

**SBVC COLLEGE COUNCIL
JANUARY 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 Bastedo - **A**
Aaron Beavor - **A**
Lorrie Burnham - **A**
Marco Cota
Paula Ferri-Milligan
Rania Hamdy
Leticia Hector
Rick Hrdlicka
Diane Hunter - **A**
Celia Huston

Haragewen Kinde
Sarah Miller - **A**
Ricky Shabazz
James Smith
Scott Stark
Linda Subero
Kay Weiss
(19 members)

Guest(s): Dawn Adler, John Banola,
Kristin Hauge, Dr. Wallace Johnson,
Ken Lawler, Ramana Pires, David Rubio,
John Shipp, John Stankas, and Andre
Wooten.

CALL TO ORDER:

1:03 PM President Fisher, called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 25, 2015 MINUTES

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the November 25TH minutes**. Rick moved, Paula second. No discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Cota, Ferri-Milligan, Fisher, Hamdy, Hrdlicka,
Shabazz, Smith, Stark, Subero, and Weiss

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: Huston

ABSENT: Bastedo, Beavor, Burnham, Gilbert, Hector, Hunter, Kinde, and Miller

Motion Carried

APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 9, 2015 MINUTES

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the DECEMBER 9TH minutes**. Scott moved, Kay second. No discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Cota, Ferri-Milligan, Fisher, Hamdy, Hrdlicka, Huston,
Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Weiss

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: Subero

ABSENT: Bastedo, Beavor, Burnham, Gilbert, Hector, Hunter, Kinde, and Miller

Motion Carried

Our Mission: San Bernardino Valley College provides quality education and services that support a diverse community of learners.

UPCOMING/FILLING POSITIONS – G. FISHER

President Fisher discussed with the group the replacement Administrative Secretary position in the President's office.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the replacement of the Administrative Secretary position**. James moved, Jeremiah second. No discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Cota, Ferri-Milligan, Fisher, Gilbert, Hamdy, Hrdlicka,
NOES: Huston, Shabazz, Smith, Subero, and Weiss
ABSTENTIONS: Stark
ABSENT: Bastedo, Beavor, Burnham, Hector, Hunter, Kinde, and Miller

Motion Carried

President Fisher welcomed the guests attending this meeting. It was agreed upon with the body that when we are following the rubric regarding vacant positions, a spokesperson from the group could speak to the members of this body regarding positions, but no more than 15 minutes, as we do when someone is asking for Emerging Funding needs.

Haragewen discussed with the group two replacement Kinesiology positions in the Vice President of Instruction office. She handed out to the members' revised memos changing verbiage of who the memo goes to, but the information is the same for each position. She also provided a handout of the rubric flowchart in case members wanted to refer to it during the discussion.

First, replacement position for a full-time Kinesiology and Health, Generalist Instructor, to replace Mr. Ken Blumenthal who retired May 2015. The process for this body is that when we have a retired position, we bring it to this body to make sure it fits the flowchart. This position does not meet the flowchart guideline of the rubric and statement of such is on the memo. Discussion as follows:

Kay confirmed that when a position does not meet the criteria of the flowchart rubric, then recommendation is it goes to Program Review. Both of these positions have gone through the new Program Review process that was just completed and they are included in the list. She is confused as to why these positions are here?

President Fisher clarified that your question is whether or not this document states that the position does not meet the criteria as set forth in the rubric, it simply goes to Program Review? That is correct, but what you have in front of you is information prepared by the Division Dean and he presents it to the VP, in which the VP brings it forward to this group. That is the Dean's determination and his judgement that it does not meet the rubric. This body is to make its own assessment. In all likelihood, in most cases, the body is going to agree with the recommendation that comes from the Division Dean and VP. But if there is disagreement, then we have the conversation that it is this committee members' role to determine if it meets or does not meet the rubric.

Kay clarified that the members' role is to determine if it meets, or does not, meet the rubric. President Fisher confirmed that is correct.

Rick clarified with President Fisher that the funds are still available for these positions and tied to these positions.

President Fisher stated, if for example, if the recommendation to the President is not to fill the position, then funds become available in the general fund to fund another position. Then, they go to the Program Review List, just completed, for the next priority position. Or you could say, no, we recommend the position to be approved. Then, funds are available for these positions and funding is not an issue.

President Fisher introduced Dawn Adler who is the chair of the Physical Education Department. She is going to speak to the group, no more than 15 minutes, as the representative from the group on both of these positions.

