

 **CONTRA COSTA COLLEGE**  
Operations Committee  
Meeting Minutes

**Date:** April 22, 2026 (every 2<sup>nd</sup> Wednesday of the Month) **Time:** 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

**Location:** SAB-211

**ZOOM:** <https://4cd.zoom.us/j/82194560051>

Meeting ID: 821 9456 0051 Passcode: FMPWEB

**Voting Members**

**Chairperson:** Victoria Menzies

**Managers:** Darris Crear, Kyle Alvarado

**Faculty:** Elaine Gerber, Leslie Alexander, *Alternate: Joseph Randy Carver*

**Classified:** Joe Roberts, Amber Tu

**Students:** Max Stemmler, Steve Sandoval

**Non-Voting Members**

**Managers:** Jaina Eyestone, George Mills, Larry Womack, Lt. Charles Hankins

Present: Jaina Eyestone, Darris Crear, Kyle Alvarado, Leslie Alexander, Joe Roberts, Amber Tu, Max Stemmler, Larry Womack, Maya Jenkins, Katherine Krolikowski

Zoom: Joseph Randy Carver

Called to order at 2:08 p.m.

Item

Outcome/Decisions

Action Items

<b>I. Welcome and Introductions</b>	Began meeting with roll call of attendees. Jaina Eyestone Chaired the meeting due to Victoria Menzies absence.	No action required.
<b>II. Public Comment/Announcements (2 minutes each)</b>	No public comment or announcement were made.	No action required.
<b>Consent Agenda - Action Item</b>		
<b>III. Adoption of Current Agenda</b>	Agenda adopted with 5 yay votes, 0 nay votes. 0 abstain.  <b>Motioned:</b> Darris Crear <b>Second:</b> Joe Roberts <b>Yay Votes:</b> Darris Crear, Kyle Alvarado, Leslie Alexander, Joe Roberts, Amber Tu,  * Max Stemmler was not present for voting	No action required.
<b>IV. Approval of March 11, 2026 Minutes</b>	Minutes approved with 5 yay votes, 0 nay votes, 0 abstain.  <b>Motion:</b> Darris Crear <b>Second:</b> Joe Roberts <b>Yay Votes:</b> Darris Crear, Kyle Alvarado, Leslie Alexander, Joe Roberts, Amber Tu,  * Max Stemmler was not present for voting	No action required.
<b>Discussion/ Information Item</b>		
<b>V. Space Utilization Process: Supplemental Space Prioritization Process</b>	The committee reviewed a supplemental space prioritization process document created by a College Council working group to address situations in which multiple requests are submitted for the same space. Discussion topics included:	<b>Operations Committee:</b> Provide feedback to the working group/subcommittee, including recommendations regarding:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revising the term “programs” to more neutral language such as “requester” or “unit.”</li> <li>• Adding timelines for operations review.</li> <li>• Clarifying that the process applies only to available and unused spaces, not currently occupied workspaces.</li> <li>• Connecting the process more clearly to existing district policies and handbooks.</li> <li>• Adding policy references and effective dates for context.</li> </ul> <p>The committee also discussed procedures related to supplemental space request packets and review timelines. The following recommendations and agreements were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requesters will have five business days to complete supplemental packets.</li> <li>• The Operations Committee will serve as the reviewing body using a scoring rubric.</li> <li>• Form language should align with the original space utilization form.</li> <li>• Separate documentation should be created for both the form and the procedure.</li> <li>• Constituency consultation may occur on an as-needed basis rather than for every prioritization request.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• alignment with original form language,</li> <li>• specified deadlines, and</li> <li>• development of both procedural and form documentation.</li> </ul>
--	---	--

**Reports From Facilities and Technology/Committees**

<p><b>VI. Facilities Update – Robert Bagany: RDA Project Updates, Current Campus Project Updates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HVAC/Filters</li> <li>- Basic Needs Center</li> <li>- Sanitary Item Dispensers in Bathrooms</li> </ul>	<p>Tabled due to Robert Bagany’s absence.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
---	---	----------------------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ELC (Furniture, Bldg. etc.)</li> <li>- MESA Center - Furniture Carpet Paving Projects - Asphalt and Sidewalk repairs</li> <li>- Native Garden</li> <li>- Greenhouse near Science Bldg.</li> <li>- Tree Trimming</li> </ul>		
<p><b>VII. Technology Update – Jaina Eyestone</b></p>	<p>Computer lab upgrades were completed during spring break. Mid-semester laptop swaps were also completed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Randy:</b> Add the technology plan to the Academic Senate agenda.</li> <li>• <b>Committee Members:</b> Review the technology plan within their respective constituencies.</li> </ul>
<p><b>VIII. Report from Safety Committee Meeting – Victoria Menzies</b></p>	<p>The committee reported that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AED and CPR training were conducted on March 24th and 26th.</li> <li>• Safety monitor trainings were completed.</li> <li>• The monthly ELC drill was completed successfully.</li> </ul>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p><b>IX. Report from Sustainability Committee Meeting – Robert Bagany</b></p>	<p>Tabled due to Robert Bagany’s absence.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p><b>X. Adjournment</b></p>	<p>Meeting adjourned at 3:21 p.m.</p> <p>Next meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 13, 2026 at 2:00 p.m.</p>	

