

SBVC Academic Senate

Meeting Minutes

September 4, 2019

AD/SS 207 3:00 – 4:30 P.M.

Topic	Discussion	Action
1. Call to Order and Roll Call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting called to order at 3:02 p.m. Roll call via sign-in sheet [see attachment: AS Documents, Sign-in Sheet]. 	
2. Public Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	
3. Senate President's Report R. Hamdy [proxy]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C. Huston is on her way to an ACCJC workshop, so I have the privilege of leading today's meeting. I'd like to give the floor to D. Humble. D. Humble: I want to introduce Dr. Dmitriy Kalantarov, the new Dean of the Science Division. he comes from New Jersey and oversaw a large division of math, science, physics, and computer science departments there. [applause] D. Kalantarov: I'm glad to be here. I've met a lot of people and I'm hoping to learn as much from everyone as they learn from me. 	
4. SBVC President's Report D. Rodriguez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time yielded to S. Stark. 	
5. Committee Reports	<p>a. Ed Policy [J. Bjerke]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We're working on a committee charge. <p>b. Personnel Policy [J. Notarangelo]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [see attachment: AS Documents, Personnel Policy Report regarding Advancement in Academic Rank] I was reading through minutes and I saw that there was some discussion on Advancement in Rank; I wanted to make some clarifications and bring some answers regarding that. There was concern about the haphazardness of the Advancement in Rank process. It may be less haphazard and more poorly communicated. There is an ongoing process that started last January in an Executive Senate meeting. The Personnel Policy Committee is okay with the current Advancement in Rank process because it satisfies the current AP. The top of the handout is an email to the Senate Executive team. The second recommendation was that we try to resolve it with Crafton Hills and their policy, then it would come back to the Senate. This was also discussed in the Academic Senate on February 6. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>5. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<p>c. Student Services [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>d. CTE [K. Melancon]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a couple things happening in our department. • We got some donations from Rio Hondo College to help support our Automotive Department. • We are also working with some companies to use virtual reality to go along with the lecture part of our distance education classes. <p>e. EEO [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>f. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule for Flex Day on September 27th was emailed yesterday. • One training is about sexual harassment. There was a new law passed that says all employees need to go through sexual harassment training. It's mandatory by law. HR is working on a mechanism that will allow us to fulfill this online. I worked with District to at least offer an opportunity to take the training. It's a 2-hour, face-to-face training that will be at the District office in the Boardroom. Everyone employed by the District has to do it, including adjuncts and professional experts. • Some CSCA training will happen as well. • J. Smith will hold a Campus and Community meeting. • Sign up for workshops! <p>g. Elections [D. Burns-Peters]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be an email going out for the adjunct senator position. • Also a reminder that the Senate President election will open in October. <p>h. Curriculum [M. Copeland]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tech review met last week. The full committee will meet next week. • One thing that came up is we're moving to the 16-week schedule in Fall 2021. The conversation centered around lab hours and how the time will change. It's not too early to think about how that new schedule will affect you, particularly if you have labs or if you have an accrediting body or requirement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ S. Lillard: I was talking to someone from Crafton. They said those minutes have to be approved by the state. ○ R. Hamdy: Yes, the calendar has to go to the state. What minutes are you referring to? ○ S. Lillard: I have some uncertainty. I think they were looking at their schedule and thinking of rearranging their class blocks but thought they have to wait because the minutes [spent in the classroom] have to be approved by the state. We should verify if we can just change it or if there is something more because it's a big move. ○ R. Hamdy: I know we have to get signed off on the calendar. J. Gilbert and Steve Sutorus are looking into that. I can follow up with them. The calendar time allocation should work out with 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>5. