

**SBVC COLLEGE COUNCIL
APRIL 27, 2016 MINUTES
PRESIDENT'S CONFERENCE ROOM, ADSS-207
TIME: 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM**

A= Absent

Gloria Fisher, SBVC President
Jeremiah Gilbert, Academic Senate President, Co-Chair
Dave Basted - **A**
Aaron Beavor
Lorrie Burnham
Marco Cota - **A**
Paula Ferri-Milligan
Rania Hamdy
Leticia Hector
Rick Hrdlicka
Diane Hunter
Celia Huston

Henry Hua, Acting VPI for Haragewen
Kinde - **A**
Ricky Shabazz
James Smith
Scott Stark
Linda Subero -**A**
Kay Weiss
(18 members)

Guest(s): Consultation Committee,
Susan Bangasser, Bruce Baron, Paul
Bratulin, Riase Jakpor, Wallace
Johnson, Albert Maniaol, Romana Pires,
Roger Powell, John Stanskas, and Karol
Wells.

CALL TO ORDER:

1:06 PM President Fisher, called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 13, 2016 MINUTES

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the APRIL 13, 2016 minutes**. Rick moved, James second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: Beavor and Gilbert

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hector, Hua, Shabazz, and Subero.

Motion Carried

UPCOMING/FILLING POSITIONS – G. FISHER

President Fisher discussed with the group that for the most part these various positions, per memos provided to the group, resulted from the retirement incentive that was offered by the District. First position is replacement Director, Grant Development & Management position in the President's Office. The Director of Grant Development & Management is retiring and this is a management level position we are seeking to replace. Dr. James Smith is the Dean over the area and will say a few words regarding this position and the need.

Our Mission: San Bernardino Valley College maintains a culture of continuous improvement and a commitment to provide high-quality education, innovative instruction, and services to a diverse community of learners. Its mission is to prepare students for transfer to four-year universities, to enter the workforce by earning applied degrees and certificates, to foster economic growth and global competitiveness through workforce development, and to improve quality of life in the Inland Empire and beyond.

James stated that this position requires quite a bit. It is really a complicated mix of technical and social skills. The person really needs to meet with faculty and staff on campus and maintain relationships with off-campus partners. Also, the person need to establish a set of priorities that people on campus and off-campus partners will agree to. Then, produce research grants that are appropriate for those priorities. So, the duties required are a lot of contact and communication in order to find the appropriate grants, and then to help manage the grants after you get them. The process of writing and developing the grant is one thing, and the process of managing the budget and maintaining compliance of the grants is something different. We are seeking to replace this position.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the replacement of the Director, Grant Development & Management position.** Rick moved, Rania second. Discussion as follows:

Kay asked if it was possible to write into the job description that this will be a self-funded position. The responsibility of writing grants be a component of all the grants we get, so it does not end up coming out of District or College funds, at least over time. For the first year not so much, but she knows other Colleges do that.

President Fisher stated that we have that for this positions here, but also for the Director of the Foundation. Many other Colleges do not provide or support the position with general funds. She would say that it is a two-step process. It is not the question here, but it is certainly something that we could entertain as we look to modify the job description, but it is not a part of the request here, because the funding exists. It is a funded position.

Rick stated this was tied to Title V and it was supposed to be institutionalized and he does not know if you can do that.

President Fisher stated she knows that the HSI STEM PASS GO Grant required us to institutionalize at least five positions, but we do not have the latitude of changing that matrix at this time.

James stated we had an informal measure of this position, having to generate grant monies, and in this case it exceeded that.

Susan said she knows in our grants we have indirect costs and she thought those costs were going to help support.

President Fisher stated not positions that are mandated or required by the grant, but that those indirect costs often go for support staff.

No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero.

Motion Carried

Scott discussed with the group three Custodian positions and one Technology Support Specialist II position in the Vice President of Administrative Services Office. He is asking the group to fill all the positions.

First custodial position is due to a vacancy created by a recent termination of an employee. Our custodian staffing is at a minimal across campus. Every vacancy puts us on hard times with substitutes to keep up with it.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the custodian (vacancy created by the termination of an employee) position.** Aaron moved, Lorrie second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

Scott stated the second custodial position is a vacancy created by the placement of an employee on the 39 month rehire list. The custodian is no longer with us and was placed on the rehire list.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the custodian (vacancy created by the placement of an employee on the 39 month rehire list) position.** Rick moved, Aaron second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

Scott advised the group this custodial position is a growth position for the gymnasium area in which there is a lot more square footage to take care of this next fiscal year. The new gymnasium is 47,000 square feet greater than our previous gymnasium. Custodians on average are running approximately around 30,000; 27,000 to 38,000 square feet approximately depending on the complexity of the space. This is over that, but, because of the budget issues he will be discussing, they are only requesting one growth position and wants to see how it goes. An additional cost is approximately \$60,000.00, which includes benefits and salary. This positions is needed to maintain the level of custodial we have now.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the custodian (new growth custodial for gymnasium area) position.** James moved, Aaron second. Discussion as follows:

Celia would like to hear about the budget issues that he is going to discuss with the group first. The group members all agreed.

President Fisher tabled the motion until after the discussion on the agenda item for Developmental Budget Status and Funding Needs, which Scott will be discussing with group.

After the discussion on the agenda item for Developmental Budget Status and Funding Needs by Scott, ***President Fisher proceeded with the vote.** Discussion as follows:

Kay asked the prioritizing of this position under Program Review.

Rick advised it was number one on the listing for Program Review.

Kay stated she asked because it comes back to process. Where do we pull all of those positions that were classified positions in Program Review? So, if it was prioritized as number one that helps her some.

Scott stated this position is number one and the growth tech position is number two, and two additional custodial positions are number three on the Program Review List.

No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: Hunter and Huston

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

Scott stated his last position is the Technology Support Specialist II position created by Craig Ferguson who will be retiring on June 30th.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Technology Support Specialist II position.**

Rania moved, Lorrie second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: Hrdlicka

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

President Fisher discussed with the group two secretary positions and seven faculty positions in the Vice President of Instruction Office.

