

## SBVC COLLEGE COUNCIL NOVEMBER 25, 2015 MINUTES

**A= Absent**

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

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

**Guests:** Johnny Conley, Raymond Carlos

---

### CALL TO ORDER:

1:03 President Fisher called the meeting to order.

---

### APPROVAL OF THE MAY 13, 2015 MINUTES

President Fisher stated the first order of business is approval of the May 13, 2015 minutes and asked for a **motion to approve the May 13, 2015 minutes**. Scott moved, James second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

**AYES:** Fisher, Beavor, Ferri-Mulligan, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Smith, Stark, Subero.

**NOES:** None.

**ABSTENTIONS:** Burnham, Cota, Kinde, Miller, Weiss.

**ABSENT:** Gilbert, Bastedo, Hamdy, Hector, Huston, Shabazz.

**Motion carried.**

---

### APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 26, 2015 MINUTES

President Fisher asked for a **motion to approve the August 26, 2015 minutes**. Sarah wanted to correct her vote in regard to Dave Bastedo's friendly amendment rejection and change it from Aye to Abstention. Kay made a motion to approve with the correction as recommended. Scott second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

**AYES:** Fisher, Ferri-Mulligan, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Kinde, Miller, Smith, Stark, Subero, Weiss.

**NOES:** None.

**ABSTENTIONS:** Beavor, Burnham, Cota.

**ABSENT:** Gilbert, Bastedo, Hamdy, Hector, Huston, Shabazz.

**Motion carried.**

---

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

---

## **APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 28, 2015 MINUTES**

Tabled.

---

## **UPCOMING/FILING POSITIONS – G. FISHER**

President Fisher stated this is a standing position and placeholder in the event the Vice Presidents or I have any positions to move forward. Both Scott and Haragewen stated they have nothing.

---

## **STUDENT EQUITY PLAN – J. CONLEY/R. SHABAZZ**

President Fisher introduced Johnny Conley, the Interim Director of First Year Experience who will be providing a presentation on the Student Equity Plan. Johnny stated that the Student Equity Plan was a collaborative effort among the offices of the vice presidents, deans, directors, coordinators, faculty, staff and students. He stated the District received \$1.3 million of categorical funds, and Valley received 68% of that.

Kay asked how was the formula determined and Scott replied by last year's FTES distribution.

Johnny went on to explain the timeline, funds, breakdown of population of students, the differences between SSS and equity, and the various stages of committee approval. Since a copy was emailed to everyone on College Council for their review, he asked that College Council vote on its approval to move forward and present it to the Board in December and then to the State by December 18.

President Fisher thanked Johnny and asked if there were any questions or comments.

Kay asked that Johnny change writing lab to writing center.

College Council **voted approving the Student Equity Plan** via electronic mail as follows:

**AYES:** Fisher, Gilbert, Bastedo, Beavor, Burnham, Cota, Ferri-Mulligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Huston, Kinde, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, Subero, Weiss.

**NOES:** Miller.

**ABSTENTIONS:** None.

**ABSENT:** None.

---

## **REQUEST FOR ONE-TIME URGENT EMERGING NEEDS**

President Fisher introduced Raymond Carlos, Director of Student Life. Raymond passed out a handout regarding the ASCA 2016 Annual Conference February 3-6, 2016 in St. Pete Beach, Florida. Raymond stated that this is about accreditation and making sure that our office is operating at the best practices regarding Title V and the Education Code and conflict resolution. He stated that he felt it was very important that his staff be trained as well to handle conflicts and sensitive situations and asked if there were any questions.

Kay asked if it is feasible to bring training to other departments and staff.

Raymond responded yes, ASCA has regional areas to where we could host an event and get our professionals in the field to come. If it's a requirement for us to agree to that for our office to do a presentation we can easily do that and make sure that anyone who needs it be trained on conflict resolution.

President Fisher stated thank you very much. Any other questions? Okay, you'll be notified of our decision.

President Fisher asked for a motion to approve and discuss the one time funding. Kay moved. Rick second.

Kay asked in terms of Board approval if this committee approves it we would have guaranteed funding could it not go to the Board agenda with the possibility of adding the Professional Development budget line later?

President Fisher stated absolutely.

Scott stated that he just wanted to clarify the motion as **approval of up to 100% of the requested cost pending review and potential of any or all of that by Professional Development.**

President Fisher added and if Professional Development is unable or it's too late, this will be funded, it will go through, that's basically the motion.