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<p>that, but let's verify that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D. Rodriguez: I just want to go back to something S. Lillard said, that the minutes have to be approved by the state. Did Crafton say who their source is at the state level? It would make it easier for us to look into it. ○ S. Lillard: No, but it was something I heard today for the first time. ○ R. Hamdy: There is a vice chancellor at the state. We send the flex hours to them. We can reach out to Crafton. ○ D. Rodriguez: I'll ask our VPI's office to make a call up to the state, if that's okay with everyone. That way we can find out for ourselves. ○ R. Hamdy: Sure. <p>i. Program Review [P. Ferri-Milligan]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● [see attachment: AS Documents, Program Review—4-Year Program Efficacy Rotation] ● Needs Assessment will be out by Monday. I was told by J. Smith we are still going to use the EMP data and that it will be out this week. ● I passed out the efficacy for your rotation. We had a discussion at last Friday's meeting. There is one department who wants to start early on their efficacy, so we thought we could put it out there for everyone. We will review our forms at our September 20th meeting. ● Also, I am going to stay in my current role as Program Review Chair until the end of this year. I would like to see someone come and shadow/work with me like they would the President's position. <p>j. Accreditation & SLOs [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● D. Humble: We met for the first time yesterday. We have our first complete draft thanks to C. Huston. She did an amazing job and worked extremely hard over the summer [applause]. The committee members are going to review the draft. It should go out college-wide sometime in the next month or two. We have split the SLO and Accreditation positions. You'll see the SLO position go out to all faculty soon. ● B. Tasaka: We have our visitation dates as well: October 12 – 15, 2020. 	
<p>6. Additional Reports</p>	<p>a. SBCCD-CTA [S. Lillard]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ S. Lillard: We had our first negotiations meeting. There is a lot happening this year: lecture-lab parity, learning communities, and evaluations. We'll be sending things out for feedback. Look for emails from me as negotiator or M, McLaren as president. Please provide feedback. ○ R. Hamdy: Can I mention something exciting that you negotiated? Part-time benefits: vision and dental. ○ S. Lillard: Yes, we're also going to negotiate medical this year. <p>b. District Assembly [B. Tasaka]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Yesterday was our first meeting. There were some BPs and APs up for first read. ● There was also conversation about nonpayment for students and the debt that's brought to campuses as well as ways to handle that. I was talking to someone on the committee about this 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
6. Additional Reports, continued	and they suggested looking at it as an equity issue. We are financially covering new students through things like the Promise Program, but we are holding debt over others who have been around for a while. The two of us discussed looking for ways to maybe help them as well. The conversation didn't go very far.	
7. Consent Agenda, continued	<p>a. Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8/21/19 • Motion 1 	<p>Motion 1: Move to approve the consent agenda. 1st: K. Melancon 2nd: V. Alvarez Discussion: None Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: D. Burns-Peters, L. Burnham</p>
8. Old Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	
9. New Business	<p>a. Program Review Reassign Time [P. Ferri-Milligan]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reassign time for program review is currently .38. It's overwhelming- the correspondence and warehousing of the documents, maintaining the website, and keeping up with everything is a lot. I'm not advocating for myself. I agreed to .38 and I'll stick with that for the rest of the year. • This needs to be looked at in terms of equity with some of the other committees. We need to have more time so that the chair can do more than just maintain because maintaining alone takes a lot of time. One thing that comes with more reassign time is more time to be creative and expansion. Program Review is tied to a lot of the standards for accreditation. It's an important committee. • I'll use the Curriculum Chair as a comparison: Their reassign time is .58. One great thing is they have a dedicated classified professional. I'm advocating that we put an election out with a higher percentage than .38 so that the chair can get more done. • R. Hamdy: Paula is looking for a motion of support. We had talked about matching it to Curriculum's, which is .58. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Motion 2 ○ R. Hamdy: Now c. Huston will take it to both D. Humble and D. Rodriguez. <p>b. 2019-2020 Budget Forecast [S. Stark]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's going to be a tighter year this year. The big picture is that the District and SBVC are both running a deficit this year. Revenues are up but expenses are way up. Salary increases are up for faculty, classified, all the collective bargaining units, and management. I'll show you how that affects our budget. That's the most significant factor. The other factor is that the state shorted us some money. They said based on our success and everything we're doing, we get a certain 	<p>Motion 2: Move to support .58 reassign time for the Program Review Chair. 