

**SBVC COLLEGE COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING
OCTOBER 28, 2015 MINUTES**

A= Absent

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

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

Guests: Consultation Committee, Susan Bangasser, Albert Maniaol

CALL TO ORDER:

1:07 President Fisher stated this is a special meeting and called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 14, 2015 MINUTES

President Fisher stated we have a set of minutes from October 14, 2015 and available on the website. I'm requesting a motion to move. Scott moved, James second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Bastedo, Cota, Hamdy, Hrdlicka, Miller, Ferri-Mulligan, Shabazz, Smith, Stark.

NOES: None.

ABSTENTIONS: None.

ABSENT: Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Hector, Hunter, Huston, Kinde, Weiss.

NO RECORD: Javier Vizcarra for Linda Subero.

Motion carried.

CONSULTATION COMMITTEE FOR THE EMP & FMP

President Fisher asked for a motion to rearrange the agenda and let the representative of ALMA, Shaun Blaylock regarding EMP and FMP go ahead of the Program Review Prioritization Process. Scott moved, Rania Second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Bastedo, Cota, Hamdy, Hrdlicka, Miller, Ferri-Mulligan, Shabazz, Smith, Stark.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Gilbert, Beavor, Burnham, Hector, Hunter, Huston, Kinde, Weiss.

NO RECORD: Javier Vizcarra for Linda Subero.

Motion carried.

President Fisher introduced Shaun Blaylock of ALMA who was hired to help facilitate our Education Master Plan (“EMP”) and Facilities Master Plan (“FMP”). Dr. Blaylock is representing the EMP side and is quite pleased with the team leaders of the company and the approach of Dr. Blaylock is such that “this is ours” and we’ll be working together with them. I felt it was important he come before this group and explain to you what the process is. What I have said initially and I have said this in other forms as well, is that College Council serves as a consultation committee for this project. It was brought to my attention on College Council that there was a lack of representation for CTE in particular. As has been stated in the past, my effort was to include CTE and I have invited Susan Bangasser to represent one side of technology, and Albert Maniaol for applied technology. Both Susan and Albert will be part of the consultation committee on EMP and FMP, these members will join us when we talk about EMP and FMP, but they are not part of College Council.

Dr. Blaylock passed out handouts and asked everyone to sign the sign-in sheet, put division, department, title and email address. Dr. Blaylock is a clinical psychologist, licensed and practiced for 19 years. He asked Scott to explain to the committee the process they went through because Scott was on the interview panel.

Scott said there was a committee specifically tasked to select the consultant’s HMC with Alma Strategies supporting the Education Master Plan site. They’re here and they’re launching.

Dr. Blaylock said he is principal in charge, President of Alma Strategies, in Sacramento. We represent approximately 28 community college districts, and 25 in the State of California. We do educational master planning, and we use your Education Master Plan to integrate your Facility Master Plan into your five year Construction Plan and so forth, ultimately getting you money from the State of California to build buildings. That is a lot of the tasks that we do. With that, just to let you know, there will be a state bond on the November 2016 general election. It will be a \$9 billion K-14 bond. \$2 billion for community colleges, \$7 billion for K-12. That has already been approved, it’s already been passed by the Secretary of State as well as by the attorney general. One of the things that the State of California’s Chancellor’s Office requires is that you have an up-to-date, integrated Education Facility Master Plan in place, and at the same, we are literally walking your campus and we’re walking Crafton’s campus, going into every single space so that we can classify approximately, and at the same time make you more eligible for state funding. That is going to come out in 2017 through 2021. I have a lot to talk with you about, but I don’t want this to be a monologue, I’d like this to be a dialogue. A number of you, James, Rania, were at the DSPC meeting, so they’ve heard the same thing so please jump in and add your comments. This is a process that is your process. I will tell you and hopefully you will come to the understanding and realization that this is not a talk-down process. We have not been directed by your President, by the Chancellor, or by the Vice Chancellors what to come up with. What we have been directed by the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors and Presidents is to integrate your Educational Master Plan to your Facility Master Plan and begin to look at your district and your colleges as an integrated unit. Meaning you will all have your own Educational Master Plans and Facility Master Plans that will be unique to your campus but to get both campuses and the district on the same schedule. Those of you who have been at a number of these, jump in and say whether I’m overstating or understating something. But your Educational Master Plan is yours. The process will be similar at both colleges, but the results will be unique to each campus. Dr. Fisher has given us some of her thoughts and ideas. No different than Cheryl over at Crafton. Scott and Mike have given us some ideas and so forth, but ultimately it is a down up process. We are here to facilitate that process. We have been pre-skilled at doing that, I have no preconceived ideas of where you’re going other than to give you my expertise and my understanding about the process and about the state and hoping to guide you through that. What will result is an integrated Educational Facility Master Plan that will then get you all on the same cycles so that all of you are moving, at least, not in the same direction but in the same general direction in meeting the needs of

your constituents. For those of you that have heard me before, does that sound about the same? A few responded yes.

This is an agenda that you have in front of you. This is a meeting. Agendas are linear, I'm more Gestaltish in my approaches, meaning I'm the whole to the part, so I use it as a guide. As we begin to move through this, these are the topics I want to touch on, but we may jump around depending upon your desires and needs. With that, I put out a number of diagrams. Please, anything you hear, anything you get, anything that you see, please share. The ultimate goal of this is the process and the process is transparent. There is nothing secret here. I will tell you to please share it with everyone that you come in contact with. Basically, when we go through this today, you will see that this committee is the primary committee at Valley College that is charged with making the recommendations with the DSPC and then spreading the news, so to speak, and then getting input coming back. I have to work hard because education and psychology and medicine have their own acronyms. So DSPC is the District Strategic Planning Committee. Let's first go to this (circle diagram). You can see how I think of things because I think of things coming in circles rather than linearly. This is the process and philosophy that we bring to you and that is about eight weeks ago the State Chancellor's Board of Governors approved a statewide strategic plan. The community colleges need to, in their opinion, focus on certain initiatives. The green circle right here is the District Strategic Plan that was completed in 2014. The District Strategic Plan should be integrated or should look towards the statewide plan in order that it is supporting the initiatives moving forward. It isn't the same, the techniques or the directions maybe somewhat different but should be integrated with the approach of the statewide chancellor. Then above that, in the blue circle, is your college strategic plan and Crafton's strategic plan.

James asked one of the things that came up in the previous meeting when you said does everybody understand what the District is, is the District proper meaning the administrative office and the PVC and KVCR and EDCT, meaning that those are separate entities and the concept of the District that includes everybody. James said that he doesn't see a distinction on the chart.

Scott explained that on the chart the handwritten edit is on there. We did that at the last minute distinguishing between SBCCD, the overall District and everybody operating as a unified unit moving in a direction versus the District Office which is the Chancellor's Office and the entities that are connected with that. On some of these it's a subtlety but it is an important distinction.

Dr. Blaylock stated that on the far left blue box, this was decided on Friday. I haven't even been to my office in Sacramento, so I haven't had a chance to change it. So that will be changed. So, James, yes you are correct.

Leticia Hector asked so which is it? Is it the office or the entity?

Dr. Blaylock stated the far left blue box is office.

Scott explained these three blue boxes (on the diagram) together they comprise the District, SBCCD. The District Office for reasons as we go through this, you'll see the District Office is an entity that needs its own Educational Master Plan, it needs its own direction, much like Crafton, much like Valley. Together they comprise the District or SBCCD, that's all of us. But the District Office is the District Office.