**AYES:** Fisher, Beaver, Burnham, Cota, Ferri-Mulligan, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Kinde, Miller, Smith, Stark, Subero, Weiss.

**NOES:** None.

**ABSTENTIONS:** Hector.

**ABSENT:** Gilbert, Bastedo, Hamdy, Huston, Shabazz.

**Motion carried.**

---

## **PROGRAM REVIEW NEEDS – S. STARK**

President Fisher stated I will let Scott explain but I just want you to know we're not quite talking about quite \$1M but \$900,000 and some thousand. The total request from program review is almost \$5M. Obviously we cannot fund everything. We hope to narrow it down so that we are able to provide funding for items in each of the four categories, not all in one category. Facilities alone is \$3M and that would mean we couldn't fund anything else on the list. So we have more needs than we have money and the needs are in four areas.

Scott passed out a revised sheet than what was on line. We identified some other money that we could use for some of these items. On the front page on the revised sheet you'll notice a lot of grayed out areas and what changed is we have some restricted lottery money that some of the items on this first page qualified for under the budget augmentation. There was about \$110,000-\$115,000 that we picked off this first page because it could be funded. Only those items that qualified could be funded from this restricted lottery money that was carried over money. Those items are on the right hand side say funded from restricted lottery. Just going down that right hand column on that page in the budget area, the top three say ongoing approved. We approved to establish a budget in our last meeting for some programs that didn't have budgets. Item No. 5 has been completed already and 8 and 9 were that were ongoing

were approved. Student Services at the last meeting rescinded their request of \$104,000 for counseling because of a robust SSSP and student equity budgets and so this changed. I have created a couple of scenarios and then we're going to create our own scenario today and hopefully when we're done we'll have all this money allocated. Scenario No. 1 throughout this document identifies the top priority items in each of the categories and funds what I could out of those. If you go all the way to the last page you'll see the total down at the bottom is \$933,863. That was just a shot at funding the top priorities in each category. If you go back to the first page under scenario 1, I funded down to line No. 15. Everything that is in a shaded area was either funded or removed for a variety of reasons. Everything that is left that is unshaded, we came up with \$89,063 with the remaining stuff on that page. So there's \$89,000 identified on this page. The next page is Equipment. The top item is biology microscopes, \$390,000. To find that \$390,000, that's why I had to give on the first page and then give on the next page a little bit because that took a significant amount of it. So the total for this scenario for equipment at the bottom is \$390,000. The next section, technology, you see I went down to item No. 12, 15 laptops and that totals in scenario No. 1, \$128,500 and the last page if you take out the stuff in gray, the items that are left are down to item No. 13, the drop ceiling for diesel classrooms, those items that are in the white categories totaled \$326,000, the largest being additional space for nursing labs, modifying the areas in HLS to do that. The highlighted, or shaded areas on your sheet on page 1, if you go to the last page the facilities and safety, the items that are dark shaded items 1 through 5, of the top three those items are all being funded and a project that's in process right now at HLS building for \$1.3M and item No. 4 is being funded out of bond money, item No. 5 is an item that we approved for funding last year, and we in the process of making that happen now. Item No. 8, area for storage and to cut steel for welding lab for \$250,000. This was denied by the bond program for several reasons. We had to reduce the scope of that project, we have a very old building and we have to watch how much money we're putting into that building because we believe that's the next building in the district that needs to be demolished and we put just enough money from the bond program to satisfy the safety issues and not investing a lot of taxpayer money for a building that's going to be scraped and rebuilt. This project also involves a lot of DSA and engineering and for that reason I put that it isn't practical. Item No. 10, additional space for Student Success Center, is not practical because we have no additional space for a student success center on campus. That's an item that needs to be addressed by our Facilities Master Plan and our Educational Master Plan. Are there any questions?

Kay states she is not seeing what they have been waiting for years and years, the lighting in the drawing and painting classrooms, and I don't see that on the list.

Scott answered yes it is on the list and there's also a portion of it that's been funded already on last year's budget. It's No. 20 on the last page.