Susan Bangasser addressed the group and stated we have an Administrative Secretary in which Nicole Williams is transferring to the President's Office, which creates this replacement position needed by Health Science to function.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Administrative Secretary – Health Science position.**

Celia moved, Lorrie second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

Susan Bangasser discussed with the group the replacement Secretary II – Health Science position who is retiring. This position handles all of the students, application processes, records for students for all the faculty for Accreditation purposes, monitors all documentation required and interacts with the students, etc.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Secretary II – Health Science position**. Lorrie moved, Rick second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

President Fisher advised the group that we are moving into the faculty positions. She discussed with the group the first memo for the replacement of the Computer Information Technology Faculty (retirement of Mona Jackson) position in the Vice President of Instruction Office. It meets the rubric.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Computer Information Technology Faculty position**. Lorrie moved, Rania second. Discussion as follows:

John stated that the memo states 75% will be taught by part-timers, and he asked what the total load was per semester and how many full time assigned to the area?

Roger Powell stated that there are five full time faculty. Then, it would be a 20% reduction and that is how Henry came up with the 25% reduction calculation per memo. He did not have the total load information with him. It would meet the rubric because 25% of the classes would be taught by full time faculty if we do not replace Ms. Jackson. They have 8 or 9 adjuncts now and, if no replacement, then they would need to hire at least 3 or 4 more adjuncts (would be his guess).

John felt that information should have been included in the memo because that is the part of the rubric that identifies automatic replacement. For discussion, it seems unclear in the memo what happened.

Celia pulled up on her phone the Educational Master Plan data sheet for 14-15, what the load is for this position for the group. CIT is showing FTEF 16.78 for the 14/15 YR, which is consistent with 13/14 YR, which was 16.56, load for 8 1/2 people.

Kay stated you need to divide that in half since it is for each semester. Kay asked how many full-time faculty in the program.

Roger Powell stated 4 1/2, half split between CIT and Computer Science.

Kay stated the loss of Ms. Jackson would make it 3 1/2.

John asked if it included summer and Kay stated she is sure it does.

President Fisher stated it is well within the rubric.

No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

President Fisher discussed with the group the replacement Economics Faculty (retirement of Dr. Walter Chatfield) position in the Vice President of Instruction Office.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Economics Faculty position**. Lorrie moved, Rick second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

President Fisher discussed with the group the replacement English (retirement of Sharon Chapman) position in the Vice President of Instruction Office.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the English Faculty position**. Lorrie moved, Paula second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

President Fisher discussed with the group the replacement Modern Languages (retirement of Lydia Barajas-Zapata) position in the Vice President of Instruction Office.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Modern Languages Faculty position**. Lorrie moved, Paula second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

President Fisher discussed with the group the replacement Nursing Faculty (retirement of Gail Mack) position in the Vice President of Instruction Office.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Nursing Faculty position**. Lorrie moved, Scott second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

President Fisher discussed with the group the replacement Nursing Non-Instructional (retirement of Michael Spahn) position in the Vice President of Instruction office.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Nursing Non-Instructional Faculty position.** Lorrie moved, Rick second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

President Fisher discussed with the group the replacement Political Science (retirement of Dr. Ed Millican) position in the Vice President of Instruction office.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Political Science Faculty position.** Rick moved, Lorrie second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

Ricky discussed with the group the four replacement positions in the Vice President of Student Services office. First, replacement position of Admissions & Records Technician position which is due to the promotion of a current Technician who was promoted to Specialist. Thus creating a vacancy under that person former position as the Admissions & Records Technician. This position accepts payments and helps students at the counter.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Admissions & Records Technician position.** Lorrie moved, Paula second. Discussion as follows:

President Fisher clarified that this Technician position was a position that already existed. The person in the technician position promoted to the Specialist position which was the existing vacancy position. Thus, leaving the technician position vacant. No additional position is being asked for, only asking for to fill the vacancy technician position due to promotion. April was the coordinator who was promoted to Director. Veada was the Specialist promoted to Coordinator. Admissions & Records Technician promoted to Specialist, thus leaving the Admissions & Records Technician position vacant.

No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

Ricky discussed with the group the **Counselor position (retirement of Carolyn Lindsey)** in the Vice President of Student Services Office. He did not have a Counselor position, so Student Success funds were used to create the Counselor position supporting our Guardian Scholars (Foster Youth). This position is categorically funded.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Counselor position**. Rick moved, Lorrie second. Discussion as follows:

Rania clarified that she is the Counselor for Foster Youth and the new Counselor hired would take over that counseling.

Ricky confirmed "yes".

Celia confirmed that it is an existing position and it is categorically funded.

Ricky confirmed "yes".

No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Ferri-Milligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Bastedo, Cota, Hua, and Subero

Motion Carried

Ricky discussed with the group the **Outreach Coordinator position** in the Vice President of Student Services Office. Mr. Williams is participating in the retirement incentive which created a vacancy, which we need someone encouraging students to register at SBVC.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Outreach Coordinator (retirement of Clyde Williams) position**. Scott moved, James second. Discussion as follows:

Rania is concerned with the title of Coordinator. We have had this conversation before, but using the term Coordinator in Student Services versus Faculty Coordinator; it causes some confusion. She wonders if there is a better name that could be used or a different way to name those Coordinator positions so they do not sound like they are Faculty positions. Rania asked if all his Coordinators in Student Services were not faculty.

Ricky stated that they are both and, if you looked at 113 Community Colleges, you would find the same thing, that there are Faculty Coordinators and Classified Coordinators.

John suggested that we need to hire someone for outreach but the minimum qualifications should be evaluated for that position. The classified staff or managerial needs to be evaluated. There is a lot that needs to go into that job description before we fly that job description.

Susan agreed, with having someone with that faculty background and understanding of our programs. We need someone not just to deliver the information, but someone who has a better understanding of the programs (might get a better value out of the position).