Dr. Blaylock stated please help us, that's a necessary and appropriate clarification. So we will make the changes in that so there's a clear understanding of what is the District of which you are a part of and the District Office which is the Vice Chancellors, EDCT and KVCR and so forth. It's a subtle but important difference. So, when we look here in terms for planning, we have the colleges' strategic plan that should align itself to the District strategic plan. I think the most important thing is the next circle up which is

your Educational Master Plan. When you look at Number II, A, B and C, it is the Educational Master Plan that should drive, in our opinion, pretty much everything. It should drive budgeting, who your constituents are, what types of programs, what types of services do we want to provide for them. And through that, what you're going to focus on, what you're going to back off on, what initiatives you want to do, that is your Educational Master Plan. That goes from one to five to ten years. And that is what we are here to facilitate you in doing. You already have an Educational Master Plan that was written a number of years back. James, you have done some outstanding work in maintaining your program review, your program goals and objectives and directions. What we want to do is put that all together and integrate that into a unified front. Which you then will come up with goals and objectives, action plans, and so forth, that will drive your budgets. For instance, if a department decides that they need extra staffing and so forth, it has to fit within the Educational Master Plan in order to be considered. Or, if it doesn't fit into the Educational Master Plan, it has to be justified as to why we are pursuing it or not. The reason why that's important in terms of your Educational Master Plan, accreditation is looking at that as well. Accreditation looks at your integrated planning process and is it budget driven, rather than education driven. Meaning, it should be driving the budget not the budget driving it. Again, a subtle difference but a significant difference.

James asked about our objectives and goals. Those are in another document that needs to follow the strategic plan. I'm not sure what your experience at other campuses is, when there are two planning documents. In our system, the strategic plan tends to be the more overarching plan, where the Educational Master Plans begin with the one sheet at the departmental level that are involved with program review and is pretty much related to instruction and limited to student services that have contact with students while the strategic plan is one that touches everything from landscaping to student success.

Dr. Blaylock stated your strategic plan is your framework and is your \$30,000 goal. Your Educational Master Plan is getting into the weeds of how you're going to actually achieve those goals and objectives listed in your strategic plan. For instance if you have a goal or an objective to meet the career technical needs of your community over the next five to ten years, that would be a strategic goal or an objective. Your Educational Master Plan would then say these are the career technical initiatives that we're going to develop. We talked about logistics, culinary arts, those types of things that would be in your Ed Plan that would then achieve that goal. The same question was asked at Crafton yesterday: Well, we've integrated our strategic plan to our Ed Plan or we're going to. Well, that's wonderful, less work for me. But my job is to make sure that they're all aligned. As we meet with you and our Educational Master Planners meet with you and we have an understanding of your strategic plan, if something pops up in one of your departments that doesn't fit, or we need to address, then we need to bring it back to this group to say this is what we found. We don't necessarily think it fits within it, but it doesn't mean we shouldn't do it, but if we want to do it, we need to make an adjustment over here.

Rania asked the end goal of this as your facilitating these discussions in the background, are you also writing this Educational Master Plan, so, at the end of this process you will actually provide a finished document?

Dr. Blaylock stated short answer yes. Long answer is that is what you need to help us with. That is one thing that perhaps how we distribute it or how you inform your community and your constituents may be different with Crafton versus Valley. Both of you, the whole district you are going to a tome. But that is just a reference. You're going to get 650 pages of stuff. That is going to be the integrated Master Plan for the District with both colleges in it. No one is going to read that. And I think one of the big mistakes that Educational Facility Master Planners do is they say the deliverable is 6 copies of the Educational Facility Master Plan and that's 6 copies of 600 pages, and that's 3600 pages and no one is going to read.

One of your tasks for us is, as we go through this process this next year, is to inform us about how to put that out there so that it is reasonable, rational and is consumable by the constituencies.

Rania stated then it would be fair to ask you then for something, rather than 600 pages more scalable so that the campus, and even more scalable than that for the community like a one pager, sort of a marketing tool.

Dave suggested sort of like an abstract.

Dr. Blaylock said yes, it could be a one pager or an abstract. Whether or not and how you want to deliver that, including a paper, as well as electronic, however you want us to provide that to you. The document that we produce, or the directions that we produce should be a living process for you. The day it's delivered, the next day it's out-of-date. We would like this to be user friendly so that you're using it continuously so Dr. Fisher, or Scott, or James, doesn't want to read through that 600 page tome every time there's a question. That has to be user friendly. I kind of look at it as the fifth grader. Meaning, if I drop this off at a fifth grade class and they read it, they can tell me what it is and what it means. Then from the Educational Master Plan comes the rest of the plans. The final one which is the biggest plan is the facility plan. Most districts and colleges have it backwards. They go out for a bond and they do a facility plan that then drives the Ed Plan. No, no, no. We're going to have an Ed Plan that drives the Facility Plan. Because, ultimately, the facilities are the tools that you use in order to deliver the instructions in the education. So that's why we're about two months ahead of the facility people. Now your task is to look at both of them. I will give you an example, the schedules and so forth. But, ultimately, I'm going to tell you, this is your plan. I will push you, I will argue with you, I will suggest this way, but ultimately it is your plan. To the point where when we are presenting it to the Board for approval, I'm going to say we don't present it to the Board. The DSPC presents it to the Board with the representatives because it is your plan, it's not ours.

Dr. Blaylock points to the chart (boxes) and stated this is the one, and I think we can overturn, hopefully, most of the rocks in the district and know kind of where the land mines are, we know the politics, and I really appreciate everyone being up front and honest and direct, but if there's something that does not go over very well, we want to know that, because it's all vernacular. We will change what we need to do, and the first thing I will tell you and I haven't been able to change it yet, is the District what Scott was talking about. That wouldn't go over very well. So that's being changed to District Planning Committee which simply means what's underneath there. So, those of you that were in the first DSPC meeting, please jump in. Each college and each entity that will have a part of the Educational Master Plan and the Facility Master Plan is in blue. You are San Bernardino Valley College blue. The Presidents and the VPs felt that this committee in each campus represents, with certain additions, the constituencies that you're serving. As we are working with you on an individual basis, all recommendations, all program review, everything that is done in the purple boxes is generated by the Deans, generated by the facility people, generated by the VPs, generated by James, all of that information will funnel up into this Committee. We will then talk about this is what the directions are, these are the goals and objectives, these are the things that the departments and the Deans are about moving forward. This is the facility side, this is the career technical education side. All of that will be presented to you. And it is from there, those recommendations from Valley will be approved by this committee. Then we'll move up to the green box to be vetted again by the DSPC committee of which there are a number of representatives here. That committee will solidify the Educational Facility Master Plan and will make the recommendation for approval and what's in those plans to the Board of Trustees. You can see the orange box, the Chancellor's Cabinet, the District Assembly and the Board of Trustees are consulted. I can honestly tell you I have received no direction from anyone at the District level, except one person, and that's your new Vice Chancellor of HR, Lisa Norman. Because Lisa Norman has a situation with accreditation that she has asked help with. I know she's starting staffing analysis as well. She does have input into that,

but that will all come into the DSPC for recommendations. There's no Board of Trustees sitting in here, there's no Chancellor sitting in here, there's no Vice Chancellor sitting in here, this is your plan. If you have questions and comments or thoughts about the process, at least as this is related. Please, you have my card, if you have questions, concerns, thoughts, do not hesitate to email me. Now I ask you if you email me you cc Scott and James, just so that there is a tie that everyone knows what the communication is. Because if I get an email from you and there's no cc, I will cc it. Just to keep everyone in the loop. Questions, comments or thoughts?