Scott stated the first scenario gave you an idea of what the budget would look like if we funded just the top priorities in each category. Scenario No. 2 was approaching from the top of the list but skipping over some big dollar items so we could fund a whole bunch of items in an area. On the first page scenario 2 essentially funded every item on that page. It goes right on down, they're all relatively small, \$167,923. Now in order to make scenario 2 work I had to reduce the amount of funding for biology microscopes. We had a discussion last time that bio microscopes is scalable but then the issue was it's scalable to a certain point. You can't just not scalable microscope by microscope at that level but maybe by classroom or section type of level where students all need to use the same microscope. This is just a shot at scaling it down don't know if that will be the exact amount. But scaling down the microscopes to a couple \$200,000 allowed for quite a bit more, skipping over item No 4, and this is just a scenario we don't have to do this, but allowing for a whole bunch of items to be funded on that list all the way to item No. 18. If you turn to the next page you'll see the total on this scenario \$554,903 in that category. Under technology under that scenario it funds \$157,500 worth of technology items. Rick, the comments on the right these items while it's one time funding you've got some ongoing funding from here?

Rick stated the criminal justice, they want to add 10 laptops to their cart and then they want to replace that on a five year schedule. So they would become the responsibility of technology services to keep those up to date and with come out of rotation funds. When you're talking adding 40 or 50 computers, that's over every five years.

Scott asked any of these concern you then?

Rick stated I can tell you that the criminal justice they bought the first five out of their budget last year so there's only five left to buy to bring them up to date.

Scott stated you see I stopped short on this scenario of item 15 which is a 40 seat computer lab, we don't have to do that but that's what I did just so how many small things we can fund. So in this scenario, you've got \$157,500 and the same scenario, just to see what money is left, I had \$50,000 left that I applied on items 6, 7 and 9 on the last page. So, there's two different scenarios on how we can do this. The way we did it last year, to start with page 1 given the scenarios, to have a motion and agree to fund down to a certain point on that page. I have a running total so we can see the running impact on the bottom line which we want to be around \$930,000 and that allows us a buffer of 10% in case sometimes goes over 10%, it will cover that so we make sure our total spending is under \$1M. But we can clear the first page, clear the second page, and when we get to the end, if there's some adjustment necessary or some funding that appears to be left over, we can come back and do an adjustment.

President Fisher stated on page No. 1, I'm looking at the bottom where it says budget totals, and I'm looking at scenario 2 and if you take into consideration all of the separate funding sources that have been identified, we're talking about \$167,923 is that correct? That's the amount of money that would be needed to fund all of the remaining items under budget augmentation?

Scott stated \$167,923 includes all the items that were already funded for establishing budgets which was around \$27,000 plus all the remaining unfunded items on that page.

President Fisher asked are we all clear on what we're looking at here? We said we had approximately \$1M or so, and we talking \$168,000 if you will for budget augmentation. I would like for you to consider that we fund all of the remaining budget augmentations which includes the four permanent budgets that we're creating, they're very small programs that have don't have a budget whatsoever and Scott can give us a total and we can move on to the next list with the balance that we have after deducting this \$167,923.

Rick said so if we vote for this it's one time funds, not ongoing?

President Fisher stated it's all one time but I must be clear about the four budgets which we are creating and just know that there will be monies to continue with those but we can't call it ongoing here because they're one time monies.

Scott stated last time we approved 1, 2, 3, 8, 9 and 33, six items for a total of \$27,000 and some odd dollars. This time it's coming out of our fund balance next year and we voted for this and it will be incorporated as an ongoing budget.

President Fisher stated we can't call it ongoing here because we working with one time funding. But we know that it will be ongoing for those departments.

Leticia asked it seems items 1 and 2 drastically changed it being the bio microscopes and Scott mentioned that you could only scale down so far so this amount then created or identified by department to say that's the minimum? My question then is what is the minimum that could be scaled down from the original price?

Sarah stated the last time I did quotes was years ago on how many sections could be serviced by that amount of money.

President Fisher asked the \$390,000 or \$207,000?

Sarah stated \$207,000.

President Fisher stated we can always go back and make adjustments. What we're doing now is moving through to create a scenario that we agree on. But if we get to the end and say, you know this isn't leaving enough money for X, maybe we need to swap something out, or if we put in, for example, the entire amount for the microscopes and then we see where that leaves us in terms of how far we can go down and we're not able to fund the nursing programs project. But we have to start somewhere, we could take it off the first page for budget augmentation and say well, we're going to save that so we have that for the microscopes. We might come back and do that, but if we start, we can move through.