President Fisher stated while she agrees with everyone is concern, she cautioned the time it would take to write a new job description is going to be a major gap in having someone in that position. She would suggest you would move forward with this position as is, so that we can move forward. But when it comes to the hiring, we do it on a short-term basis until such time as we can move it through, not hire someone permanently. If we do not have someone out recruiting, we will suffer in the fall and spring enrollment. Because you know how long it takes to move these positions through the process, it could be six months down the road. This is just a thought as part of discussion. I agree that you might want to look at the job description more carefully. Working under the umbrella of the VPSS, it comes to your understanding what the needs are we are talking about here. Are we talking about two different things and two different people? Can we afford two different people and that would be a question for the VPSS since he holds student support monies and student equity monies that are a separate categorical funding base.

Rania inquired if the Coordinator position could be under that categorical funding because it certainly applies.

Ricky stated that this is a much longer discussion than we probably have time for. Let me say this, that Counselors are already doing outreach at the feeder high schools. Everyone of our counselors, for the most part, are assigned to a feeder high school. We are mixing two job descriptions and I do not know if this is the arena to talk about outreach in terms of time. This position which was re-written in the last year, and it took him a year to get the job description approved, is the person who deals with the prospective students first. Then they go through our process and they meet with a Counselor. This position is not the only one doing outreach. There are Counselors involved in outreach. When you talk about College Fairs and the types of things this position does, it would be a challenge to have someone on a 10 month or 120 days because there are outreaching events at churches on Saturday's & Sunday's. There are things going on that this position does that would not necessarily be considered faculty work. We involve faculty on those opportunities when it would be appropriate.

John thought it was more of a managerial position. It does required a great deal of discussion of what we expect from an Outreach Office. We do have a lot of mechanism in which we reach out to the community, but what does that person do and are they managing the efforts of the entire campus in a systemic way to be that first touch person, making sure that the first touch is positive and brings students to the college or not. I think the President had a suggestion that we could fill this position on an interim basis or temporary basis until that larger discussion can be had, but I would be hesitant to say we should fill this position as is in a permanent way at all.

Celia wanted to know if it is possible to make a friendly amendment to the motion to go out and fill it as a temporary basis while it is being evaluated.

Ricky stated a classified position cannot be filled on a temporary basis. The position has to be flying.

Celia asked about a Professional Expert.

Ricky said then you are giving classified work to a non-member of the bargaining unit.

Lorrie said she came in as a substitute to a classified position when she was hired for two years.

President Fisher advised the group that we cannot fill the position with a substitute unless the position is posted or flying.

John would suggest that the job for the Outreach is coordinated by the VPSS and he will make sure that it gets done in whatever way it needs to happen, using the existing resources, until you can have a real discussion about this. Having a position fly that we know, or have questions about, is futility to the service of the campus, for a long time frame seems inappropriate.

Ricky stated he agreed with John. His concern is that it could be a management position, but in that discussion we would have to address the bargaining units' view of them losing a position in their unit. So there are some absolute challenges. Then, if I were to hire a Professional Expert, having someone do that work while we figure out what we want to do, I am back in the same situation.

Rania commented that maybe the position is a Director of Outreach, like Johnny's position as Director of FYE, in which he does a lot of things a classified staff does not do. Then, it is a managerial person and that role becomes expanded and some more accountability and reporting, things like that occur from that position.

Ricky said that it is a great thought, but we are going to hear from Scott about budgets, in which we are talking about going from a max \$60,000 position to an \$110,000 plus benefits. I would love to have a Director.

Rania asked why it could not come from categorical funds.

Ricky clarified because it is not an allowable expense.

Celia said there were a lot of classified positions on the web site for substitute positions.

Ricky commented that is because if they are out sick or long term illness, then you fill with a substitute.

Aaron clarified that you have to have someone in the position already, before you can fill it with a substitute.

Celia asked what is the minimum qualification for this position.

Ricky started looking up the job description on the website and he believes it is a minimum qualification of an AA degree. He said he re-wrote the job description a year ago from a Technician to Coordinator. He agrees it should be higher and would love to have a Director.

President Fisher stated then there is the financial impact of a Director. At the same time, the question is how effective is the current position?

Ricky stated best practices are that many Community Colleges have either a Director of Recruitment & Outreach or Coordinator. Those positions are usually classified, whether it is a Classified Manager or a classified member of the bargaining unit.

President Fisher stated maybe part of this discussion is being driven on what we saw, or perceive took place, as opposed to taking the job description and finding a person that meets the criteria you have in mind. I do not think the job description itself is insufficient. I think it can be sufficient if you select the right person to fill the position. Whether it is a coordinator or director. The difference is that one supervises and one does not supervise. In terms of level of expertise, a coordinator can bring that to the arena and I think that is what we would be looking for, someone that has the experience and the ability to get out and

commingle with people at all levels and not just certain populations. Not that she agrees, but we need to get on with this and decide if you want a Recruitment Coordinator or you do not want one for six months to a year, based on everything that is being presented here today.

Ricky read and clarified that the job description requires any AA Degree and read what the person's responsibilities were for the Outreach Coordinator from the website. He stated he had written this job description and that his background is outreach.

President Fisher said that brings us back full circle and let's look at the job description and hire the person we want in that position, rather than going outside of what we have or a different title. Clearly there is enough in that job description to satisfy the concerns that have been raised. It is about who is hired.

Kay stated she had two concerns. First of all an AA is not enough education to do what you say. It sounds like at least a BA degree to her, beyond that, since there is a lot of concern about the term Coordinator, with the confusion between classified and faculty positions. If there were another word that the Classified Union would accept quickly instead of the term Coordinator.

Ricky has had these conversations before, but there have been classified Coordinators on this campus and other campuses.

Scott stated the VPAS office has a Coordinator position.

Ricky stated that idea, or notion, would require the changing of somewhere between 9 to 12 positions. There are Coordinator positions across campus in classified ranks.

President Fisher stated that there are more coordinator positions in classified than there are in faculty. There are only three faculty coordinators on campus. If you really want to have a good conversation, but this is not the place for it, what other title do you want faculty to distinguish them as Coordinators. It is very confusing having Faculty Coordinators because they work on a faculty schedule and they cannot supervise anyone, and they are more like a Department Chair or Faculty Chair than a Coordinator. To me, it would seem we would want to distinguish the faculty with another name. That is another meeting, an Academic Senate meeting would be a place to start. Clearly that would be a 10+1 to take something away.