Dr. Blaylock stated okay, this one (Attachment A). This is probably one of the most important documents that we are producing. Every single committee has a copy of this. Every single member, please share this. This is the actual scope of the work with the deliverables on the side. This is actually our contract. You can share it, you can look at it, and it is broken into two places: process and approach. The process is starting on page 1. We are right now in step 1 and step 2. That's prepare and analyze. We are now doing a space inventory. Our researchers have been in contact with your researchers at the District, the coordinator for that for now for the Educational Master Plan is Keith Wurtz. I met with him today for two hours, he's really a great guy, and he just got this job and guess what you're going to coordinate. So he is the District coordinator just to make sure everyone is rowing in the same direction. So if you get an email and you see Keith Wurtz on it, or whatever, he's having to keep track of all that. Scott has been really a part of this as well, I don't know if he's going to continue kind of being the gatekeeper, but Scott and Mike at Crafton, have been very involved in this process, so we're involved with them as well. Right now we're between step 1 and step 2. You can see on the right hand side the deliverables that we're looking at. We are going to go through, you'll see on IDe, the space utilization analysis. The space utilization analysis is going to take two forms. The first form is programmatic, and the second is simply space utilization. What we are going to provide for you is a space utilization programmatic. That means how much wish is being generated by program and how much space does that program occupy. We need to know that for a couple of things. The State measures that through lab, lecture, office, AVTV and library. We need to know that, how much wish is being generated per program. We also want to look at, and this is a planning process. If you have a program that is generating say 5% of your campus wish but taking up 15% of your assigned space, that's something you may need to take a look at. Now, you may look at it and say, no, no, no, that's fine. That's okay. But at least you're making a decision from an informed approach. The other thing that we're looking at is, the major reason is for planning. Say you want to start a program, logistics. What type of space needs are you going to need in order to develop that program and live that program. That's what we want to know. So if you're generating x amount of wish and that program is going to need x amount of space because of that wish being generated, that's what we need to know. That goes directly then to the Facility Plan. Because as you are looking at that, you're not going to have that building on line, or that facility on line, for another five years. You have a five year lead time to get the curriculum in place, go through your process and so forth. We need to know that because you can't decide to do a new program or to curtail a program, or to increase a program because you need to have at least four or five years lead time in order for the space to be reconverted. Then the other thing we're going to do with space utilization, just how much space is being used, when, what days and is it being used effectively to State Chancellor's guidelines. For instance, are there life science people here? Yes. A biology professor will say, well all of our labs are full. We need more lab space. I'm not saying this is the case with you. But then when we do a space utilization analysis there have been times at some of the colleges where it's being used significantly for the times that they want to use it. But Friday afternoons, Friday mornings, Monday mornings, after 5:00 pm it's not being used. You need to understand that for the times that you're using it, yes, that space is being used a lot. But there are other times that it's not being used. You have to make the decision as a college, do you want to recreate more space that's expensive or not in order to meet those needs, because the State will not pay for that. I'm not judging that, that's just the way it is. The State of California looks at Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 8:00 pm. That's 12 hours a day, five days a week, that's kind of what they put out there. And if it's being used 30 hours a week but it's available 60 hours a

week, they're going to say that that space is being utilized 50% of the time so therefore, you may not be eligible for additional funding. Now you as a district using your money, you can do that, but in terms of State money no. I'm not making a judgment, I'm just saying that's the way it is in relation to the state.

Rick stated you mentioned AVTV, IT doesn't generate wish. How does IT space fit in, office space?

Dr. Blaylock asked IT in terms of instruction? Text Support? That comes under office. And you get 110 square feet per 15 wish and that 110 square feet for office is not just office. It's office, it's reception, it's IT, it's support service, it's student services. One of the things we have to inform professors is, they say well the office allocation is 110 square feet, why can't I have an office that's 110 square feet, or why is my office only 70 square feet? Well, because you have to hold over 40 square feet for all the support stuff. So, IT would be under office. Now, the State Chancellor's categories are arcane. The last time they were done was in 1967. We are working hard at changing those, specifically AVTV. That's when you had, you know those carts that you wheeled around in, and overhead projectors. Libraries right now, there's a library cap load. In our planning we are actually reducing the square footages of libraries not increasing them. Because very few people are carrying books. Or they'll carry a collection of books and every else is digital. We just replanned the new library at West Valley College in Saratoga and it went from 70,000 sq. ft. to 42,000 sq. ft. And they were happy about that because then they got more space to do other things with.

Ricky asked then in that case, are you building more computer resources into libraries like computer labs and those sort of things, since there's no actual books?

Dr. Blaylock responded no, computer labs, PCs on a table are arcane as well. What we are looking at is WiFi, bandwidth, charging stations, those types of things.

Rania asked but wouldn't that depend on student population? The computer labs in the library are full.

Dr. Blaylock. Yes, that's actually a good thing to look at. Saratoga. Saratoga is in the Silicon Valley, super wealthy district. It has two colleges, West Valley, and Mission College in Santa Clara. Mission College is right next to the Levi's Stadium. For you, this is where the Educational Master Plan would not mirror Saratoga. It would mirror yours. Perhaps you would do more computer labs, but then you would look at maybe more hours open or more access, that type of thing. San Mateo is another one of our community college districts, another one of our clients. San Mateo does all of their information through email, social media, and so forth. They don't do any of this. But that's Hillsborough, they are a basic need district. They get no state aid because they are self-contained. But I'm pointing that out because we also represent LACCD and you look at L.A. city downtown and so forth, so this is where your constituencies and what your goals are and is very important because it's going to be very different in how you deal with that.

Diane asked I have a question about the wish. If the analysis of the space utilization based on wish were taking into account that the wish formula does not account for contractual and limited plus caps and so the formula is sort of flawed for those areas that have those areas that have those so they would never meet the wish requirement to begin with? I just wondered if your analysis would also include that.

Dr. Blaylock answered yes. It would say it as a footnote. The problem you're going to run into, and I don't disagree with what you're saying. But when you're playing with the rules that the State lays down, those are the rules. So you can say I don't like the rules and contractually we can't do that, fine. Because the State is going to say this is the way it is. We can make a footnote, for these reasons, so on and so forth. For instance, notoriously, wish versus space, nursing programs will never meet that because it requires so much space.

Susan commented I think English would be okay because it's not wish per faculty, it's wish do we have enough classes to cover it.

Dr. Blaylock stated specifically nursing and some of the science programs, the other ones are fire science and police, where you have these huge spaces, and the balance comes in, this is where the Educational Master Plan is important, is that you have programs that generate wish but suck up space, but then you have programs over here that generate wish but don't suck up space. So you have to have that balance. Another example, we did a Master Plan for Valley College at LACCD. Tyrine Leader was the president at this time. She was being pushed really hard to expand her nursing program. This was when Arnold Schwarzenegger, in the early to mid 2000s, said we need more nurses. We did the Master Plan for them. They have a huge theatre arts program there. As a matter of fact, most of the people that you see on TV are alumni of the Valley Theatre Arts Program. Well they decided that they were not going to expand the nursing program. Let another college in the district do that. We're going to expand our theatre program because the wish generated for that space and the need was so great that they decided to do that and let L.A. City or Trade Tech or one of those expand their nursing program. So that's where you use your Ed Plan to do your balancing.

Rania stated that was kind of putting them on the map, people were coming to them for that specifically, really kind of self-serving. Even though nursing could have been beneficial to them theater was more beneficial.

Dr. Blaylock stated of course. Most of the people on Taxi came out of Valley College. They have a huge alumni portion but the point was they can generate wish using that program and that's what they need to do. Because your President and Scott here are business people as well and we've got to balance and generate the money. So that's where the Educational Plan is real important. Yes, it's all about it money but it's also about your constituencies and how you're going to move them forward.

Dave stated if you focus on too many things, you don't do it well. Focus on what you do well.

Dr. Blaylock stated exactly. You can be all things to all people and nothing to no one. That's something you really need to look at.

Rania asked where does parking come in?

Dr. Blaylock stated I'm smiling because within 20 minutes your counterpart at Crafton asked the same thing. Parking. That will come into the Facility Master Plan. They are contracted to do a traffic study and this comes out of the Educational Master Plan and the Facility Master Plan and I don't think Cheryl would mind me saying this to you because her group said, we have a parking issue. But she said I refuse to spend \$30 million on a parking structure. Can we look at other ways to do that. I said I don't know what those are but we can give it a shot. Because that's a big issue for them for different reasons, for them it's because of the hills, and for you because you're urban. So, yes, a parking structure is going to be about \$22,000 per space. And that's a lot of space, per spot.

Scott mentioned the one we've got designed right now is a \$50 million structure. If we go another route it could be a \$30 million structure.

Ricky asked do you ever stay on top of parking though?