# Supplemental Space Prioritization Process

---

## **PURPOSE**

To establish a clear, consistent process for prioritizing space requests only when multiple valid requests exist for the same space.

---

## **WHEN THIS PROCESS IS TRIGGERED**

This process is used only if all of the following are true:

1. Two or more programs submit requests for the same space
2. Operations confirm that all requests are operationally feasible
3. A prioritization decision is required

If any of these conditions are not met, this process does not apply.

---

## **PROCESS OVERVIEW**

- 1. Initial Space Request**
  - Programs submit requests using the standard Operations form.
- 2. Operations Review**
  - Operations confirm feasibility (facilities, safety, ADA, IT).
- 3. Conflict Identified**
  - Operations identify competing requests for the same space.
- 4. Supplemental Packet Issued**
  - Operations sends the Supplemental Space Prioritization Packet to requesters.
  - A submission deadline is provided.
- 5. Review & Scoring**
  - Designated reviewers apply the rubric.

- Review focuses on student responsiveness, belonging, and impact.

## **6. Decision & Documentation**

- A recommendation is made.
  - Rationale is documented.
  - Outcome is communicated to all parties.
- 

### **KEY PRINCIPLES**

- Student experience is the primary consideration.
- This is a tie-breaker process, not a re-review of feasibility.
- Transparency and documentation are essential.
- This process should be used sparingly and consistently.

# SUPPLEMENTAL SPACE PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

## Notice of Space Conflict Review

Multiple requests have been submitted for the same space listed below.

Operations has reviewed all requests and confirmed that they meet operational feasibility requirements.

As a result, the **Supplemental Space Prioritization Process** is being used to determine priority.

---

## SPACE REQUEST INFORMATION

**Requested Space:**

---

**Programs / Departments Involved:**

---

---

---

## WHAT IS REQUIRED

Each program listed above must complete:

**Supplemental Space Prioritization Form** (included in this packet)

Completed forms must be returned by:

**Submission Deadline:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

## HOW THE DECISION WILL BE MADE

- Submissions will be reviewed using a **non-weighted, student-centered rubric**.
- Reviewers will focus on:
  - Responsive services for students
  - Student belonging and experience

- Clarity of use and student impact
  - Facilities, ADA, IT, funding, and safety considerations have **already been reviewed** and will not be reconsidered at this stage.
- 

### **IMPORTANT NOTES**

- This process does **not** replace the Operations space request form.
  - This process is used **only when multiple valid requests exist for the same space**.
  - Clear, specific responses will support an equitable decision.
- 

**Operations Contact:**

---

**Date Issued:** \_\_\_\_\_

# SUPPLEMENTAL SPACE PRIORITIZATION FORM

Program / Department Name:

---

Requested Space:

---

Primary Contact (Name, Title, Email):

---

---

## SECTION A: HOW THE SPACE WILL BE USED

### 1. What will happen in this space?

*Describe the primary activities or services students will experience.*

---

---

---

---

### 2. When will this space be in use?

*Include days, times, and duration.*

---

---

---

## SECTION B: STUDENTS SERVED

### 3. Which students will realistically use this space? (Check all that apply)

- Any CCC student (general use)
- Students in specific programs or services: \_\_\_\_\_
- Students in a defined pathway or discipline
- Student clubs or affinity groups
- Primarily one specific student population: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**4. Approximately how many students will use this space in a typical semester?**

*Estimate and briefly explain.*

---

---

---

---

**SECTION C: RESPONSIVE SERVICES & STUDENT SUPPORT PRESENCE**

*Responsive support means a student can speak with a person for help, questions, guidance, or referrals at the time they are in the space.*

**5. Will this space provide in-person, responsive student support? (Select ONE)**

- Staffed during all open hours
- Staffed during posted hours each week
- Staffed on a limited or rotating basis
- Not regularly staffed
- Self-service only