Kay stated I was just suggesting because that's the largest amount that's impacting everything so start there and go back to the front page.

President Fisher asked to fund the microscopes first?

Kay stated no to find out in scaling down, how far can we scale down that still meets the needs of that department?

Sarah stated the essential thing is that right now what we see is low.

James asked the \$207,000?

Lorrie stated maybe \$350,000 would be the lowest we could go?

President Fisher asked \$350,000 from \$390,000? So more than a third of what we have available would go for one single department's needs? We have \$1M and you're talking about it as if it can't be scaled, because if it's \$390,000 and that's the way it has to be, or no less than \$350,000, then guess what? If it gets moved off of the page then there's nothing. Instead, we can do half of that.

Kay stated I'm looking at the current program review document from biology and their request for probably the 12 year for microscopes, the new amount is \$390,000.

Lorrie stated it's the same this year as it was last year.

Rick asked so how many microscopes is that and how much does each microscope cost?

Sarah stated I have pretty much asked for microscopes pretty much every year.

President Fisher asked is there a short answer to this? How much are the microscopes?

Lorrie stated we're talking about 140 microscopes in five labs. There is a difference in microscope use in a microbiology class than there is in a general biology class which would cost less. So, roughly \$2000 for general biology and \$2500 for microbiology.

President Fisher asked how many lab stations are in each?

Lorrie stated 28.

President Fisher stated you have five labs currently that this amount of money would cover. Tell me how it would impact the department in a negative way if you were looking at three labs instead of five.

Lorrie stated I don't know how you would decide which three labs. We talking about anatomy, physiology, how do you view slides without microscopes when what we have are falling apart? How do you have a student not look at cells under the microscope?

President Fisher stated okay, I sat on the accreditation for the nursing program and the nursing program is asking for \$200,000 to put some walls up. But that program is in jeopardy if that work is not done and completed when the review team comes back through. We have to look at the good of all programs and taking a third of what we have, more than a third, and not just putting it into one program. We need to look at how many of our needs can we meet. We may not be able to satisfy all of our needs. I appreciate the comments though because this is what we need to hear for all of us to be informed.

Paula stated I kind of tend to go that route, getting some of it is better than not getting any of it. We were looking at the program review documents for this year and there's not anything specific.

Lorrie stated I would like to suggest and I don't know if this can be done in program review but a phasing, maybe get a commitment from the College to do three classes now, one class next year and one class the following year. That three would take care of the needs of the oldest microscopes in our program and then we would also be able to go through the old.

Sarah stated she would like to consolidate some of the microscopes that are in good condition and that some of the equipment is dated from 1998 and some of them are now older than some students.

Leticia asked if you have these phases, because if we said we had to have them all we might not get any, what would that first phase look like?

Lorrie stated the first phase would be 90 or so scopes and then from there maybe do the other roughly 50 or so, and I think that would work.

President Fisher said I can't commit to something down the road when we don't know how much money we will have. I think it's important to include that in all the documentation that you move forward in program review throughout our process that you still have this need for additional microscopes. But I'm looking at not having an all or nothing situation so I'm going back to the first page where I started, and the **\$167,923** to fund all of these that, in some cases are small amounts of money, otherwise they will never get that. I'm asking for a motion to approve, with the understanding that we can go back and revisit if necessary what we've approved because we want to pull something off so we have money to fund something else that's going to be left off. **May I have a motion with all of those conditions?** Lorrie moved, Rick second. Discussion?

Leticia stated I just want to point out that at 90 if that is the first phase and estimating \$2250, that's in between the \$2000 and \$2500 that's \$202,500 against the \$207,000.

President Fisher stated excellent. That should be sufficient. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

**AYES:** Fisher, Beavor, Burnham, Cota, Ferri-Mulligan, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Kinde, Miller, Smith, Stark, Subero, Weiss.

**NOES:** None.

**ABSTENTIONS:** None

**ABSENT:** Gilbert, Bastedo, Hamdy, Huston, Shabazz.

**Motion carried.**

President Fisher stated let's move on to page 2 and 3, we're looking at total requested items of \$1,276,593. In scenario 2 we have \$554,903, that's too much.

Scott stated so far we have approved \$167,923. So we have to get up to \$930,000.

Paula asked regarding the culinary fryer, why didn't we put anything there?

President said because of the amount.

Scott stated if you look at the \$167,923 we've approved, when you put \$203,000 in the category of the microscopes we've used up \$371,000, we still have to get to \$930,000.