Scott answered another way to go at that parking without building parking structures is to distribute our classes across those five days, 7 to 8 at night, and then all of sudden your parking problem diminishes

significantly because you're not generating all that FTES in a certain prime time. You've got it distributed.

Rania stated there's something I've noticed, and it's not actually a facility but something that could be implemented in the design, and I think this is really important. We need somewhere designated on the college as a drop-off, pickup zone. Because this completely falls in line with our constituency. A lot of them get dropped off, they get rides here. One of the things that impacts the parking lot so much and causes people to swerve around each other and causes a lot of impact is that someone stopped right in the middle of the parking lot and it just backs things up.

Dr. Blaylock stated one of the things I would ask you to do, is all of you, put those ideas on paper and email them to me and to Cheryl. Because we don't want to forget that. That is probably one of the biggest issues in terms of drop off, pick up, entrance, the zone, the travel. That is a huge thing. And it shouldn't be denied, it shouldn't be poo-pooed. Especially for an urban campus. You are correct. And the parking structures are something that I wouldn't say out of hand no, because there might be ways to do joint use. I don't know what you have around here, something of that sort. The other thing I would say, I'm suggesting to Crafton, they put parking down somewhere. No one uses it. Well the reason why no one uses it, is because it's a ways. So, we'll do a parking analysis and traffic analysis, where do people come and go. So if you build a drop off over there, where ever that is, and no one's over there anyway, they're not going to use it. So it's very important that you, as a group, tells us that. We don't know that.

Rick stated that just wanted to make sure that when you're doing that traffic study, the gym is opening up. Our traffic may be a pattern right now but next year it's going to change, so we need to take that into consideration. A lot of people are avoiding that corner of the campus just because of the construction but when that finishes, our whole pattern is going to change.

Dr. Blaylock stated all of those are outstanding ideas. Please write them down and email them to me. And then what we'll do is I'll bring them back to this committee or we'll create a list-serve and send them out so that we don't take the time at these meetings. We can vet them.

Dave asked do you do student research? Do you have a car, do you ride, do you have a laptop, do you have a smart phone?

Dr. Blaylock answered yes. Are there any student reps on this? Yes. There you are. Okay, great. That is something that we need to talk about with you is how to access the students and the best way to interface with them.

Javier Vizcarra stated we do a survey in the beginning of the semester basically, and in ten days we ask them do they get dropped off, do they take public transportation? We do ask those kinds of questions.

Dr. Blaylock I agree, we want to probably expand that. Getting back to your discussion is that surveys like survey monkey may not hit the people that we want to hit. And so those are the things that we need to know from you. Do we camp out in the student union and do something like that? Do we come to student senate or student council? We want your input in how to best meet students' needs and give their information back to them and open a dialogue. Because at West Valley in Saratoga we could send out an email to everyone and that would be fine. That may not be the case here. The other thing we need to know is how many languages are spoken on this campus. That is another thing that is very important, Spanish and English of course, but are there any other languages that need to be taken into account in order to communicate well your constituents. So if you could take my card and then if we can communicate on that so that we can best serve those needs.

Rania stated this may or may not work but students have to go see a counselor several times and if there was a way to set up where the counselor had like a little card or something and once that card was filled out it was checked off in their record, then you have the card and that way you're going to get all of the students that have to see the counselors face to face which is the majority of everybody.

Dr. Blaylock stated is Ricky here? I met with Rebecca who is your counterpart at Crafton, because one of the things that an Educational Master Plan gives short trip to, is student services.

Ricky answered I was kind of noticing that.

Dr. Blaylock said Rebecca has asked quite assertively which is great. We need to be a part of that because you can talk about all the programs that you want and do all the teaching that you want but we're the ones that get the students in those programs. We know the students better than you guys do.

Ricky stated and I'm glad you said that, I was just waiting for the opportunity. When we were at the District, and that was one of the things I said to James when we were listening to the presentation and the model that mentioned best practices, many schools have gone to a model of a one-stop shop. Right now on our campus that's not feasible. Student services is in three different locations and that lends itself to a student getting the runaround, whereas there was a student services were housed in one area we would, from a qualitative standpoint, I believe increase the changes that the student would not get the round.

Dr. Blaylock stated so what I will do with you, is that I will contact you, and probably you and Rebecca have different needs but just kind of a student services district, and we'll talk and then you as a committee it will be a chapter or that will be part of the Educational Master Plan. I will tell you if you read most Educational Master Plans, they don't talk much about student services.

Ricky stated I would just add to that. Every single one of our student support services has a problem with storage. When these buildings were built, there wasn't storage space factored into them, and now we have these external storage units that are routinely broken into. Or they are at a location that is inconvenient for the staff, waiting rooms, computer labs.

Dr. Blaylock stated those are all things that we need to know because when we set standards so that the architects come in and design it, that that's taken into consideration. We've gone an hour and I don't want to take up much of your time. But I want to go to the District a little bit and explain what's happening there. There's a number of people you're going to come into contact with, myself (Shaun), you'll be in contact with Cheryl Sterrie, she's an Asian lady whose an architect who we're working with, you'll come in contact with Sandy and you'll come in contact with Bobby. The real person who is kind of the goddess of educational master plan, you'll be meeting her, Dr. Allie Tamar. She's a former vice chancellor at the state level, she's a former vice chancellor at the district level, and she's a former VP former instructor. She is the one that is going to come in and actually meet with your deans when we're reviewing your program reviews and all the data you already have, she is the one who's going to be sitting down with you and going over those. Because she has the most experience. So you're going to be seeing five people around. As you begin to do that, please come and talk to us. We want to be transparent. There will be nothing that I give you that I don't want you to share. Matter of fact I'd rather get an email from people saying please stop, I don't want this anymore. That would be a benefit for me rather than to say I don't know this. Anyway, the District. We have heard, and you have been very open, so has Crafton, so has everyone else and I appreciate it. They have been very open about their concerns with the EDCT and the integration with the campus and colleges and so forth. That is one thing I have not been directed by the Chancellor but just looking from the outside looking in, EDCT and

the KVCR issues have to be addressed as it relates to integrating them back into the campuses. Those are things that I'm going to be looking at because those are things that I know are big silos and are things that need to be addressed. So that's going to be addressed in this as well. The other thing we will be involved with is Human Resources, Lisa's group. Because they're having to put together a staffing plan. In reviewing the staffing plan that was done in 2014, it may have some structural issues I need to take a look at. But just looking at the data, 25% to 40% of you are going to be retired in the next five to ten years, in terms of the faculty. That's a huge turnover. The Educational Master Plan is extremely important right now, so is the staffing plan. Because as you begin to decide which programs you're going to expand, which programs you're going to curtail, which programs you want to bring on. That's going to be a very big decision as you begin to recruit to hire who you want to come in. So that will be one thing at the district that we'll be pretty involved in. That will be really important with your Ed Plan in order to inform HR what direction she needs to go in setting up those processes. Because you look at the demographics, just look around, in five to ten years most of you won't be here. The same thing is if you have a program that you're wanting to perhaps curtail, and someone retires from that program, you may want to then look at hiring someone over here because that's a program that requires a special skill set that you have to go out and find. That's something that the Educational Master Plan should do for you.

Rania asked so do they actually go into personnel files and say oh, this person is such and such age and this person has been here this long?

Dr. Blaylock stated no, we'll say much like what we've asked James to do. Please give us your demographics of your employees. I don't know your age and I don't know if you're going to retire, but I do know collectively that in the next five to ten years about 25% to 40% of you won't be here. So, that's important. It's also a budget thing. For instance, I'm not sure they're going to do this but if they say, we're going to give a golden handshake, how much does that mean, how much is that going to cost? But it has nothing to do with you individually. And no, I won't see your personnel file. It's the same thing that James keeps, all the demographics on your campus you're your students that attend here. He may not know that person, but to know that person he would have to go to you.