Lorrie stated that a Coordinator is a classified position, but if you look at Coordinator positions on other campuses, the minimum qualification is a BA degree. Her concern today is if we should move this forward and hire someone in that position with an AA degree?

Ricky stated he could assure you that the applicant pool would primarily be filled with people with Bachelor's and Master's Degrees. He can also assure that the pool will be filled with Counselor positions because of the challenges of getting Counselor positions.

President Fisher mentioned a thing about a pool of applicants is that they must meet the minimum qualifications, but you do not set that as your minimum standard as you are reviewing applications. A member stated it could happen. The way the positions are written today, someone could get hired with an AA degree. President Fisher said "yes" it could happen. She said she cannot emphasize enough that you will say "yes" you are going to do it or "no" you are not going to do it, but if you do not act, we will be hurt without someone in Outreach. We are already hurting and when we get to Scott's presentation, you need to hear about the money problems, the FTES, and the efficiency problems that we face as an Institution and it is killing us.

Jeremiah stated he is not above filling this position, but we have an Outreach Coordinator now and we are already efficient. To say it will hurt us, we are already hurting. This person will report to the VPSS and he should make sure when we get a new person that the person is doing what is on the job description. If someone was doing all that, then we should be benefiting, but he does not see that happening now. The job description he feels is brilliant.

President Fisher said she was trying to be candid and respectful, but that is not a reason to deny us of the position as an Institution that we need.

No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beaver, Burnham, Ferry-Milligan, Hamady, Hector, Horlick, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Basted, Cota, Hua, and Subzero

Motion Carried

Ricky discussed with the group the **Student Services Technician I** position in the Vice President of Student Services Office. We have a staff of two in Assessment and they assess students on campus and off campus. One of the staff in Assessment is participating in the retirement incentive, thus creating a vacancy.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Student Services Technician I (retirement of Carol Brown) position**. Rick moved, Jeremiah second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Beaver, Burnham, Ferry-Milligan, Hamady, Hector, Horlick, Hunter, Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss.

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: Basted, Cota, Hua, and Subzero

Motion Carried

DEVELOPMENTAL BUDGET STATUS AND FUNDING NEEDS – S. STARK

Scott provided the group with a snapshot of the developmental budget stance. Our allocation for this next fiscal year has gone up by a little over a couple of million dollars from what it has been for this fiscal year. The majority of that is due to an increased FTES that we gained over the last year. We find ourselves in the first round, always many rounds, but right now as it stands we have a \$504,000 deficit with the deficit that was presented to the board initially, we knew we were going to have about \$184,000 deficit. But, right now it stands at a little over a half million dollars. A question that he gets is how come a couple more million dollars in allocation can be a deficit of one half million dollars? Where did that money go? Well, 1 ½ % increased salaries across the board, if CSEA accepts the 1.5 % increase, per STRS increases, medical benefits increases, Step-and-Column increases with full-time faculty positions, we hired eight full-time faculty, and the state so far has pulled the rug out from us that we thought was ongoing funding, but at this point is one time funding. That is huge and it is \$785,000 itself. The KOLA is only 0.467% this year, but the cost of goods and services have gone up more than 0.467%. Gas prices are what is being blamed for driving that down. But, one thing that is driving it way up, for us, is the new law of prevailing wages

12

Our Mission: San Bernardino Valley College maintains a culture of continuous improvement and a commitment to provide high-quality education, innovative instruction, and services to a diverse community of learners. Its mission is to prepare students for transfer to four-year universities, to enter the workforce by earning applied degrees and certificates, to foster economic growth and global competitiveness through workforce development, and to improve quality of life in the Inland Empire and beyond.

now. All of our vendors need to be registered with the Department of Industrial Relations so any contracts over \$1,000 have gone up significantly. An additional 2% growth in itself equates to about a quarter of a million dollars. New growth comes with additional costs, typically adjunct faculty as one of those additional sections, and, if there is any monies left for support cost. The assumptions that are going along with this \$504,000 deficit does not include, at this time, (3) additional faculty positions that are created by the retirement incentive (only includes in budget now by taking the savings of retirement positions), assuming our efficiency is remaining the same. We have an aggregated efficiency right now of approximately (3) FTES being generated by each section, on average. We do a lot better in the summer and this last spring we have fallen below (3) three. Overall average is 2.99%. I selected (3) three, and if we increase by .1% on a three unit class, we go from 30 to 31 students that would bring in and save us an additional \$168,000. I cannot stress how much money is inefficiency. A ton of money is in our efficiency. We had to pull back 5% on the 4000's, 5000's, & 6000's from all the Instructional Programs across campus. We have \$100,000 in our operational budget as a reserve account for FA, which is a requirement reserve account in case a student does not qualify for and, if paid, if a loss, we have to pay it back. Last year he had it hitting our fund balance as an unfunded purchase order, since he did not want it hitting our operational budget since it would be a here and there thing. As it turns out this year, we used up the \$100,000, so we cannot go on doing that. We have to include it as part of our operational expense. It does include this additional growth custodian position, which has yet to be determined. So, if you vote "no", you could free up \$60,000 of the deficit, but again that would come at the cost of less service to the campus with the additional square footage of the gymnasium. There is a potential savings that he has yet to calculate yet but he is working on that is with vacancies. When are these positions going to come on board and there is going to be some savings there. He is working with HR and Jose in Fiscal Services to fine tune that and maybe there will be some savings there. We should know in about a week or so. It includes reassign time like we had last year. He has to calculate reassign time and right now it includes (7) seven full-time faculty positions that are reassign time. It is spread out over a number of positions, but the full time equivalent is seven full time faculty positions. That is like 70 sections. So that are the assumptions that I used in where we stand right now with this \$504,000 deficit.

Kay asked if that was the back fill of those assignments or seven with all their benefits and everything else.

Scott stated that is the back fill for those positions. The salaries are included in the 3000's object codes. That is pretty much where we stand. If we do hire the additional (3) faculty that would equate to approximately \$177,000 first year. It should also be noted that the \$504,000 that the District fund balance is covering is 1 ½ % salary increases across the board this year and next year, but the third year it will hit our operational budgets. That is a snapshot of where we are at and things could change. The state typically goes back and forth and changes. We are hoping they will give up more monies for the full-time faculty and reverse that decision, and then maybe the May revise will change to our benefit. But, where it stands right now, we are in a real tight spot. We will continue this conversation at the next College Council meeting and have any information on the May revise.