---

**6. If staffed at any time, describe who will be present, when, and what support is provided.**

---

---

---

---

**SECTION D: STUDENT BELONGING & EXPERIENCE**

**7. How does this space help students feel connected, supported, or welcome?**

*Provide concrete examples.*

---

---

---

---

**SECTION E: MISSION & EQUITY ALIGNMENT**

**8. Which college goals does this space directly support?** *(Check all that apply)*

- Student success or retention
- Equity or support for underserved students
- Guided Pathways or pathway engagement
- Academic support or enrichment
- Community or campus engagement
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Brief explanation (1–2 sentences):**

---

---

---

**SECTION F: SHARED USE VS. INTENTIONAL COLLABORATION**

**9. Is your program willing to share the space if scheduling allows?** *(Select ONE)*

- Yes
- Possibly, with conditions
- No

**If Yes or Possibly, describe how shared use would work:**

---

---

---

**10. Does this proposal involve intentional collaboration with another program?**

- No – single program use
- Yes – informal coordination
- Yes – intentional collaboration toward shared goals

**If yes, identify collaborating program(s) and shared goal:**

---

---

---

**SECTION G: COMPARATIVE STUDENT VALUE**

**11. Compared to other possible uses of this space, what does this proposal add for students?**

---

---

---

---

---

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I understand this form is used only for prioritization when multiple requests exist and does not replace the Operations request process.

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

# SUPPLEMENTAL SPACE PRIORITIZATION RUBRIC

*(Reviewer Use Only)*

---

Requested Space: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Program / Department Being Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

---

## REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS

- Use this rubric **only after Operations confirms feasibility**.
- Base scores **only** on responses in the Supplemental Space Prioritization Form.
- Do **not** consider funding, facilities constraints, ADA, IT, or historical use.
- Scores should reflect the strength, clarity, and evidence provided.

---

## SCORING SCALE

Score	Description
1	Weak or unclear evidence; criteria largely unmet
2	Minimal or inconsistent evidence; limited alignment with criteria
3	Adequate and clearly described; meets core expectations
4	Strong and well-supported
5	Exceptional, compelling, and clearly differentiated in student impact

---

## SCORING CRITERIA

### 1. Responsive Services & Student Navigation

Score (1-5): \_\_\_\_\_

Consider the extent to which the proposal:

- Provides timely, accessible student facing services that support educational and career goals
- Improves student navigation through clear location, signage, and co located or integrated services
- Reduces access barriers (e.g., wait times, referrals, unclear processes)
- Supports proactive or high touch student support models
- Demonstrates sustainable capacity to maintain responsive student services
- Shows clear service outcomes (e.g., usage, responsiveness, resolution)

## **2. Student Belonging & Experience**

Score (1-5): \_\_\_\_\_

Consider the extent to which the proposal:

- Creates a welcoming, inclusive, and culturally affirming environment
- Fosters belonging, safety, and connection to the campus community
- Reflects and supports diverse student identities and experiences
- Encourages student engagement, interaction, or community-building
- Improves the overall quality of the student experience in the space
- Incorporates student voice or feedback into space use or design

## **3. Student Impact**

Score (1-5): \_\_\_\_\_

Consider the extent to which the proposal:

- Reaches a meaningful number of students, with demonstrated depth and frequency of use
- Shows clear impact on students' academic success, persistence, completion, or educational experience
- Supports students' educational, transfer, and/or career goals
- Addresses identified student needs or gaps
- Uses data, assessment, or evidence to demonstrate outcomes and impact

## **4. Mission & Equity Alignment**

Score (1-5): \_\_\_\_\_

Consider the extent to which the proposal:

- Directly supports the college mission and strategic priorities, including Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM)
- Advances equity, access, and culturally responsive practices
- Serves disproportionately impacted or priority student populations
- Aligns with institutional action areas related to cultural humility, safety, wellness, and collaboration
- Promotes transformative learning, student development, or holistic growth
- Demonstrates intentional, equity-centered planning in the design or use of the space

## **5. Shared Use/ Collaboration**

Score (1-5): \_\_\_\_\_

Consider the extent to which the proposal:

- Is flexible and adaptable to support multiple uses over time
- Supports shared access across programs, departments, or units
- Promotes cross-unit collaboration or integrated services
- Avoids duplication of space or function elsewhere on campus
- Can be scheduled or accessed by multiple stakeholders
- Maximizes overall utilization and efficiency of campus space

---

### **OVERALL COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT**

Which proposal better serves students, and why?

---

---

---

---

**Reviewer Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Role / Committee:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_