Dawn Adler stated that this position was written up in Program Review and she agreed with Kay in ranked order. The reason it came to this body is that she is following through with the consensus within our department and division that we value the position and would like to replace it.

Celia questioned that this is a generalist position; how many can teach a generalist position and how many strictly athletics?

Dawn stated all of our positions within our department have a coaching aspect and a teaching aspect to able to be a generalist. There are currently eight faculty positions without these two positions here. John and she are the only ones that do not have a coaching component to the job.

Rania clarified that the only case is that it does not meet the rubric and that is the only issue.

Kay stated she had a concern that this process becomes a way of circumventing Program Review. She needs to express that and she thinks the Program Review process needs to be followed and not diminished. When we set up a process that sends it to Program Review, we should follow the Program Review process.

Dawn completely agreed with Kay and stated they do not have a very strong case for this first position. There is not a strong caption behind it. There are so many needs of the general campus. She wrote up and tried to address this upon the recommendation of our division that they did not want to lose their position and this seemed to be the climate to do that. To do due diligence for the positions, I did that.

President Fisher entertained a **motion to approve the Kinesiology and Health position**. Kay Weiss **moved that we support the memo that was presented by the Division Office, and that this particular position does not meet the rubric and should go to Program Review**; James second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Cota, Ferri-Milligan, Fisher, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Huston, Kinde, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, Subero, and Weiss

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: Gilbert

ABSENT: Bastedo, Beavor, Burnham, Hunter, and Miller

Motion Carried

Second, replacement position for a full-time Kinesiology Instructor/Women's Basketball Head Coach to replace Ms. Sue Crebbin who resigned August, 2015. Discussion as follows:

Dawn Adler stated the rubric for the box for special regulatory mandates, respectfully the memo that was written, says "no" for Title IX. However, there are interpretations of Title IX that, within the department and within the division, they think there are Title IX issues. She handed out a couple of handouts that showed some of the aspects that we are trying to focus the argument that we do meet the rubric for that criteria. She proceeded to provide the members with the concerns and information and history on the position. She stated it is a successful program and without a full-time person there is absolutely no way

the level of this team will be able to continue. It loses the opportunity for the marginalized population that would be part of this and be able to transfer on, and that is why they are here for this position.

The members reviewed the handout on Title IX provided by the group. Further discussion proceeded amongst the group regarding the number of men and women coaches, full-time and part-time coaches, Title IX, the compliance issue, participation rate, the access, and demand.

Dawn commented that this position is also in Program Review and in our division it ranked number one and across campus it rank number six. We thought it was all good until we thought the campus had only ten positions. Then, hiring eight from last years, we thought that this one would not get funded, so that is why this is here to advocate for the position because it is important.

President Fisher entertained a motion **to support the memo for the Kinesiology Instructor/Women's Basketball Head Coach Position**. Ricky moved, Rick second. Discussion as follows:

Celia mentioned she would like to know more about Title IX and does this really qualify for a special regulatory mandate.

Linda wanted clarification, if we are voting "yes" to accept the memo?

President Fisher clarified that if you agree with the memo then you are recommending we fill the position and you vote "yes".

Rania motioned to amend the motion that, even though this position does not meet the rubric, we are requesting that this position be hired for fall, 2016. Ricky moved, Rick second. Discussion as follows:

Kay wanted to reiterate her point again that it feels like we are going around Program Review and Leticia agreed.

Ricky stated the issue for him is not Title IX. The issue is that, at some point, Community Colleges that use part-time coaches, adjuncts are going to find themselves with Obama Care and hourly wage. Because the adjuncts are held to an hourly account per contract, but if you do the math on the amount of travel and practice, every part-time coach in the state is working full-time hours on a part-time pay. There is no feasible way for an adjunct coach to stay within the stated number of hours as a head coach. If he was going to argue regulation that would really be the argument because it is not feasible for an adjunct based on the number of hours that adjuncts are held to be a full time coach. There are several cases going through where folks are coming back to Community Colleges as adjuncts and suing them for back wages because of that.