Celia asked that when you were going over the snapshot of how we came up with the deficit, you talked about the 1 ½ % salary increases. But, when you closed, it does not impact us for the 16-17 or the 17-18 budget year.

Scott stated that it was included for. If we did not have that one time funding from the District fund balance this year, it would have been a million dollars. That is going to cover us for the next two years and then, as we get additional growth, maybe things will catch up with us in a couple of years and we will be in a better position.

Celia asked if because you are getting the money from District, it does not mean you can back it out of our deficit, or has it already been backed out.

Scott advised it has already been backed out and part of that. Again, we would have a million dollar deficit otherwise.

President Fisher said she wanted you to have this snapshot of information to think about and you will have more time to discuss it at our next meeting when we come back on May 11th .

President Fisher advised the group we have on the table a motion and second to approve the hiring of a Custodian growth position. She called for the vote (*see discussion and voting section for this position above).

UPCOMING COMMITTEE EVALUATION SURVEYS – J. SMITH

James advised the group that it is time to do the evaluation committee surveys. We can do one here today, but he also had enough for all the committee chairs to take them with them to distribute at your committee meeting. The email did not work. Maybe two people from this committee responded, which is more than most. The response rate was awful. So they are going to do paper and pencil this time in order to get the surveys completed for compiling data. He provided the members each with a survey to fill out for this committee and to return it to him at the end of the meeting today.

OPEN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES (OER) UPDATE – R. PIRES

Romana addressed the group and stated that some of you have been on my email and some of you have been participating in this already. In March she went to an Open Educational Resource Informational Conference that was related to the latest legislation regarding Open Education Resources. A couple of years ago, SP10.52 created an Open Education Resource Counsel that was made up of CCC and CSU faculty. They were tasked with identifying 50 courses where Open Source Educational Instructional material could be created. That was followed up with SP10.53 in 2013 which created the California Digital Open Source Library to provide these resources that were being developed into a central on-line library. Today, that library is housed at wwcool4ed.org. Then, recent legislation last year, AB 798, 2015, created an Open Educational Resource Adoption Incentive Program which is a three million dollar grant. There will be one hundred mini grants that will be awarded among the Community College system and the CSU system. The way that it works is that there will be a \$1,000 dollar award for every section, not course, where faculty convert to using Open Source materials that can demonstrate a 30% savings from the material being used now, or the previous semester, to when the material was adopted. So, we have to show a 30% savings and, also, part of that instructional material has to be free and Open Source. So what they mean basically by Open Source is copyright, that it can be reproduced. The Academic Senate, back in March, decided to move forward with this and tasked me to take a lead on this. The first thing that we did is send an email to the campus to see if there was an interest for this. There seemed to be an interest, so at minimum we have to identify 10 sections. At minimum, we can ask for \$10,000 and maximum is 50 sections for \$50,000. If there is any money left over from the three million dollar grant to share, we can ask for the same amount of money we were awarded for 2017-2018 year. So along with this there are some requirements; that we have a textbook resolution that is passed by the Academic Senate, which we already did at the last Senate meeting; that we have a narrative proposal for textbook affordability plan, which is what you have a rough draft of; and we create a Textbook Affordability Campus Coordinator and

that is a temporary position and has a four year commitment because the grant does require the Coordinator to file a report once every year for four years. That position is grant funded and we can ask up to 30% of the money to fund the Coordinator. You also have a proposal with the different responsibilities and this is going to the Senate next week. If we pass these responsibilities, at that point, we will send out an email with request for letters for this position. At this point, we have a commitment for 20 sections, which is \$20,000 and we are very happy about that. It was kind of difficult at first, but now people are hearing about it and are emailing me and asking questions. Three of those 20 sections are honor's sections. She has been in communication with one of the contact persons for that and she was told possibly we could get funded for that as well, if we justify that this will have a significant impact on our honor's program. At this point, we could receive anywhere from \$17,000 to \$20,000. Basically, we have to demonstrate as a campus we are ready to implement where we are and that it is something that we will sustain for a four year period and the plan is feasible. They are asking us to identify from the rough draft all sorts of activities that we are committed to acting on and a lot of it is outreach, a lot of it is professional development. So I am asking that this is informational, but we do have to show that faculty, students and administrators are involved in this and support this. I ask that you look over the draft of the handouts provided to the group today and send her any feedback that you think should be included or anything that does not look feasible, or anything out of line. Please send it to her since she is still working on cleaning up the rough draft and what to include of anything that is provided. Ultimately based on the remaining meeting schedule, this will be approved at the last Senate meeting on May 18th. Since this group's last meeting is the week before the May 18th meeting, do you want to receive this as an informational item or do you want to take a vote of support on this? That is up to this body; not sure how you do things.

President Fisher stated the way we do things is that we do vote on things, but she hears two questions, one spoken and one not spoken. One question is that will this body support this proposal? The unspoken is will this body support an additional new position to be funded from general fund to a certain extent?

Romana said she is sorry that she did not explain it properly. The position does not require any reassignment time, nor are we asking for any monies because that position will be a stipend position the way it is written up and that money comes from the grant. Out of the \$20,000, we are asking for the maximum 30% to go towards the stipend in which we will decide whether it will be distributed in a two year period or four year period. All the plan set requires is that this plan is voted on and approved by the Senate. It does not have to be approved by various administrators or collegial bodies. But because of the culture of our campus, we have a very strong collegial consultation history, so she was thinking it was probably appropriate that it would be based on our culture that College Council votes to support this. Also, keep in mind that you will be voting on it. Normally when Senate votes on something, it then goes to College Council, but because of the calendar it works out different.

President Fisher clarified that she is asking this body to support it. She wanted to make it clear that there is no commitment of general funds here and you are not asking for reassign time that is going to pull faculty out of the classroom. You are asking for support and is it not stronger if you have the support of the College Council?