President Fisher stated we're back on these culinary fryer ovens and steamers. Is this something that can be disaggregated, they sound like different things. I would be more inclined and would want you to consider a reduced amount, maybe divide the \$100,000 by three and hopefully they can buy one of the other or a couple of things. By doing so, we're not just skipping an item. I also wonder about Perkins monies and what the availability is for alternative funding sources.

Kay stated I was in the meeting where we were trying to divide up Perkins monies and we're getting next to nothing this year and Crafton is getting a lot.

President Fisher stated so, if we put \$33,000 into that?

Leticia stated is there anything in program review for this year?

Kay responded yes, I did. Steamer for kitchen, sunroom and cafeteria both use this piece of equipment. Would like to upgrade to a steamer combination oven. But this says \$40,000.

President Fisher stated okay, if we did that, then we would take off No. 18 and plug in No. 40 for No. 4, because we have to move something up, if we want to stay within this framework until we get to step back until we can look at the complete picture. Are you with me Scott?

Scott responded I don't know what you mean by Item No. 18.

President Fisher stated Line No. 18 is Diesel-flywheel grinder \$37,000 if you eliminate that.

Kay stated so if we gave \$40,000 to culinary and the \$203,000 and instead of \$207,000, we would be very close to where we are right now.

Scott asked okay you want me to cross out No 18 and fund everything else except No. 18.



Kay stated I think that honors what program review did in prioritizing it a little bit more.

Scott stated so we've allocated \$721,000 including everything on this page. So that leaves about \$200,000 for the next two pages.

President Fisher stated we need to go back to the second page where we made the changes, put in \$40,000 for Item No. 4 culinary arts and removed Line No. 18 in the amount of \$37,000. We went with \$203,000 for the microscopes, correct? **Motion to approve?** Paula moved, Lorrie second.

Scott stated okay, so that's \$553,000. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

**AYES:** Fisher, Beavor, Burnham, Cota, Ferri-Mulligan, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Kinde, Miller, Smith, Stark, Subero, Weiss.

**NOES:** None.

**ABSTENTIONS:** None

**ABSENT:** Gilbert, Bastedo, Hamdy, Huston, Shabazz.

**Motion carried.**

President Fisher stated technology, scenario No. 1, I'm just going down the line, and that leaves off 15 laptops and cart and a 40 seat computer lab and \$4,000 for clickers but I'm always a little curious when we're adding computer labs. The impact on our technology services because Rick has trained me so well to know that we need to have that in place. And we only have \$200,000 left is that right Scott?

Scott answered if you follow scenario 2, it will fit perfectly.

President Fisher stated but that would not take us to facilities and safety.

Scott answered what it would give us is the items that's funded on Scenario 2.

President Fisher asked what about the nursing area?

Scott answered no, scenario 2 does not, if we funded that it would take all of that.

President Fisher asked do you see any monies coming in in the future that might be able to address that need before the college is dealing with an accreditation visit? This is about Facilities, line 11, additional space for nursing labs/modification of existing HLS, it's \$256,000. We do not have enough money based on the scenarios that we're working with right now. We'd have to remove something huge in order to get there for quite a few items.

Scott stated there's some District program review money that's been set aside at the District level, \$500,000. I expect to get at least \$250,000. That particular project would be a classic high priority project to take because it's going to be allocated at the District level based on priority. And if we've got accreditation of that program on the line, I think that program would be worthy of that \$250,000 from the District money.

President Fisher stated based on what we're looking at, it's \$50,300 under scenario 2 because everything else is impractical or it's already funded and then without taking things out of order that leaves line 11 for the nursing modification so if we're looking for additional monies from the District then it would still fall in line with our order of priorities and we'd still be able to move forward with all of the things just as we've approved them right now. That's going back to technology and picking up the \$157,500.

Kay asked about the nursing lab space. Does this budget mean building new space?

Scott stated it means modernizing existing HLS space and turning it into additional nursing labs.

Kay stated which means losing classroom space?

President Fisher stated it's that or lose the nursing program.

Kay stated I'm not saying we shouldn't do that, but we're really hurting for classroom space.

Diane asked this is not a candidate for a partial amount then like the others?

President Fisher stated I don't believe so because the construction project for the nursing program, that's not something that can be separated or scaled down.

Scott stated no, I had an architect come in and evaluate this for us.

