fit well into the goals of the College Council. Working as a subset of the College Council, the Planning Task Force conducted business in conjunction with DBSG direction.

While the Task Force took on many issues and moved discussions forward on several fronts, the primary outcome of the Task Force was the approval of a revised College Mission/Vision/Values statement. Given that this was identified as the first (and primary) task of College Council for the year, it can be said that the Council achieved its goal.

The plan to begin the process of reviewing college-wide goals (scheduled for late Fall and early Spring) and the strategic plan proved to be overly optimistic. Taking on these two items would have been difficult given the ongoing district-wide conversations in regard to development of a new budget allocation model.

2013-2014 College Council Charge

The Administration proposes that the 2013-2014 academic year follow a similar process to that pursued in the current year. Over the summer, Dr. Noble will take the lead on building a schedule to address the college's goals and the strategic plan (essentially updating the attached files). This will imbed planning in the College Council process as defined in its charge and will give a map to again achieve success in planning.

Two challenges should be addressed at the first meeting of the College Council in August, 2013. First, members must commit to attending. College Council in the current year struggled to maintain a quorum

during the Spring Semester. If class schedules interfere with attendance, it is critical that a substitute participates in the meetings.

Second, the College Council should adopt a work meeting/business meeting model as used by the CLPCCD Board of Trustees. Work meetings would be the time for committee reports and discussions of progress on college goal/strategic plan review. The business meeting would be the time for formal input and discussion on final decisions. Ideally, business meetings would move more quickly to facilitate engaged participation.

The process needs to move with some speed as planning for the full accreditation visit should also begin this Fall. These two processes can move on parallel tracks.

Once the Council approves a realistic schedule and assigns tasks, it can systematically address the issues facing the planning needs of the college over the next year. No action needs to be taken at this time – the Council should carefully consider its options as the new year opens and quickly take action in its first meeting in August.
###

DATE: **May 3, 2013**
TO: **President Kevin Walthers**
FROM: **Active Shooter/Critical Incident Taskforce**
SUBJECT: **Law Enforcement for LPC and Securing our Infrastructure**

In our first report the Active Shooter/Critical Incident Taskforce made a series of recommendations concerning an integrated response that dealt with the intervention/prevention model. We are well on our way as a campus with the mental health aspect of that program thanks to the continuing efforts of Dayna Barbero of the Student Health Center along with the LPC Counseling and DSPS Programs. ***However there is limited coverage on Fridays, when there are still significant numbers of students, faculty and staff on campus. We are recommending that the Health Center, counseling and DSPS hours of operation are expanded to better cover those instructional hours on Fridays.***

Additionally, the securing of the campus infrastructure is also necessary for the integrated model to truly be in place. However, the information needed to present a recommendation is harder to come by. ***According to Tim Nelson, District M&O Manager, we would need to hire a consulting firm to conduct a survey to determine how many "Columbine" locks and window coverings (and types) would be needed. Mr. Nelson also said that once that survey was completed, a bidding process would have to take place to hire a firm to install the modifications.***

The third part of our proposal was to explore the options of armed law enforcement on campus. For the past several weeks, members have been meeting with or researching various options for armed law enforcement on campus. Below you will find the different options as originally presented and the estimated costs for each one.

NOTE: Until May 24, we have a small window of opportunity to obtain a grant from PoliceGrantsHelp.com for School Resource Officers. Ms. Sarah Wilson of this organization has offered to write the grant for LPC for a nominal fee of $1000. The taskforce strongly recommends that we go after this grant and utilize Ms. Wilson. This organization is located in San Francisco.

Ideally, a district-wide police department made up of POST certified and sworn police officers, supplemented by campus safety officers would be the solution to having a professionally trained, certified and armed presence at Las Positas College as well as Chabot. However, the time to accomplish this task is, in the opinion of the taskforce, too long to wait for. Even if the board were to approve the creation of a district police department at their next meeting, the actual time to rollout would be a minimum of one year from date of approval. This time estimate is optimum if everything that is required to start an agency can be in place and ready to go prior to the hiring of police officers.

These requirements include, but are not limited to the following: Liability insurance, pay and benefit structure, (including retirement) training funds, equipment, to include agency equipment such as office supplies, computers, licenses with the California Department of Justice, qualification with the California POST Commission (which is not mandatory but very prudent to do) police vehicles, long weapons and personal safety equipment (state law requires the agency to provide this).

In that regard, we believe that the ultimate goal should be a college district police patterned after any of the over 70 community colleges that already have a police department or any of the CSU/UC's that all have campus police. As stated above, the time from approval to rollout is too long to wait in today's world.

As an alternative to the above, the following, in order of preference are submitted for your review and submission to the board:

1. Livermore Police Department officers patterned after their successful School Resource Officer program. This would cost the college/district approximately $700,000 a year for four officers for approximately 18 hours a day, Monday through Saturday (This includes pay and benefits, with LPD picking up any worker compensation issues due to OTJ injuries). This cost will vary after contract negotiations concerning actual hours per day worked. Four officers would give us coverage from 0700 to 2300 Hrs each week day and from 0800 to 2000 Hrs on Saturdays. Special events would have to be discussed and arranged in the contract. We require four officers to have one on duty during day and evening classes and also to cover day off/vacation relief.

2. A district-wide contract with the Alameda County Sheriff's Department patterned after the contract between ACSO and the Peralta Community College District. This contract covers three of the four colleges in the Peralta district and costs approximately $2,780,000 dollars for the 2012-2013 school years. (Attachment #1) This cost covers approximately 88% of Peralta's security needs. (Attachment #2). This cost to Peralta would be approximately $250,000 to $300,000 lower for our district with only two colleges and would cover more than 90% of our security needs as a district.

    a. It should be noted that the district currently pays the City of Hayward $233,005 annually for **one** police sergeant to run the Campus Safety Office at Chabot College. (Attachment #3)

3. Having existing Campus Safety Officers given "Powers to Arrest" authority and training under Section 832 of the California Penal Code to include firearms. This training, 64 hours in length with the firearms component, confers upon our safety officers limited arrest authority with board approval and an MOU with the Livermore Police Department to accept persons arrested for transport to the county jail. This option is the least desirable. While it gives us trained and armed safety officers, it is a grey area of authority and, as with the option of a district-wide police department, training, equipment, liability insurance and certification are expensive and time consuming. It should be noted that most of the campus safety officers who work for LPC are either retired law enforcement or currently serving "Level 1" reserve peace officers. (A Level 1 reserve officer is one who has had the same academy training as a full-time paid peace officer but is not working at a full-time position.)

4. Maintain the current campus safety operation with no alteration. This is not a recommendation by the taskforce.

In the area of infrastructure upgrades to improve classroom and non-classroom physical security, as stated in our first report and above, the taskforce believes that it is imperative that this be accomplished simultaneously to picking and implementing a law enforcement option.
Respectfully Submitted,
(SIGNED)

Mark Tarte
Task Force Facilitator

Task Force Members/Contributors:

Dayna Barbero	Carol Edson
Joe Cook	Theresa Dubord
Jim Gioia	John Gonder
Ron Johansen	Ernie Jones
Craig Kutil	Sean Prather
Jesse Martinez	Barbara Morrissey
Jeff Nelson	Ryan Sanchez (LPD)
Catherine Suarez	Seb Wong

cc: File