Ramona thinks so and she is not asking for your support today because this is a draft of the plan.

President Fisher would ask that the members have an opportunity to look at it a little more carefully, prior to our next meeting on May 11th, even though you will be actually asked to vote prior to the time it goes to Senate. It has gone to Senate in one form already.

Jeremiah stated this will come back to Senate on May 4th for the first reading and then on May 18th which is our last meeting, that is when we will select the coordinator and will vote to approve the final version of the plan.

President Fisher verified that the coordinator will be a faculty member and that person will commit to this work above and beyond their regular assignment. It will be a stipend.

Ramona stated it does not have to be, but it is recommended to be a faculty member, and "yes" it is correct that they commit to this work above and beyond their regular assignment. That is how the legislation was submitted and wants it that way and it is a stipend.

Rania wanted to add the Coordinator does have a job to do, but that once this plan gets implemented, the majority of it is professional development. The majority of it will fall on her working with this Coordinator who will be the liaison for this legislation, since it is a lot of professional development and that is her role.

Ramona added that we also are asking for a stipend for someone to take on the facilitation of creating a website and collecting Open Source materials for resources for students and faculty.

President Fisher asked where does that stipend come from.

Ramona stated it comes from the grant. The more sections we have the higher the grant. She has been talking to the Deans, the Senate, and sending out emails and that all depends on if we can get more sections.

President Fisher stated she had the benefit of having information shared with her upfront so she would understand what this proposition is. She could lead the council to get us in either to agree or if they are not going to agree, it was not because they did not have all the information. She stated Ramana did a fine job of explaining. We know what it is you are asking and you are not asking for additional funding. The only reservation she has is about the Coordinator title. Each time I have looked at a resolution recently, it talks again about a Faculty Coordinator. She emphasizes the need to move away from that at some point in time or eliminate Coordinators on the other side. She does not see that confusion, she sees it as problematic.

Ramona commented that it was interesting that the conversation took place here because it is TACC, Textbook Affordability Campus Coordinator (how it is written in the legislation). The recommendation is that it be a full-time faculty.

President Fisher stated that is really the conflict that comes up because whenever anything is called for, whether it is 10+1 or the whole collegial process and it is necessary to have faculty involved, you have to have the faculty voice. But, how do you identify that faculty so as to distinguish them from the faculty in the unit, in the classroom, every day without these additional assignments? Whether it is reassign time or stipend. How do you distinguish that person? We do that in a way with Faculty Chairs. We pay them a stipend and we give them a title and they are distinguished from the faculty in the classroom without those additional responsibilities. It is a point she wants to make about all these faculty Coordinator positions that are coming up and we definitely have to have the faculty. If the state legislation says it has to be a Coordinator title, then they can call it whatever they want. But, internally we have a different label. As long as that person is caring out the responsibilities, then there is not a problem.

Ramona stated the first word that came to her mind was "Facilitator" when we had the discussion earlier on Coordinator titles. That is one way to distinguish it.

President Fisher stated it just needs to be a special title.

Ramona advised the group that Jeremiah will bring this back to our last meeting on May 11th.

President Fisher asked the council to review it and come with your thoughts for discussion, so we can vote to support this or not.

Ramona advised that any changes then can be made prior to the next Academic Senate meeting.

President Fisher thanked Ramona for her presentation.

RESOLUTION SP16.02-FUNDIG SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTION FOR STUDENT SUCCESS AND RESOLUTION SP16.03 – SUPPORT FOR A COORDINATOR OF DISTANCE EDUCATION – J. GILBERT

Jeremiah addressed the group and provided handouts of two Resolutions from the Academic Senate, SP16.02 Funding Supplemental Instruction for Student Success and SP16.03 Support for a Coordinator of Distance Education. He is bringing these to the group because often resolutions are directed at the District, so then they go to the Board, but he does not bring them here. These are more local. He wanted to bring these to your attention and are more informational, but there is very good information here; we have this HSI STEM Pass Go project that we are losing the grant for. We support the efforts that have been made and we are requesting that the administration find a permanent way to fund what has been done. I know that there are discussions going on to try to get some funding to keep the two recruiters that we have in SI right now. Also, it is the first under the Program Review Substantive Project. The second one, for the Coordinator of Distance Education, we have been very lucky with Jack Jackson and he is doing a lot. But, one, I was going to have Jack and, two, roughly about 20% of FTS generated through Distance Education. We have these Substantive Change Documents that have to be written now. As most of you are aware, there is a lot more of documentation that the State wants now. Whether the Accredited Agency or the State, there is just a lot more work, and Crafton currently has a Coordinator of Distance Education and their program is about a third the size of ours. So, we are asking for this position to be full release time because it is just going to grow. Keep in mind that District Education (DE) is not just on-line, it is hybrid, anything that has any sort of instructional time in the classroom. These resolutions are just more for informational for the group.

ACCREDITATION AND STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES – C. HUSTON

Celia stated the Accreditation Team came and we will find out in June, 2016.

EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN – J. SMITH

James stated they are still writing the EMP, no draft to date.

STRATEGIC PLANNING– J. SMITH

James stated we are measuring our year end results to our objectives.

Program Review – P. Ferri-Milligan

Paula advised the group that they will be finishing the efficacy in the next couple of weeks.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

No Reports

FACILITIES MASTER PLAN WORKSHOP: 1. EXPLORING FACILITIES OPORTUNITIES AND OPTIONS PART 2

Tabled to next meeting on 5-11-16

Chancellor's Update – Bruce Baron

President Fisher welcomed and thanked the Chancellor for coming. She advised him we had one bit of business we need to cover and we have you scheduled to begin at 2:30 p.m. If he would not mind, she had asked Scott to give us that snapshot of the budget, so we can go back to the position we tabled. *Scott proceeded to present his snapshot of budget to the group and a vote was taken on the tabled position.

President Fisher stated, as she mention about five minutes ago, Chancellor Bruce Baron is here to give the group his update.