Leticia stated Rick mentioned earlier that criminal justice already covered half of the laptops so then that means we can cut the \$13,500 in half?

President Fisher responded yes, absolutely.

Scott asked is that item no. 3 in technology?

Rick stated you can also remove item No. 5 because I already added those to the nursing lab.

Scott stated so remove item 5 and item No. 3 is \$6,750. So that makes a total of \$137,250.

Diane asked what about No. 4, it's already being funded, right?

Rick stated that's the ongoing budget that will be funded by the department.

Scott stated that we have \$859,000 allocated already, so there's enough to allocate scenario No. 2 plus a little bit in facilities.

Rick stated take out item No. 8. I just gave her a computer last week.

Scott stated our total is \$906,000 and under this scenario we have funded down to, we can't do nursing lab under this scenario, but that's a fine target for the District program agreement. So we've got \$906,016.26, we've got about \$25,000 left that we can go back up.

Lorrie stated I have a question about the nursing program because you had said something about we need that or we're at risk of losing our accreditation, so shouldn't that be on the top of our list?

President Fisher stated no, because I know the District has \$500,000 for the District Program Review monies and they have not yet divvied it up but we're in line to receive about half of it and I confirmed with Scott that he has the same understanding that I have, that when we receive those monies we'll be free to use them for any purpose. This way if we go back to our program review list and go down the facilities, it will be right in line and we won't have pulled anything off. If we don't find the money here that would be one of those emergency emerging needs because it just has to happen.

Aaron asked about the license and where are they going to get the space? Are they reconfiguring it?

Lorrie stated you know if you go into an emergency situation, you have sectioned off areas and so that's what they need to have. In the current lab that they have they need to section it off, so they can work in those areas.

President Fisher stated it's not a new space, it's a modification, but it's expensive because it has to meet the prescribed requirements and that's why the architects came in.

Kay asked Scott how much do we have left?

Scott replied we have about \$25,000 left. We haven't approved the technology. We have about \$134,000 approved there. Under the scenario we funded it's the same as scenario 2, we funded down to facilities not including nursing but we still have \$25,000 left.

Kay asked so we could potentially go back to equipment and add a few items?

President Fisher stated I need a **motion to approve the technology \$134,250**. Sarah moved, Paula second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

**AYES:** Fisher, Beavor, Burnham, Cota, Ferri-Mulligan, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Kinde, Miller, Smith, Stark, Subero, Weiss.

**NOES:** None.

**ABSTENTIONS:** None

**ABSENT:** Gilbert, Bastedo, Hamdy, Huston, Shabazz.

**Motion carried.**

President Fisher stated we need to go to the last page Facilities and Safety. Some things are already funded and we're going down for a total of \$50,300 in Scenario 2, drop ceiling for HVAC lab, higher level of security for the Health Science Department, room darkening shades for Art 107 & 118, I'm asking for a **motion to approve the \$50,300**. Kay moved, Paula second.

**AYES:** Fisher, Beavor, Burnham, Cota, Ferri-Mulligan, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Kinde, Miller, Smith, Stark, Subero, Weiss.

**NOES:** None.

**ABSTENTIONS:** None

**ABSENT:** Gilbert, Bastedo, Hamdy, Huston, Shabazz.

**Motion carried.**

Scott stated so we have about \$25,000 left, we can go back up to Equipment, you have a choice of funding some of this stuff, or a couple more microscopes. We stopped at the diesel flywheel grinder, if we funded that we'll probably be a little over.

Kay asked how much over would we be with the \$37,000?

Scott replied about \$15,000.

President Fisher stated we previously removed it but now we can put it back. May I have a **motion to approve line 18 the \$37,000 for the diesel flywheel grinder?**

Kay asked if Item No 19, the theater muslin drop could be added for \$635?

President Fisher stated yes. We're a little over but that's okay. **Motion was amended to include line 19 the \$635.** Sarah amended her move, Marco second. No further discussion and the group voted as follows:

**AYES:** Fisher, Beavor, Burnham, Cota, Ferri-Mulligan, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Kinde, Miller, Smith, Stark, Subero, Weiss.

**NOES:** None.

**ABSTENTIONS:** None

**ABSENT:** Gilbert, Bastedo, Hamdy, Huston, Shabazz.

**Motion carried.**

---

## **ACCREDITATION AND STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES – C. HUSTON**

No report.