No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Cota, Fisher, Hamdy, Hrdlicka, Kinde, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, and Subero

NOES: Weiss

ABSTENTIONS: Hector, Ferri-Milligan, Gilbert, and Huston

ABSENT: Bastedo, Beavor, Burnham, Hunter, and Miller

Motion Carried

ACCREDITATION AND STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES – C. HUSTON

Celia gave a verbal update that there is a second draft making its way around the email with a survey attached. Last semester we actually got 85 survey responses. We have a wonderful form that Rania put together and we have five bodies. So, we are going with the survey again, hopefully, to capture more information and get more responses. We are going to have another document for first reading for Academic Senate on the 3rd and College Council on the 10th, with final documents, hopefully, for signature coming the following meetings.

EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN – J. SMITH

James passed out handouts to the group regarding the Educational Master Plan/Facilities Master Plan. We had an Educational Master Plan meeting with the consultants and we discussed this layout for their contents for an Educational Master Plan. District has contracted them to assist us with updating the Educational Master plan with our plan and CHC as well, then integrate them with District. One of the things is that our Strategic Master Plan goals are integrated with the District Strategic Plan. Educational Master Plan will have a set of those as well. Those goals, if not the same, should be very compatible with the goals we have already established for the campus. The consultant is going to be here at our next meeting to discuss goals with us and how those goals will integrate with District goals. Two things, one is the EMP and the other is the FMP. The FMP will be driven by educational needs and goals, based on our EMP. At one point we had a sub-committee to read and review the EMP. We have the one page sheets every year and every five years we create a plan that integrates all of the individual plans into a level plan. As we work with the consultant, we can have one group as College Council or have a sub-committee of College Council to review the input and process. We do need to have a core group on campus that oversees what they do. We can make a decision, and those are two possibilities.

Scott questioned, if we go the sub-committee route, then that does not diminish the number of people we are going to have with the full College Council body? Or does it?

James stated, no, the sub-committee will review the output, the deliverables, and the drafts as they produce each one of the chapters. We need to work with them.

President Fisher asked where this suggestion is coming from; that we have a sub-group?

James answered that it came from him. We had a sub-group that was working on the plan, but we put it on hold because the consultants were hired.

President Fisher had a concern that on the outset she was asked to identify the members that would be part of this process of developing these two plans. She was the one that stated it would be College Council, but with good reason. This body was the most representative body on campus and every group is represented here. So, if we come up with a sub-group, she can understand how that works better with everyone's schedule, but concerned about groups being left out because she has received feedback that they did not know that or what they were doing. In looking at it as the role of all the members here to carry the information back to the groups they represent, if that is not happening, then she would feel very uncomfortable pairing it down to a smaller group, thinking that the information is going to be shared. That is her thought, and, after she said College Council seemed the best group, CHC followed suite. I augmented the Applied Technical side for CTE representative, and I added Albert Maniaol for Technical and Susan

Bangasser for the Applied, so we would have those voices and receive their input for the purposes of the EMP and FMP.

Paula stated she has brought it back to her group for discussion amongst the group, but questioned what the consultants have done to date.

James stated that CHC has an EMP Committee.

Ricky requested if they could have a single point of contact and on their end?

President Fisher said the single point of contact is Scott Stark, and, at their end, it was discussed that they will be having a point of contact per my meeting at Chancellor's Cabinet.

Group discussion was that information is what James has already presented and done, but just in a different template.

James stated there should be some new data at the next meeting because they have done an economical scan.

Rick wanted to express some concerns that he received at Opening Day meeting. A lot of people were saying, why we are doing this, we already did this. A lot of them do not understand the reason this was started because of the bond measure upcoming. He does not think the campus understands that about the bond related issues.

Rania stated that they did not present the presentation that was discussed. It was very disappointing.

James stated we did discuss the bond measure and it must have gotten lost in communication.

President Fisher stated it was a loss in opportunity to communicate with all faculty and staff present.

Scott updated the group on where he thinks we are at. We do need to build some more facilities. Most likely there is going to be some state monies that we can leverage and the rest of our bond fund we have authorization for. The FMP is basically going to tell us the priorities on campus & district wide, where we are going to spend these monies and what facilities. Based on a meeting a week ago, where we are at is that they have walked the campus and have data on campus space; how it is being used, when it is being used, down time, etc. They have collected all that data. He has sat down with them and reviewed the data with them. They have that information now. It is going to be on hold to wait for the EMP piece. We have done the Community external environmental scan and have all that information on Community needs. We are doing the internal stuff now and the first week of February they are going to be interviewing the department heads for detail information on each individual's program, obstacles, how your facilities are meeting, or not, meeting their ability to deliver that program. That is one of the last critical pieces of information that they are going to be gathering. When the last critical piece of information is gathered, they will put it together in a format that, we as this body, can look at it, understand it, and see how the existing facilities do, or do not, line up with our ability to offer the programs that we are delivering now or the we need to be delivering, based on all the information. They need to put us in a position where we can put an educated recommendation forward to the District Strategic Planning Committee on what we want in terms of where we are going towards the EMP & FMP.