1st: M. Jacobo 2nd: D. Fozouni Discussion: None Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>9. New Business, continued</p>	<p>amount of money. Now they're taking \$2 million back from SBVC because they don't have enough to give us what we deserve according to the funding formula. The short story is some community colleges didn't do well to meet their metrics in success and FTES goals. They were put in a category called "Hold Harmless" last year. This meant they were given a safety net and given the same amount of funding. Their funding came off the top of the state appropriation for community colleges. What was left was divvied up amongst "Successful Schools," Valley being one of them. Many of the Region 9 schools were Successful Schools. That particular implementation isn't working for Region 9 (deficit shortfall of \$27 million with \$2 million for Valley) and one other region in the state. In our budget, they're doing a projection on that and the forecast is we will get hit with \$1 million out of that \$2. The basis is based on some pretty sound reasoning over the past few years on a deficit factor. They're estimating that maybe 50% of that deficit will go away.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R. Hamdy: So when you've presented the budget before, it was always a district-wide budget. You said \$2 million is taken from SBVC, how does Crafton get affected? ○ S. Stark: It's \$2 million taken away from the District. It roughly represents 70% and 30%, and I'll show you that later. ● S. Stark: The final budget is going to the BOT next Thursday night. There is a call to action on that deficit factor that I was talking about. The call to action is to either fully fund the Student-Centered Funding Formula, or to change the implementation of it and recommend that they spread the deficit factor amongst all the schools, not just those that did well and penalize them. There are a couple other details that go along with that, but that's the basic idea. ● Let me show you a slide on budget increases. I did some cropping instead of making you put your glasses on. This is big-picture stuff. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Last year's (2018 – 2019) budget: \$51.4 million (1000s: faculty and classified salaries, benefits). This year: \$54.2 million, a \$2.8 million, almost \$3 million increase just in salaries and benefits. We had a big jump. That's the biggest jump in one year I've seen since I've been around in the last 6 or 7 years. ○ Last year (4000s: supplies, contract services, equipment purchases) \$6.2 million. This year \$6.4 million, a \$0.2 million increase. In that category you can see we've held fairly tight. It wasn't that everything went up, we had to hold it. We had a larger increase than that, but we were asked to judiciously cut. Some areas went up, we're using more natural gas, but we're projecting that increase. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M. Copeland: You're saying that the 1000-level is faculty and the 4000 is supplies? ▪ S. Stark: Yes. Faculty and classified benefits. That's the big category. It went up almost \$3 million. We had to really work to keep the other category where it is. ▪ M. Copeland: Did you do the District? I'm just curious if there are figures for the District and their costs? ▪ S. Stark: I'm not covering that today, but they were pretty much held. They had Program 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>9. New Business, continued</p>	<p>Review like we did. They were primarily held, let me think about it. I can get back to it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ P. Ferri-Milligan: I have it here. It's interesting. If you look at a District-wide budget and what was funded, they asked for hundreds of thousands of dollars and they're getting ongoing funding. They're getting positions. I'm looking at the Chancellor's Revised District Program Review Committee Rankings Funding. We're looking at a lot of money on that. When we can't get ongoing funding for basic programs that we haven't got in six years, I'm still making that argument for Program Review. For six years we haven't got ongoing funding for the budgets, we are stuck with classified and hiring freezes... ▪ R. Hamdy: S. Stark, can you show what P. Ferri-Milligan is referring to? ▪ P. Ferri-Milligan: It's on the District Program Review Committee. ▪ S. Stark: So the Program Review money for this year isn't from the general fund. Are you looking at the general fund? ▪ P. Ferri-Milligan: I don't know, some of them are personnel- the police officers. It's supposed to put where the funding source is and I don't see it. ▪ S. Stark: The primary increase for the District this year was in police, police services, additional positions, and additional vehicles. The other significant increase was a transfer of expenses from the block grant to the general fund. ▪ P. Ferri-Milligan: Human Resources Analyst, Purchase Risk Management Supervisor, District Planning Services, Renewable Energy Project, hire new IT Security professional, Director of Distance Ed, hire Director of Administrative Applications, ... ▪ S. Stark: Here's how I'll address that: You'll have to address that with the District office. I could investigate it, but the best source is to go to the District Budget Committee. ▪ P. Ferri-Milligan: Who's on the District Budget Committee? ▪ S. Stark: The District Budget Committee reviews that. ▪ P. Ferri-Milligan: Who is on the District Budget Committee? Do we have representatives from the college? ▪ S. Stark: Crafton has representatives, Valley has representatives, and the District has representatives. I can tell you this, everything you just