Rania stated but you don't know who that person is then. I guess that's what I'm asking, so you're saying that as you know that 25% to 40% of the people are retiring, say that a lot of them retired from this program, or that program whatever, if you are using that to fund the Educational Master Plan, how do you know if you don't know that several people in this area might be retiring or in that area. If you're just looking at general demographics, how does that shape the Educational Master Plan?

Dr. Blaylock stated it shapes the Educational Master Plan because you as a group say we want to shrink this program, and expand this program, and develop this program. We are initially going to start with a goal of, say, for example, 1500 FTEs for this new program that we're going to expand. That translates to three full time equivalent positions that translates now to 750 x 3, 3200-3300 wish that we have to generate out of that program in order to fulfill the needs of that program. That does not tell you who's going to be there. So what that does then, as you're looking at someone who then says I'm going to retire out of welding. I'm just picking. Instead of backfilling in that program with that FTEs, you look at hiring into that program for that FTEs.

James stated I think you started by saying you were looking at how to estimate the capacity necessary for HR. So, for HR it's doesn't mean it's not so much specific departments, since they have a pretty good idea in terms of employee turnover.

Dr. Blaylock stated right. For instance, you might have a higher employee turnover faster than most say, in mathematics, statistics, technology than you would in history because those people are snapped up in

private industry. It's something HR would be aware of, or should be, that's their charge. We're going to help her get that going.

Ricky asked would this constitute another environmental scan in terms of emerging fields?

Dr. Blaylock answered we're doing that right now. And that's what we'll talk to James about, and Keith, and the new guy.

James asked so what about the environmental scan that you did two years ago? Is that obsolete?

Dr. Blaylock stated no, it's not obsolete, but we have that. One of the things that I want to give you is an Educational Master Plan that has kind of multiple options or multiple decision trees as you're moving through. Because the day I give it to you is the day after it's out of date and you should be looking at it updating it as you go. So to answer your question James, if you look at the economic report generated in 2006 here. If you don't have it, I'll give it to you because I read it. It said that by 2010 the Inland Empire is going to be like 50 million people and it's going to be exploding and it's going to be whatever. Well, what happened was 2008. So, the economics and directions and the demographics that you're looking at is about a half a step above a crystal ball. So what you begin to look at are programs or educational issues that are more long term. For example, Scott brought it up to me, logistics. You drive around, you walk around here, I see all these warehouses going up. Those are not going to be abandoned very quickly. And really smart people are saying this is going to happen over the next five to ten years. You take your demographics, your economics, you take it with a grain of salt, but at the same time you also have plan A, plan B, plan C about what you're going to do and have programs that are a little bit more sustainable in a downturn than are not sustainable. Also programs that initially have the potential to give you a living wage without necessarily a college degree, and so forth. Those are things I would suggest that as you look ahead in the demographics, what's coming to you in this area, or what is in the area that satisfies A, B, C, or D. That's what you use the demographics data for not necessarily to build to attract students, because that will be decided by the Department of Finance in Sacramento. I don't want to take up more of your time, you'll see a lot of me anyway. Real quick, Friday?

President Fisher stated Dr. Kinde is not here but you did connect and you will be meeting with the Deans on Friday is that correct? So what should we expect from you and/or Cheryl moving forward in the immediate future?

Dr. Blaylock stated we just went through the 24th revision of the schedule. The key, today. I think we have it. It is etched in jello. So what you're going to have, what we're looking at is some space, some areas, that we're going to have to ask you to really help us on. You'll receive the schedule the next time I see you. We're going to ask for some time in November at one of your meetings. The next time I come it's going to be a working meeting. Meaning we're going to have data for you, we're going to be presenting your external scan, we're going to be presenting your internal scan. James, you will have seen it already before and given your thoughts and input into it. We will be presenting to you the things that we have already begun to generate. Also, you are not going to get a Master Plan, here it is, and you've never seen it. As we're doing chapters, we'll be handing them out to you for you to review, read. So that will be something we'll ask that you bring back here to this committee as we begin to look at those. We're going to be coming to you, I would like to at least once a month, we'll want an hour or an hour and a half, this is what we're doing, this is what we've got, handing out chapters, this is the information that we've gotten, this is what we are interpreting as, what do you think, that type of thing. You'll hear me talking but it will be mainly about data. We have been given the time frame of the final draft being done by the end of May before you leave for the summer, with the final-final being brought back to the DSPC the end of August and that being approved by the Board by the end of August or the first of September. We expect the first draft of the EMP to be done by the first of March, the final

draft to be done by the first of May. So the Educational Master Plan will be done. The Facility Master Plan will be well on its way. They require a lot more of those pretty pictures and all of that, we just write. They're linear.

Dr. Blaylock mentioned he would like to begin to schedule Allie Tamar and he and President Fisher went on to discuss possible future dates and times in November and December.

President Fisher thanked Susan and Albert for the short notice. I realize I didn't have the conversation with you that I'd intended and then you arrived after I sort of give the explanation to the group but I believe it's critical that CTE be represented, not just applied technology but nursing allied technologies represented. Not as a member of College Council but as part of this consultation team. I know there was some overlap here today since you were in the Deans' meeting and there'll be more on Friday when the Division meetings take place, but the more times we're exposed to it the better.

PRIORTIZE PROGRAM REVIEW

President Fisher stated next order of business is I took things out of order, we agreed. For those of you who have served on College Council for at least the last year, you may recall the process that we used when we were looking at the items that came through our program review process in the areas of faculty, classified staff, budget augmentation, facilities, technology, equipment and a finite amount of money, and Scott's going to take over in a minute, but the budget committee approved \$1 million. We may have access to a few more than that \$1 million not from the fund balance but from other source, but our job is to allocate the monies so that we're able to meet the highest priorities but realize that they go across the various areas that I have just identified. Meaning you could spend the \$1 million on all budget augmentation. What about the facilities, the technologies? Scott will explain the process.

Scott stated what we're going to hand out is the program review needs minus the faculty and minus the staffing section. What you'll see is budget augmentation, equipment, technology and facilities needs and the priorities that were determined. The facilities by Facilities and Safety Committee, and technology by the Technology Committee, and then equipment. We need to determine and lay out some assumptions before we start on this process. What I've outlined are some things that we assumed last year, and then learning as we were going through the process last year, some other things might make it go a little bit easier. We can add to this, we can take away, we can modify the ones that we have here. So, we have a \$1 million that we can invest in these four categories of program review needs. Last year, we made a determination that in order to maintain control over the \$1 million we allocated \$900,000 or \$910,000 and not to exceed that so that we had a contingency of 10% on top of that. This assumption here is not to exceed a 10% over the amount allocation and that's everything included, that's shipping, that's taxes, that's out the door, packaged or needs to be installed, that it would not exceed that by 10%. Now if we determined you want to it to exceed by more than 10% in order to hold a million, we have to reduce the allocated amount to something lower. Now the second half of that first item, let's say that we got an estimate for \$100,000 for something and then 10% beyond that is \$110,000 approximately well if it turns out that the costs was significantly more than that, can we just work with that division then to scale that down. If it's something that's scalable, like buying a number of pieces of equipment, so we can get back to within the amount allocated and continue to proceed versus cancelling it or it coming back to program review. How do those things sound, are there any questions?

Paula asked when do we have to have these done?

Scott answered that's one of the assumptions that we're going to go through. I'm going to make a suggestion, we get it all spent this fiscal year.

Paula said because we're looking at the 2014-2015. We're going to have a 2015-2016.

President Fisher stated right. This is what happened. The plan was that we would use the 2015-2016 as we discussed for program review and the Chancellor here before Academic Senate said we would be using the faculty list from 2014-2015. We will use the program review list from 2014-2015 for all of our needs, otherwise we're splitting. We're saying, we're using one year for one purpose, and one year for another purpose. So, the goal is to get us caught up, not skip part of the year, because that was problematic for some people. The program review list that you will complete will be on schedule with the way that this has been playing out. We were on track, but things were changed. So, that's sort of where we are.