James stated with the economical scan we will see more than before. He does not know how the scan will address some of the hard questions, if we want to include new CTE programs or the process. We have a process for our discontinuous programs. They have a very strong recommendation about developing new

programs based on economic conditions in the community and he does not know how they propose to shift from old programs to new programs. He believes this new economical scan is going to come with recommendations about new industry opportunities.

President Fisher asked about the email regarding our campus that we are in some special select group.

James stated we are one of the one-hundred fifty six campuses at a National level that have been selected as the number one. He has not seen the email either but he will report on it the next time. There are three stages. The first stage is where you are identified as an improving campus. The second stage is where you provide your data and say what you are doing in terms of improvement. They validate the fact that the improvement is what it appears to be in IPeds where we submit our data (where the original data starts). Then they do a set of interviews and this narrows it down to a group of ten campuses that receive an award for most improved. We made the first cut.

STRATEGIC PLANNING— J. SMITH

James stated, according to the Consultants, what we have as our Strategic Plan is what most campuses call an Educational Master Plan (EMP). There are not a lot of campuses that have both, an EMP and Strategic Plan. He remembers we developed the EMP as a reaction to an Accreditation recommendation, and we also built a stronger Strategic Plan. According to the Consultants, our Strategic Plan will serve as a skeleton for adding more “one pages” and chapter introduction in what they call for in the EMP. Once they give us information, we will need to discuss it. It may be that we do collapse our EMP and Strategic Plan into a single document with two sections. That is something we can determine later.

President Fisher asked Celia if she knew if ACCJC would have an objection if we combined our plans into one plan compared to two stand-alone documents.

Celia stated she did not know offhand but she could research that. She was thinking that we call it the Strategic Master Educational Plan. We have way too many plans and she thinks the idea of getting something and blending them together could actually help us quite a bit.

President Fisher stated that even the FMP could be another section. They all sort of tie together. You cannot develop one without the other.

James stated when he was at this training only autonomous organizations have legitimate Strategic Master Plans. Units of subsets or sites that are part of a larger District, or bigger Corporate, or large organization do not have Strategic Plans because they do not have enough autonomy. They have sub-plans that talk about how they produce a product or service. You have to be independent to have a legitimate Strategic Plan according to this training he attended.

Kay stated, based on her experience with Accreditation process, if everybody uses the language, then we have an EMP. They are not going to care if we have a separate Strategic Plan, as long as that plan is strategic.

Program Review – P. Ferri-Milligan

Paula stated they are moving along and they met last Friday for the efficacy phase and planning that. A question came up and they thought they would bring it to this body. When we ask for the Programs to

report their mission statements on the efficacy documents, is it required that every department have a mission statement?

President Fisher stated if it is a requirement, it is a requirement of Program Review.

Paula and Kay said we could say a mission statement, or a statement of purpose, that supports the College mission. A long time ago, a VPSS requested that all Student Services areas have mission statements, but I do not think it extended to the instructional programs.

John said it came from someone saying everyone had to have a mission statement. A mission statement is really a statement of purpose. We evaluate a program that had a mission, or a purpose, and they understood how they related to the rest of the institution. It was not like we think of for a College Mission Statement.

Kay clarified that this body does not have an expectation that every program has a mission statement?

President Fisher stated that there is not any mandated requirement. It is more of an interest for Program Review in the evaluation of the entire document rather than this body.

President Fisher asked if Paula happened to recall what the top three faculty positions were.

Paula stated the faculty positions are HVAC, Aeronautics, and Chemistry. Then Mathematics, Automotive and women basketball.

President Fisher was asking since she met with Fiscal at District yesterday and, as you know, the District is offering an early retirement incentive. If they get the number they need, they have made the calculations to determine how many additional positions we can hire as a result of the money savings from the positions that go vacant. There is a possibility of more positions becoming available for the 16-17 year and these positions are clearly for the Program Review list, who makes recommendations, and the President has the final approval.