Bruce Baron addressed the group and since Scott was talking about budget, he added a couple of comments. Number one, we will fill the three positions due to the retirement incentive. The promise was that the retirement incentive was to generate additional positions based on how much money we saved. That savings was specifically to be used for up to five faculty positions. I believe we generated enough savings for (4) four full-time faculty positions. Three at Valley and one at Crafton. So that commitment stands and we will fill those positions. That is in addition to filling the faculty that retired and that is in addition to filing the 8 positions and 3 at Crafton, eleven positions that he authorized this year. Scott is right when he said that the State did not forward funds for the (8) positions funded this year. There were eight hundred somewhat thousands of dollars added to the 15-16 budget for full-time faculty conversion from adjunct. That money, when you track the line items into the 16-17 budget, disappeared. So, we were promised that if we converted the ongoing adjunct money added to the eight \$15,000, we would have funding for those positions. The State is aware of it, the Chancellor's office is aware of it, and all of the Districts are fighting to get that money reinstated, and that will definitely help us to fund it. But the commitment is there and it will continue. Scott was also right when he said that we are going to fund the collective bargaining unit 1 ½% increase next year, and 1 ½ % the year after, out of the reserves for two years. That is so we can stabilize enrollment and try to keep the budgets of the Colleges intact and we

convinced the Board to allow the fund balance to go down to 12% from the current 15%. So, if you reduce the fund balance, that means the operating budget will go up on an ongoing basis. The projection that I saw District wide was we should be able to stay at 12% for a while, so that is the plan. Scott also talked about enrollment and he talked about productivity. One of the issues this year is that it cost us quite a bit more to generate an FTES than it has in previous years. Valley is really close to the State goal of 525 hours of productivity and now I think we are down to under 400. Crafton was even lower; I think about 330 hours compared to 525 hours. It indicates that in trying to achieve the enrollment goal, we opened up a lot of classes, many of which were low enrolled. We did not close those classes, we just kept them opened to substantiate the enrollment, but it cost us well over an extra million dollars to support those classes. Now, what is interesting is the report I saw this morning with the projections for summer showing a flip. A couple of months ago, Valley was easily achieving their goal and Crafton was falling way behind. Now Valley is falling a little behind, unless it has a really huge Summer Session and Crafton has picked up their FTES. A lot of that comes from AB 540 students that were miscategorized and not counted, and tutoring hours that were not counted. So, I guess they are picking up a lot more positive heads, as is Valley, that were not counted as of the last time he looked at the report. All this to say, that next year we have a 2% growth and the State gave us a little bit more money this year. I do not know how much in detail; this one gets into the enrollment and FTES. But Valley achieved its initial enrollment and then had a stretch goal. That is the goal that I do not feel you will be able to achieve with just the summer. He asked Scott the number that was out there.

Scott advised the stretch goal was 10-5-5-4 then it went to 10-7-1-4 and now he thinks it is setting at 10-5-5-8, something like that, with everything being adjusted. The money is there if we can achieve it.

Bruce stated the goal is that we will do the very best that we can and next year we will do our best to be more efficient and not keeping so many low enrolled classes across the District. The big question for him, and he threw it to the Budget Committee, is the following, Crafton wants to continue to grow at a rate that outpaces the funding. Next year there is only 2% growth funded for both Colleges and Crafton says, and the Enrollment Management Committee agrees, that they would achieve the 2% and an additional 5%. My question is I do not know where that money is going to come from. So, it is not funded by the State and I do not know if that is a valid goal right now. I am bringing that back to collegial consultation and asking Jose to look at those numbers again, hopefully before we go away for the summer. It would be a little bit of a challenge giving this content to the Board for the budget. So that is that.

James questioned that last year you were saying that this was the year we could expand our cap, that the State would take care of the growth this year and increase our cap. Is this the only year we can do that?

Bruce stated that this was the only year because next year is 2% growth across the board. Unless something changes and the State allows additional growth, we will be stuck at 2%. So, he thinks there are a lot of things that we have not tapped into yet that can achieve additional enrollment growth. We are on the verge of introducing Non-Credit classes in the District and he really thinks there is a real potential for a Non-Credit Program. There was talk about bringing back our Work Experience Program that we put aside several years ago. He thinks we could generate some FTES there. More classes at the High Schools and more partnerships. With AB 288 and with the concurrent enrollment law we have an opportunity to sign an MOU with every School District in your service area to provide Career Pathway, and provide High School students with College Courses. We have an enormous potential for at least another several hundred FTES. I hope we get a chance to talk about this next year, but we only can grow 2% right now. So the issue is going to be whether there is going to be extra money state-wide, and if other Districts are not achieving their growth, will we get the opportunity to grow more? I always like to achieve our growth and have a couple hundred FTES unfunded cushion that we carry out of our own budget. So, if the state does find

extra money and we can get extra growth, we have the FTES we can put against that right away. The other thing that we were hoping for is that we were only funded 0.47% COLA, which is really ridiculous. When you think about Step-and-Column increases, the cost of increase to the supplies that we buy all the time, the collective bargaining increases, obviously 0.4% is no more near the 3 or more percent those things are costing us. This is why we went to the Board and asked them to reduce the fund balance to 12% so we could keep doing what we need to do and meet our commitments and our growth with full-time faculty. I think that we went to the State and asked the State to take some monies out of these block grants that they are giving us for deferred maintenance and instructional supplies which we also need, and move some of that money into discretionary so we can better meet the operating needs of the District. He does not know if that is going to happen yet or not, but there is a possibility. That would be more money per FTES, but we will have to see.

We are doing as a not-for-credit program a pre-apprenticeship course through the Economic Development Incorporate Training Center. It is a National Union approved curriculum that allows students to learn the Construction Industry basics and then they can be accepted into the apprentice program in the Union Shops. A lot of Districts teach those classes as non-credit and can also feed into our credit programs, like Electronics and other areas like HVAC, and earn credit as well. We are still investigating the non-credit or maybe one or two pilot programs as it will test as it goes through with the Curriculum Committee. A lot of potential for those things and change of philosophy on how we manage the Economic Development Incorporate Training Center. He really sees it as much more integrated with the work of the campuses and he really sees that we have a real opportunity when we need FTES if we take some of those not-for-credit programs and feed them into the non-credit and feed them into credit courses on the campuses. If the economy tanks, then we could move those back into not-for-credit and run those contracts again. But I think we need a much closer relationship with the Colleges and the faculty so we can understand what are these classes; and how would they fit into the campus structure, and what is the dynamics to shift not-for-credit into non-credit. Once the Senate is really comfortable with the non-credit and with the change of leadership, they will have a lot more open discussion and sharing of resources and taking responsibility for some of those programs and doing them at the College level. So, he is looking forward to having conversations about it because he thinks it's beneficial to the Colleges.