Scott stated if we held it to 10% that means it will probably be about \$910,000 something like that to hold the allocation but my experience last year how things come in, some of them come in more, some of them come in less. I think \$930,000 would be over a 10% maximum, but we could probably get close to it.

Rania said that's what we did last year. You said it seemed to work out well, about 10%.

Scott said yes. I think we can up it a little bit, 10% of \$1 million, it would be about \$910,000. Are we good with this? Okay, the other thing is some of these things are listed let's say, we want this piece of equipment and we want it installed here. Maybe it's a \$100,000 for this. Well this hasn't been fully vetted yet. Especially on some of the facility, so we just purchase a piece of equipment that's stand alone, some things that need to be installed, is it viable? Can it be installed to code, can it be installed safely, is it going to function per the intended? If it can't then we would cancel that unless we could scale it back to make it work. If items discovered are installed already, we're going to go through some of these that I've identified. But there could be more on here and you never know, and some of the program has funded other things, so as we go through it, and we determine that some things have been funded, then we'll skip over that and go to the next priority. Is there any discussion on that?

Ricky stated I'm trying to understand the handout because I'm seeing a number of numbers. I'm seeing \$1 million in one place, \$300 in another.

Scott said I intend to go over that so that everybody understands how it's put together. With the exception of facilities, the facilities items take longer. We're doing some of the facilities items now, it took all this year to get things lined up to do some of it. With the exception of facilities, can we have an assumption and actually a rule that the other things will be completed, purchased, acquired, this fiscal year? Because this last year we didn't make an assumption or rule like this and so we've been trying things over. It starts to get really burdensome carrying funds over. My recommendation is that we complete this this fiscal year making purchases.

Sarah asked can you help me understand in some cases it looks like there have been delays and what were the delays?

Scott answered some of the people that were going it or purchase it, it just didn't happen.

Rick said I'll give you an example on the reading lab software. They spec'd out a certain software, got it approved for the money and then that software vendor discontinued that product. So we carried that money over and now they're trying to choose another piece of software and trying to fit it into the budget and now there looking at other monies to backfill because they don't have enough money there. That's an example of what happened.

Scott said I think we've got enough time if we start moving on this after we've actually made the allocation that they'll be enough time to vet through some of those problems. If we keep this maximum expenditure at \$1 million, which is what we need to do with our fund balance, that we set the allocation at \$930,000 and that will give us plenty of room if some of them hit 10% we can work with that. We don't have to vote on this at this minute but is everybody generally in agreement with these assumptions?

President Fisher stated well I believe we should have a motion and vote on the **assumptions** so it's part of our record. Do I have a motion to agree? Sarah moved, Rick second. No Discussion and the group voted as follows:

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Bastedo, Cota, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Miller, Ferri-Mulligan, Shabazz, Smith, Stark.

NOES: None.

ABSTENTIONS: None.

ABSENT: Beavor, Burnham, Huston, Kinde, Weiss.

NO RECORD: Javier Vizcarra for Linda Subero.

Motion carried.

Scott stated I want to bring your attention to some of the things that are on this sheet. The document is divided into four areas. Page 1 is the budget. So these are budget augmentations that have been requested and at the bottom of the page is the total which is zero. You can see the total that's been asked for which is \$394,320 worth of budget augmentations. On the comments on the right says it's on-going. Just as a general rule the money that we're allocating here is one time money. So one time money can't go towards on-going commitments. Maybe there's one exception that we can vote on today. On page 1, you see where it says Culinary-budget increase \$20,000 completed? These are items that Karol and I have noted that it's already been taken care of for any number of reasons this year. The Culinary Arts though was addressed and that additional funding was allocated to Culinary Arts. But we're going to come back to this first page. But I'm going to continue on with an overview.

Sarah asked in regard to the Culinary Arts budget increase, it is ongoing?

Scott answered yes, it's ongoing. On the second page, and half of the third page is our program review needs for equipment purchases. If you'll notice there's one on the top of that, there's one that's grayed out Auto tech stem rack hoist, that was purchased and installed, and that budget is completed. You can see the total on page 3, \$1,276,593 worth of requests. We have \$1 million to spend so the needs far outweigh the dollars that are available this year. Then we've got \$318,000 with the technology needs that have been requested and that takes the second half of page 3. Page 4 is facilities and safety needs which takes the entire page and items 1, 2, 3, and 4 are funded and they're actually all in progress. Page 5 is just a grand total. Let's go back to the first page.

President Fisher stated for people who have not served, in going through all these pages and the categories, for you to see overall that we're talking about requests that exceed \$3-1/2 million and we only have \$1 million so the goal is to go back and look at each one of these and see how far down the list can we go on each one and what should be the priorities. In the order, not out of order. It's not the role of College Council to change the order of priority. The number one priority for budget augmentation is No. 1. If we're going to fund, then the answer is yes and they are already prioritized. So the job here is not to re-prioritize the areas.

Diane stated well, Dave asked the same question I had and Part 2 is if we fulfill 1 through 4 does No. 5 become No. 1?

President Fisher stated let me say that here and it goes to Paula's question, sort of. Whatever is left here is done. If we don't get to No. 5 and it's not funded, then the next time, next year, then we'll be looking at the new program review list and these items are no longer on it.

Dave said they might be rearranged.

President Fisher stated they might show up on the next program review list such as No. 5 may become No. 1. But if we only funded down to No. 10, then that's it. Those others are gone. Does that make sense? Is everybody clear on that, we don't get to go back and revise something? James, Rick?

James answered I was a little confused by the not requested and it's initial request, if it's not requested.

Rick stated the heading that supposed to be budget, is ongoing budget is not requested. The technology ones, not that they don't want it anymore, they just don't want ongoing budget to support it. I think the heading got changed, or something there. Under comments where it says not requested that means that that department did request on going budget to cover that. So if they're asking for computers and they buy six computers and they don't request ongoing funds, it's not requesting it for it to be covered in the future. Once those computers are dead, they go away and they no longer have them. That's what that means.

Scott stated on this first page budget augmentation, I've highlighted some things, because there are requests to establish new budgets. My understanding is which isn't ongoing, by the way all those are ongoing requests on that page, but these in particular, WST, Anthro, Dance, Soc, Child Dev. these are legit programs that don't have any budget. I added these up right here and we have \$13,500 to establish budgets for those programs. This would be one ongoing item we might want to consider to establish ongoing budgets.

Sarah asked what about Pharm Tech?

Scott stated I didn't add them onto to here but Pharm Tech is way at the bottom of the priority zones. It's another legitimate program that isn't funded on an ongoing basis but for this I only went down to a certain level. The reason I did that is because unless we're going to fund everything on this list, we wouldn't make it down to Pharm Tech.

Dave said and we could do that.

Scott answered we could do that, absolutely. We could say forget facilities, we want to put all our money in the budget augmentation.

Dave stated and if we did this there would be no 10%.

Jeremiah stated also for clarification, for instance, you have a faculty list. A few years ago we were told we could hire three instructional faculty. The No. 2 on the list was a librarian, that's non-instructional, so they were skipped. We could also say, we want to fund all the established budgets, in order, then it doesn't matter that Pharm Tech is No. 33. We would just say we want to establish anything that's identified that's establishing a budget, that's what we want to approve, and then we wouldn't run into that issue.

President Fisher stated all right, let's turn that into a motion. The one caveat is we're talking about establishing ongoing out of one time. So there's a little bit of a risk in there, but the amount of money

we're talking about is relatively small in comparison to budget. So if I may receive a motion to approve funding as listed to establish a budget request, which includes the very last item Pharm Tech. To establish a budget, is that basically what you're saying?

Jeremiah stated yes, and I would make that motion that a fund establish a budget. Jeremiah moved, Sarah second.

President Fisher asked discussion?

Dave asked is that right to subvert this whole thing and take something from the bottom and take it from the top?

Jeremiah asked how is that subverting?

Dave answered we're grabbing something at No. 30 and moving it to No. 1.

Jeremiah stated but we're also skipping biology, welding.

Dave said I think that's the problem with the whole thing.