---

## **EDUCATION MASTER PLAN – J. SMITH**

James stated that he wanted to remind people of the Open Forum on the 10<sup>th</sup>.

President Fisher stated that the Open Forum with the Consultants is having the team come opening day. I think what's more important is we'll have faculty and staff available on opening day and we would want Mr. Blaylock and Sheryl Sterry to join us then for what I believe is a well planned process that will engage the faculty in what we're trying to accomplish with our Educational Master Plan.

James I believe the 10<sup>th</sup> won't be that well attended. I just don't expect it to be.

President Fisher so maybe I call upon you to talk about the arc plan, the score card. So we'll have some good information, if people are interested they can come.

---

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING – J. SMITH**

James stated the 15<sup>th</sup> it will be a great time for the consultants to talk about what they're doing at district about our strategic goals and the Educational Master Plan. It would be a good time to talk about these restrictions on space that resulted from the fire inspection, the issue of the modification of nursing that's going to reduce the amount of classroom space, and that those are critical elements for the future goals of the campus when it comes to educational master planning as it relates to the facilities master planning. So I think it will help if enough voices are there and they surely hear it. We put all the mission statement and models for the next meeting.

President Fisher stated all of the college council members serve on the steering committee for the facilities and educational master plan. She suggested college council start a little earlier so that most members can attend and avoid conflicts in time with the steering committee. Scott and I are working on it, Scott is the designee to interact with the team and I'll get back to you as soon as I can so that you can plan accordingly.

---

---

## **PROGRAM REVIEW – P. FERRY-MULLIGAN**

Paula stated program review will be finished by Spring, we finished with faculty, we'll be finished with equipment and budget next Friday, and we finished Classified, and I was talking to Kay about a lot of what we did is on the new ones.

Kay stated so we're probably going to have to work with Scott and Karol. We'll submit the prioritized list as it is, but some of those items may have already been funded now through this.

President Fisher stated very good because a lot of people didn't get what they requested so they put it back in, which is very smart. Any other discussion?

Rick stated that the SBVC campus email is really for announcements that are pertinent to the business of the college. With the new office 365 we're able to create groups now that people can subscribe to. The technology committee decided to create a group called SBVC chatter. People can post anything they want, like open discussions, you would get instructions on how to subscribe to the list and how to leave if you want at any point. As a group it organizes things, if someone puts a topic out there, or someone adds to it, and organizes it like a list-serve. I wanted to bring it to College Council for approval.

President Fisher stated discussion?

Kay asked for those employees who do not yet have office 365 will they still be able to subscribe?

Rick stated everybody has outlook 365, not just office 365. So it's part of your outlook 365.

Sarah asked I assume things like the college mission statement would work on the existing college lists, but would the chatter group be topics that are somewhat less central to our operations?

Rick stated this is just one group that we're going create. If we want to create SBVC mission statement and create a group for it and start a discussion on that, we could do that. Anyone now can create a group and manage a group. You can send out an email via SBVC campus and say do you want to join my group, I'm starting a group about biology, or library resources or the mission statement, then people can join that group and have a discussion on that group and the group could be disassembled. This is something that came with 365.

**Kay made a motion for college council to support the technology committee's plan for chatter group.** Lorrie second.

**AYES:** Fisher, Beavor, Burnham, Cota, Ferri-Mulligan, Hector, Hrdlicka, Hunter, Kinde, Miller, Smith, Stark, Subero, Weiss.

**NOES:** None.

**ABSTENTIONS:** None

**ABSENT:** Gilbert, Bastedo, Hamdy, Huston, Shabazz.

**Motion carried.**

---

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

No report.

---

---

**OTHER:**

Leticia stated we're working hard reviewing courses and materials as well as programs and certificates. We also reviewing the P4022 course approval that the District has created and waiting feedback.

President Fisher wanted to acknowledge the work that Leticia is doing with the curriculum because there's so much. We're past the deadline so anything that moves through now will not be available once it is finalized through the catalog process for 17-18, is that right? I think that's good for everyone else to know.

Linda Subero stated that she wanted to acknowledge the good turnout and success for the Associated Student Government which occurred on 11/24/2015.

Kay stated she wanted to announce the Fall Theater Production, Completely Hollywood, and raising funds to send nominees to the Kennedy Center American College Theatre Festival in Hawaii this year.

---

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

---

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