# MEETING MINUTES

Date: 11.1.19

Time: 11:00 – 12:00 PM

Loc: 1943

## NOTES BY TOPIC

| **ITEM** | **TOPIC** | **DISCUSSION** | **OUTCOME** | **NEXT STEPS** | **\*RESP** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Introduction/Agenda Overview | * Discussing the LRC proposal; on the agenda today as an action item   + Soliciting feedback and discussion and a vote to approve or reject |  |  | Simon |
| 2 |  | **Item 2:** LRC: Proposal to set up the LRC (library) and tutorial services as a separate division with the possibility that the new dean could also serve as an ‘evening dean.  Reflection on how we did today. Did we use the protocol?   * Isaac: Supervisor available during the most busy times; maybe having a “night dean”; someone available when most needed by students; 9:30am to 1:00pm * Amy: Librarians state it is a little frustrating that they are being seen as the ones coming up with the proposal but rather only voting on it; they “can live” with the proposal; if they are open until 9 o’clock a librarian needs to be present   + Figuring out staffing with part-time and full-time librarians * Paul Szponar: Currently full-time and part-time librarian is always present, at De Anza, this is not the case which allows for longer hours of availability * Betsy: Student feedback   + Why is EOPS positions where it is? As opposed to more integrated with Counseling/FA   + Student voice: especially those students that are using this area; get students involved   + What will the final LRC Center look like   + Provide mentorship training for students; make use of the concept of a center * Leo: This center is really resonating with students, especially like myself who has really been taking advantage of the center and resources   + Integrating not only the services we already have, but all services all in one center because the current set up is not optimal for students because everything is scattered on campus * Students are really supportive of extended library hours because of the resources that they provide.   + Students want to be involved in the planning process.   + San Jose State has certain security measures in place for students     - Asking for student ID’s after a certain time. * Leo: Have we consulted with the police department? * Kurt: BSS Faculty interested in advancing tutorial support to students * Mike: Can Paul go through the proposal and see how some of these questions will be answered. * April: Still does not know why EOPS was moved. Can address some of the challenged that EOPS is having; although 8200 was not perfect, it served the purpose of having all student services under one roof.   + EOPS is student services first and is being challenged in the area they are currently in.   + EOPS staff doesn’t understand why the move and students are asking questions. * Thuy: Moving EOPS to its current location was to have it in a more central location, where a lot of tutoring is occurring to build a sense of community.   + Very open to moving EOPS back to its old location if it serves students better * Amy: People are supportive of the idea but since a lot of this happened during the summer and only administration met to plan and implement ideas. * Thuy: This is an iterative process; an appreciation needs to be had for the decision-making process   + This is part of the governance process; feel free to vote on whatever you believe is the best decision   + This is the quality of the decision-making process * There is a lack of tutoring especially for math; there needs to be an increase in resources for front line staff * Isaac: if the decisions are being made but not permanent, that needs to be made clear * Recap: April’s point regarding EOPS is separate from this; comments regarding the process and people’s concern of the point they were brought into the conversation in the decision-making process * Proposal: Is this a positive move especially for our students? * Motion: approve the creation of the new division while relying on the stakeholders/students and the implementation of operational details * Voting: whether or not to approve this * Approval is conditional on whether stakeholders/students are involved. * Decision of the advisory council is unanimous; will work on recommendation to be sent to the President | The Council voted to approve the LRC proposal unanimously with the proviso that students and all stakeholders be involved in the next steps and implementation. | Send memo to President Nguyen | Simon |

\*Include the person(s) and or group responsible for next steps.

## MEMBERS PRESENT

### Voting

Tri-Chairs: Mike Mohebbi, Isaac Escoto, Anthony Cervantes

Administrator: Betsy Nikolchev

Classified Staff: Danmin Deng

Faculty: Amy Edwards

Students: Leonardo Blas, Tiffany Nguyen, Duye Liu

### Non-Voting

Ex-Officio: Thuy Nguyen, Kurt Hueg, Paul Starer

Foothill Community: April Henderson, Paul Szponar, Patrick Ahrens, Ashley Dafferner

Recorder: Veronica Hernandez

Facilitator: Simon Pennington