Jeremiah stated I disagree.

Dave asked why do you disagree?

Jeremiah stated because there's a distinction here between establishing a budget and increasing the budget.

Dave stated then we should have two categories. I mean these were prioritized by program review.

Scott stated we could take those out as a separate issue, separate from program review and as a body just say we've got these programs that are currently unfunded, a completely separate issue, fund those on an ongoing basis.

Dave said and then if you don't do that and just go through and just choose what you want, then you've subverted the whole priority list.

Scott answered well that's just why I went down the list.

President Fisher stated there's an easier way to do it and I think you're all touching on it. We're going to remove the establish the budget items. They don't meet the criteria, they're ongoing as opposed to one time and any ongoing listed here, other than those that we will remove as creating a new budget, they won't be but one time, even though the request is for ongoing. There's not going to be ongoing because we're using one time monies. I preface the statement with before with regard to establishing budgets, is it's a small amount of money and we should be able to find a way to ensure that those departments have at least some budget which they have nothing now.

Sarah stated I deeply sympathize with what Dave said and the concern about subverting the program review process. I served on program review and I know how difficult it is and do that work and prioritize. On the other hand, I'm not unsupportive of Jeremiah in his motion in that I feel that it is unhealthy and impossible to grow a program with no budget. That is the basis of my vote. That's the only explanation I can give.

Leticia stated I understand both positions. But as far as program review process, because we have one list and they've been combined. So, we've got the established budget and then others. We've got one list that been prioritized so is program review looking at all as one and they have taken all of that into consideration and created this one list.

Dr. Fisher stated let me say this about what happened before and what I'm not seeing on this page. We were able to go through the program review list last time and identify pots of monies that were available, restricted funds, Fund 41, different sources of funding, bond. We were able to pull those items off of the list as funded so we didn't change the priority that program review sent forward. We simply pulled off the items so if No. 3 was funded by bond, then No. 4 became No. 3 and that didn't subvert the process. We actually were able to free up money. I would say that to put this to rest the easiest way would be to just pull those items off like we did with the items that were under Fund 41 or bond money and then we can accomplish what we need to do in terms of insuring that those programs get a budget. It's not going to be one time.

Paula stated it violates what we just voted on. We voted on the assumptions. These ongoing budgets do not meet that.

President Fisher answered they don't.

Leticia stated that was my only question because I understand that there probably should be two categories. But if that's the case then that should take place in this cycle coming through. Because if not, then we're just creating new rules now.

Scott said then another way of doing this is, we could just vote on those in order and it's a one time funding. That's all we're doing today for those programs we augment their budget one time. At a later date we can look at those and specifically for next budget year and take a look at those and include those in our annual operational budget. But for this year at least it meets the needs of the program by giving them a one time funding that they would normally get approval on.

Dave asked for clarification are these ongoing budget augmentations? There's one here.

Scott stated we've talked about both but right now in order to stay within the program review prioritization, we can approve these and not pull them out, then we could view this as a one time augmentation.

Dave said I thought this budget category was, you get this augmentation and it's augmented for the rest.

President Fisher stated no. This is one time.

Dave asked why is this any different from equipment?

President Fisher stated if we don't pull it off and hear part of what I said about us attempting to find a way to make these ongoing because we realize as an institution, the importance. If you leave it here in this list and we continue down this path, it will be one time. Despite the fact that the request was for ongoing, because these are one time monies. It was a matter of being able to identify, based on a report that was written by the department, that they have no budget and they were prioritized at the top with the exception of Pharm Tech. We can approve it however far down the list you want to go knowing that we have a limited number of dollars and I think the point was made that sure we could fund all of them. We can go from No. 1 to No. 33, No. 5 culinary arts has already been funded so take off that \$20,000 -

\$374,320 we could vote as a council before we get to the next page, but then what about the other requests. So typically what has happened is we've gone down so far on the list and then we go and look and take into consideration what's really important and how far down do we go on the next list, etc.

Rania stated I think this is what you saying. That we leave the list the way that it is but from that extract the ones that want to establish an ongoing budget, make that a separate list so we could really establish an ongoing budget for them and we still have the program review priorities and that makes a lot of sense because then we can actually fund them ongoing. And then we can continue going down this list and provide one time funding.

Jeremiah stated I thought that was my motion, if I wasn't clear, pull out the established ones for ongoing funding that's \$14,725 and then consider what's left. Well, that was my motion.

President Fisher stated well we've have the discussion and we're all clear on what we're going to do. We're going to establish the budget items \$14,725 and then we'll decide how much farther down this list we want to go. So that's two separate lists. And we're all clear on this.

Rania stated yes, two separate lists, yes. Welding would be No. 1, etc.

Dr. Fisher stated I want to be clear, we have not circumvented the program review process, we have not changed anything other than we're pulling off items that are in a specific category.

Paula stated I think we have circumvented the program review process because if they were going to prioritize, and this is a good discussion to bring to the group when we do the needs assessment for this year. I think we really have if we go off the list and say oh, we're going to pull this out, we can say that for any list for any reason.

Dr. Fisher stated the only thing that's changed here, well there are a few here, 1, 2, 3 and then we go to No. 9 which is actually No. 8 because Culinary Arts has already been satisfied and then pulling up what's now No. 32 to the top but I'm talking about pulling them and I thought I heard pulling them off the list completely.

James stated we should keep them probably on one list. I'm just wondering what is changing.

There were multiple comments back and forth about ongoing budget versus one time.

President Fisher stated I'll reiterate my example. Last time we ended up with three lists. Because we had items that we pulled off that were funded by Fund 41, we had items that we pulled off that were funded by bond monies and then we went down. So we technically did work that program review couldn't have done because program review does not deal with the money. We're dealing with the money piece, budget committee has done its job and says okay, here's \$1 million and you figure out how you're going to spend it using the program review list and so that is what we're doing and I'm really uncomfortable with leaving this with too many thinking that we are circumventing the program review process because the committee members work very hard and if they think that for one minute the work that they're doing is for naught because College Council is just going to set aside all of that hard work and makes its own arbitrary decisions. I think that that undermines us maintaining the confidence we need in our processes.

Sarah stated I don't know how this can be resolved, but the person who said that this is a golden opportunity needs to understand that there is a difference between asking for a budget augmentation and asking that your program that has no budget get a budget.

President Fisher stated we have a motion on the floor that it may be and we need to vote regarding **establishing budgets**. No further discussion. Jeremiah moved, Sarah second.

AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Bastedo, Cota, Hamdy, Hrdlicka, Miller, Shabazz, Stark.

NOES: Ferri-Mulligan.

ABSTENTIONS: Hector, Hunter, Smith.

ABSENT: Beavor, Burnham, Huston, Kinde, Weiss.

NO RECORD: Javier Vizcarra for Linda Subero.

Motion carried.

Scott stated last year for example, we have a limited amount of money and you'll see that this year as well, where at the top of the list there's a huge dollar amount that we can't fund. Because program review says that's priority No. 3, you stop you don't spend any money, so this body chose to jump over that item because it was impossible to fund within the priority. Another example of that is this year, we've got ventilation and HLS 213, 281, all these items right here. They're on program review. You're talking about \$1-1/2 million worth of stuff. Here it is priority No. 1, 2, 3 for HLS. We pulled that off to the side and funded it through other monies from the District Office and it's being handled right now. But if we were following the logic that we've been talking about here today, if we were following strict program review, we don't care if the District funded this already, we're going to fund it again. We have to use some discretion in what's happened. This one here, this was an urgent and emerging safety issue that came up that was on program review but we had to pull this early and get started on it and go through BSA to fund it out of bond money and so there's another one that's No. 4 on program review but guess what it's been handled by other means.

Ricky stated my esteemed colleague Marco and I have conferred and we've agreed and propose that the \$104,000 from counseling not be considered. It's item 13 on page 1.

President Fisher stated thank you very much Marco and Ricky.