Jeremiah reminded the group about the FON and, if under the FON, the penalty. John commented on the rule being leveled. President Fisher stated FON is important and is measured at the beginning of the fall semester for the entire year. Jeremiah said that SBVC is fifteen faculty short to meet the FON and two short at CHC. President Fisher stated maybe we need to look at if we cannot afford to maintain the 15% reserve in order to continue to do a good job, if we would need additional monies for support positions and supplies.

Ramana questioned what was the process in place, or timeline, for the Dean to submit the replacement positions memos to College Council?

President Fisher said what do we want to do as an Institution of guidelines for divisions when a vacancy occurs? When do they initiate action with creating the memo, with following the rubric, coming to College Council? Maybe it is a conversation they want to have at the Senate level. The Senate is where the rubric came from. But that would come here as a recommendation and this is what we like to see happen. We could all discuss it and say whether that is something we want the divisions to do, give the Deans an opportunity to speak in how this would impact them.

Kay stated that it was her understanding that we only sent the memo if we were supporting the position and we did not send the memo if it did not meet the rubric. We do need some clarification.

Jeremiah said to follow the rubric and if it is “no”, then it goes to Program Review.

Discussion amongst the group of when the memo is written and to be sent forward. It was decided that the memo needed to be written regardless, and they do not have to advocate for the position if it does not meet the rubric, but they need to inform the rest of the institution what is happening. Whether the position meets the rubric, or does not meet the rubric, the memo needs to be written. The memo goes from the Dean to VP, then the VP refers it to College Council to make a recommendation. President Fisher stated that they would put this in writing and will disseminate that and make sure that it is consistent and understood by everyone that needs to know.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Scott reported on this year’s budget. President Fisher mentioned earlier that our fund balance is going to be below 15%. The board is aware that it is going to be below the 15% on a temporary basis, but anything below 15%, it locks. We contribute to the fund balance and the remaining funds in our fund balance is around \$2 million. We have the budget adjustment for the \$1 million in Program Review Needs. What he wanted to express to the group, and for the group to share with others, was that last year there was a lot of monies left in supply accounts (4’s & 5’s), a lot of money sitting there. He guarantees at the end of this year any monies that are left in your accounts will fall out, and it is going to go into the fund balance. We will not have access to the fund balance next year. He recommends, right now, that you all review your accounts, and that you spend your money this year. Any supply type or equipment, etc., that you have money left in your accounts, you should use it to stock up on supplies, etc. for next year. That is one piece. The other piece is our \$1 million dollars in which you have received emails this week to act on this now. Give him your information and let’s spend that money. That money is not going to carry over to this next year. Whatever monies left will be locked up. He would be very aggressive this year to make sure you use the dollars you have in your accounts. Scott stated the cutoff date will be sometime in April. Also, the Developmental Budget will be earlier this year and the District office is starting earlier, and are almost done, and they will calculate what the assessment will be for this College. It is difficult for him to craft our budget without knowing what the assessment is going to be to our college. We need to know the assessment because that comes off of our revenues ahead of time. This is going to help us do a better job earlier this year on our budget.

CHANCELLOR’S UPDATE – BRUCE BARON

The Chancellor was not present.

OTHER:

Ricky advised the group that we were elected to participate in the Educational Planning Initiative (EPI) which is the State’s pilot for common assessment, common educational plan, and some kind of comment follow-up service for students who are not doing well. I am going to ask Marco to work with Jeremiah because we absolutely want and need faculty participation because this would add another software, potentially on how we communicate with students. EPI would interface with Datatel. There is a software called Star Fish. The counseling staff participated in a demo on opening day. We have identified some faculty, but I would like to ask Marco to work with Jeremiah to make sure that there is faculty involvement in it because there is training that is necessary. Now CHC is going through the initial implementation and ours is scheduled, I believe for fall.

Marco clarified that we are scheduled to do it together at this point. It was originally scheduled for CHC to go first, but the way it is looking, we will probably do it together. They are lagging behind and we are both scheduled for fall.

President Fisher confirmed that Jeremiah will carry the above information back to his group and Jeremiah confirmed he would.

Meeting adjourned at **2:58 PM**

Next College Council Meeting: 2-10-16 (1-3:30 PM)
Academic Year 15-16 (bi-monthly, 2nd & 4th Wednesdays from 1-3:00 PM)
02-24-16
03-09-16/03-23-16
04-13-16/04-27-16
05-11-16/~~05-25-16~~

DKG