Accreditation, you know, we are waiting for June when they meet and we will have our letter and know where we stand. Worst of all cases, we stay on warning or get put on probation, and I certainly hope that is not the case. Or we get approved for our reaccreditation and maybe have a midterm report, or no midterm report. We will have to see. We did an enormous amount of work at the District and he feels really good about it. The work was done collegially, all sincerity, in a transparent way, and I hope we have permanent improvements seen throughout the District, in time in the Budget area and HR area. We have to wait to see how it all comes out and how they felt on what we did. He thanked everyone for all the good work that they all did. Now it is a waiting game.

We had the first meeting of the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Group. They sent six people of peers from other colleges to sit with several groups that were involved in the Accreditation work primarily. Their task is to look at what we have done to improve and meet the recommendation of the ACCJC and to validate whether or not we are on the right track. Look at best practices to see where we can do better and give us their feedback, after which we can apply for a \$150,000 grant to implement the improvements that we agree upon in the final report. I have to check. I think there is a meeting in a week or two in which they are going to present what they found and talk about where we go from here. Then there is a third meeting in which it is supposed to be the final meeting where we actually draft a report together. He will keep everyone up-to-date about that to keep you involved.

You may or may not know that the Fall Community College Conference is going to be at RCC and we have been invited to be one of the host Districts. The President's Office, at least, has been notified that the conference is on November 17th and 19th at the Riverside Convention Center and is called Mapping the Route, Re-envisioning the Community Colleges. As a host District, they have asked us if there is anything we want to showcase. It is a great opportunity to show off how wonderful SBVC is and showcase what we would like to bring over to the Convention Center. They are happy to allow us to do that. Hopefully, the word will get out by the VP's and Dean's and you will showcase areas off at SBVC.

EMP and FMP processing are moving along. They are drafting reports for the EMP at this point and working on data collection for the FMP. It will be interesting because it is a Crafton issue, a lot of new buildings without a lot of new students, and the utilization rate for the campus is going to be very low. I do not know if that is going to be looked at by the State or even if we go out for another bond. We need to strategize as a District because whatever numbers were used several years ago to develop the Master Plan really projected Crafton in a much different place than it actually is. So, we have a lot of new buildings and there is not going to be a lot of people in some of them and that is a deep concern I have inherited.

President search update, the screening committees have met. I know at Valley the committee is working on building a pool for interviews. As far as Lisa tells me, we are on-track still to bring a recommendation to the Board in June, if there is a recommendation. I have not heard of any problems, glitches, or off-schedule problems at this point in time.

Bruce asked the group if they had any questions.

Rania said you mention Mathew Isaac's area at the PDC and I have to agree with you that there is a huge opportunity for outreach and student conversion in that area. I am happy to hear you say that once the new person gets that position, we will be working more closely with them. Just from her area, since her title has PD in it, the students get really lost in the shuffle when they take classes at the PDC and they just get exposed to course work. So, then they want to become students at Valley, but they just don't know how because we do not have any pipeline for that. A lot of times they call me and say they took classes at the PDC at District and can I now take classes through you, and are those counted as credit? I try to get them to A&R and help them as much as I can. There is a huge potential for those students to become our students and move through a degree program very easily because they are already excited.

Bruce states he was really glad to hear her say that and I have really known that for a while now, but I just could not make it happen. We had set up this EDTC Coordinating Committee years ago with Faculty Senate and other people on it; it really fizzle out. We just could not get it to do what we needed it to do. The PDC was set up originally as a stand-alone PDC, without a lot of thinking that it is a feeder to credited classes, that grants should be developed jointly, and Colleges should share in the work. It was not really thought as a partnership. But we have a great opportunity and he appreciates that. He will probably revisit the Coordinating Committee idea so we can make sure, as we begin to make plans and we organize that, we tap into the Colleges and get that thinking.

Rania said that the Outreach Coordinator in Student Services, once that person comes on board, would be a great person to partner with.

Bruce stated, one other thing, most of you probably saw an email I sent to all full-time faculty about a charge I made to the District Budget Committee. I have asked the District Budget Committee for a five year plan for increasing the number of full-time faculty. We have the eleven we did as a District and we have the four that will be covered with the Retirement Incentive, but we need more. We corroded our full-

time faculty numbers a great deal the past five years with a number of SERP's and have never really recovered from it. I have asked the Committee to give me, by December 1st, a five year plan that exceeds the number of full-time faculty that would be required under the Faculty Obligation Number (FON), which is the minimal full-time faculty number we must have. So, I am really looking forward to that work. I am not sure where they are going to find money or exactly how it is going to come out, but the charge was clear and Jose will take that to the Committee and work on that.

Rick wanted to make sure that we are not forgetting about Classified Staff. We keep saying more faculty but we are not getting any more support staff. We need to make sure that there is a ratio built in there for Classified to Faculty.

Bruce did not know who is on the Staffing Plan Committee and maybe we will talk about that. I think that the infrastructure that the support staff concerns really need to be something that we take a look at and maybe we could incorporate that in next year as well. But in the staffing plan we really have to have a long term plan in what is the appropriate numbers of classified staff and instructional support staff to support the educational mission of the Colleges. Some of those are hard to figure out, but he thinks it is something we need to look at and he really appreciates that comment and he will not forget about that.

Bruce thanked the group for having him come; he appreciated it.

OTHER:

President Fisher reminded the group to complete and leave their committee survey for James prior to leaving the meeting today.

Meeting adjourned at 2:59 p.m.

Next College Council Meeting: 5-11-16
Academic Year 15-16 (bi-monthly, 2nd & 4th Wednesdays from 1-3:00 PM)
~~05-25-16 Meeting Cancelled due to Commencement~~

DKG