Rania stated I just wanted to add to what you just said. Last year we skipped a big dollar item and then we figured out the amount and because we skipped that item, we were able to go down eight more spaces down the list. When we calculated it out it really benefited eight more programs and you're right that one large item was funded by something else. So, there's a logical way to do this as we help more programs.

Dave asked my question is how much money do we put where, and wouldn't you start with facilities and safety, other items on here, I mean you pull things out.

Scott stated that's how program review prioritized within the facilities and safety committee but we don't have that limitation in this case.

Dave stated if we look at facilities, you said 1 through 4 were funded, so is 5, 6, 7, 8, are any of those safety issues.

Scott stated the top priorities were funded based the safety, the deterioration of facilities.

Dave stated before we spend any other monies shouldn't we be addressing things that are safety?

Scott answered well that's up to this body. And that the prioritization's done, that's not necessarily where this body would choose to put its money.

James asked didn't you say that program review considered safety first, weren't they prioritized?

Scott stated the facilities and safety committee prioritized based on the significance of the safety issue by issue so that's how they prioritized.

James asked so aren't they already at the top?

Scott stated they're at the top. Let's take a look at the overall picture here. I went down a ways and found \$138,000-\$139,000 worth of stuff on equipment. It's just a place to start on budget. Now if we go down equipment, this one was done already, so I pulled off bio-microscopes, a long standing issue using ancient microscopes that need to be replaced. \$390,000. This is a very scalable item because it can be scaled microscope by microscope. I don't know how many microscopes there are.

Sarah stated there are problems the idea of this being scalable. One of the problems is if you go lab by lab, you end up with manufacturers discounting models so you end up with a lab that has CH30s and over here you have Nikon Eclipses with parts that are not interchangeable. I don't get rid of the dead microscopes because they contribute parts. The other thing is adjuncts and microscopes that differ from lab to lab, it's a huge challenge for adjuncts.

President Fisher stated so what is the bottom line here. Let me see the total at the bottom that you projected.

Scott stated I put \$317,000 in this one.

President Fisher said so from \$390,000 to \$317,000.

Scott stated that's a big ticket item right up front so if we're trying to balance it all between these four categories, none of these get funded. Then we go into technology.

President Fisher stated that's the point. The way it's set up right now and then this body will be making a decision is that for that area of equipment the total would be \$317,000 just for microscopes and we'd never get down to any other items on the list and that's the point.

Scott stated exactly. Here I just tried to do some balancing, I went down the list to this point here, \$128,000 and on the facilities side, since these are all funded, a quarter of a million dollars for an outdoor steel cutting area to be constructed for the welding labs. That's something that we would discuss here as to whether we would want to fund that or not. I put it in red, and I did not include it in this total and I added this one, additional space for nursing labs. This is a modernization of an existing facilities that we've got and turned them into additional nursing lab space, it's just one way to do it. \$316,000. So let's just look at the total to see how things add up. \$900,000. There's some room for a little bit more. With that division, we're very close to where we need to be. We need to decide how to balance that, between those four, do we put them all into microscopes and facilities and hold back on technology and equipment or budget augmentation. What do we do?

Dave asked can you do that again?

Scott stated on the facilities side, this is a discussion. This isn't a building this is new construction on a facility that is destined, if everything works out well for this college under our Educational and Facilities Master Plan that that building will be replaced.

Rick stated I thought College Council voted to build them a mid-stand area for them at one point and a cover, didn't we vote for all that?

President Fisher stated no we didn't, we discussed it at length but it was not approved by College Council.

James asked back to the safety. All of the basic safety things have already been funded, is that right?

Scott stated no, the sound proofing was considered a safety item, a dropped ceiling was considered a safety item because of the noise, these were the significant safety items, this is moving down to lesser areas of safety. You might recall this one here, this was regarding HLS, the nursing department came in and did a presentation to gain some security in their front office administration reception area. It wasn't approved, it was come back with more information.

President Fisher stated and in the meantime, they followed the process, they went to program review, and here it is.

Rania stated a different way we could do this and divide up the money in a different way. We have four categories, budget, safety and facility, technology and equipment. Say that total is 950 items. If we divide that by 4 and then say for each list we have \$237,500. If we look at that more scalable amount of money and let's give each \$237,500 and then start going down the list and saying okay, this cost \$200,000 let's skip that but let's see how far down we can let down the list, because I think the ultimate goal is to help as many programs as possible. If we have \$238,000 to dedicate to each list then we try to go pretty far down the list and pick items that have modest totals then that would help us help more programs.

Leticia asked so you're suggesting we can skip through, say, if you look at facilities and safety you would skip 8, go to 9, skip 11, go to 12, see how many you can accommodate?

Rania stated yes, I'm suggesting that we give each list, \$238,000 and then we try to give as many, not picking and choosing, but with that money we try to get as far down the list as possible, mathematically.

Paula stated but you're looking at it as everything is equal. Everything is not equal. The reason they're prioritized is because some are more in need than others. So the whole idea is not to get as many in there as possible but to get the most in need. So they're prioritized as No. 1 whether they're \$250,000 or \$10,000 they are most in need, right?

Leticia stated if not, you would put it in order of price or total.

Rania answered well then if we could give each list \$238,000 for example, and if the first one cost \$200,000 then let's give that one \$200,000 we have \$38,000 to work with. So, then we give each list a budget, and just work our way down. And we don't skip and just work with what's there.

Paula stated because when we work with program review they're not all equal.

Sarah stated I did the math one time and figured out that we can service the microscopes for possibly 25 years before we have to replace them but I cannot service all of the microscopes. So saying let's take \$237,000 and let it trickle down doesn't mean it's trickling down to the right places when we've already displaced something because of its cost. Not everything is independent and without impact.

Rania answered but that is just the reality. We only have a finite amount of money and we can only get down so far, so maybe there is another pot of money that can fund the \$400,000 for the microscopes. We need to start going down the list and using that money. I understand things are interconnected.

Sarah stated but you are the one that has proposed that the finite amount of money is \$237,000.

President Fisher stated the reason why this comes to College Council is because you are to be making some decisions. If we were just going to have program review decide how the budget would be disbursed, then program review would be doing that, but they are not. If it is the decision of this body that we skip an item because by skipping an item we open the door to fund ten other needed items, and this one big item doesn't take up all of the money, then that's a decision for this body. It's not my decision, it's a decision for this body to make a recommendation to me. How are we going to approach this?

Diane stated making these important decisions, I don't appreciate having to do it on demand like this without any preparation. I feel inadequate to do that personally. I know we have to make decisions, I agree with you, we need to do that but I want to make an educated decision and I didn't feel coming in here I could do that with this.

There was further discussion regarding what was on the Agenda and the program review documents and President Fisher stated that the program review documents were made available to her electronically by Sheri Lillard and everyone is welcome to take a look at them, but that was program review's job to make them available to everyone.

Paula said she will arrange to try and get them posted on line within the next week or two.

Leticia stated I agree with you as far as it's our decision to choose what gets funded so I don't think necessarily just dividing it up and just going down each list would work because we could just pass that on to program review and just say take what you can with amount of the money we're giving you and there are different issues with different areas and that's what we need to discuss. But my only concern is when we start skipping things based on dollar amount because it's program review as many of you who have served on program review know they've gone through the details that we don't have and we just have a list and based on that detail and they felt that the one that \$250,000 be should be No. 4 before the \$2,000 one for some reason and they've done the research and looked at the program as a whole so which may be why they stopped much earlier at one category and decided to go elsewhere to serve more areas.

President Fisher stated so we'll come back, it will be listed on the agenda prioritize program review and we all know what that means prioritize in terms of budgeting and maybe that's the piece that didn't connect. The next meeting is November 25.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Next College Council Meeting: 11-25-15
Academic Year 15-16 (bi-monthly, 2nd & 4th Wednesday's from 1-3:00 PM)
~~12-09-15/12-23-15~~
01-13-16/01-27-16
02-10-16/01-27-16
03-09-16/02-24-16
04-13/16/04-27-16
05-11/16/05-25-16