read, that was all reviewed by the District Budget Committee. It went through a highly scrutinized process and they approved it. Detailed questions like that, I would take it to the Vice Chancellor's office and the District office. ▪ P. Ferri-Milligan: Who from Senate is on that? ▪ R. Hamdy: C. Huston and I are on it. ▪ P. Ferri-Milligan: Can you take these questions to them and bring us back some information? ▪ R. Hamdy: Yes, absolutely. I'm wondering too. So all of those new positions they're getting, does that affect how many new positions we would have gotten? I imagine it must. ▪ S. Stark: After we calculate all the revenues, the District assesses the campuses for their services and right now that assessment is over 19%. That includes police, HR, fiscal services, 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>9. New Business, continued</p>	<p>printing services, TESS, those kind of things. Again, without knowing the details of what P. Ferri-Milligan just brought out, I do know it was scrutinized quite heavily and ultimately passed. The biggest areas were police services and a transfer of expenditures to the general fund.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ P. Ferri-Milligan: R. Hamdy, when you go to the budget committee, that whole chancellor's hiring thing that's going on, these did not go through that. Some of these are new positions. • S. Stark: Alright. Let's take a look at the multi-year projection. We are in this budget year and we are running a deficit of about \$616 thousand. We are spending more than what we're bringing in. That means we have to dig into our piggy bank to cover that. Crafton is running over a \$4 million deficit this year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This year (2019 – 2020): So, our and Crafton's deficit: \$5,033,023. That will get pulled from our piggy bank at the District to cover that shortfall. We had a fund balance of \$21 million, now the fund balance will be 14.29% (\$16,243,069). The Board of Trustees directed us to keep at least 15% in the fund balance, then they lowered it to 10% of projected expenditures for a given year. The reason for that is if we get in a bind we can still pay salaries for a while to help us get out of it. 1.7 months of salaries is what 14.29% fund balance gets us. The Board wants us to stay above 10%. The burn rate is \$9,469,235 per month in this district. ○ Next year (2020 – 2021), we are still in deficit spending. It's a little less than this year; this year was a big hit with salaries. Next year almost \$4 million brings our fund balance down to \$11 million, which will pay 1.3 months of salaries. ○ In 2021-2022 it will be a half a million in deficit across the district. So we start climbing out of it in 21 – 22 according to these projections. ○ By 2022 – 2023, we are showing a little bit of an excess. Then a little over a couple million by the following year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪M. Worsley: Do these numbers include the District numbers now? ▪S. Stark: Yes, this is a district-wide forecast. ○ S. Stark: That's the multi-year. Now let's look at the revenue analysis. We want to make sure we're getting our piece of the action for SBVC. This is a little analysis for this year, which is a Student-Centered Funding Formula budget. We have CHC, SBVC, here's the total unrestricted revenues. This is SBVC and CHC's take: the base allocations are SBVC 53.8% [\$4,728,859] and CHC 46.2%. The base allocations are given directly to the colleges from the state. It has to do with our size, we are a multi-college district, so that's a fixed number of \$4.7 million. In terms of FTES, if you remember that the Student-Centered Funding formula is based on more categories: FTES, Supplemental Performance from 2017-2018 that's determining the budget this year, Student Success (# of transfers, certificates), so based on FTES revenue coming into the District, SBVC has 69.5%. That's where we were at the beginning of last budget year based on our performance. In the supplemental category, we are getting 75% of the revenue. That's based on this campus' performance based on the supplemental category in 2017 – 2018. So we're doing well as far as the District is concerned. In terms of transfer and student success, we're getting 69.5% of that. Then we have our piece of the \$1 shortfall, \$2 million but we are 	

projecting \$1 million, here's our piece of that shortfall. Overall, our revenue is worth 69.5% of the take. After we do this, we pay the District's expenses. What's left is allocated to the college for our expenses. In quick summary again, we are spending about \$600 thousand more than we're taking in.

■Questions/Comments:

■D. Burns-Peters: I understand we need to be updated and that's part of your job. There are a lot of positive things that SBVC is doing and doing right, and I've heard that the last three updates you've given. I can also tell you that as a faculty member, in the last three updates, I feel like we are being pointed out as the cause, or blamed or responsible, for the shortfall that's happening. It's been made very clear that our salary is part of the problem.

■S. Stark: True.

■D. Burns-Peters: And I get that. But as a faculty member sitting here in Senate having that coming at us, I shouldn't be made to feel guilty for the increases I've had here and for the work I do. Without faculty there are no students and no revenue [scattered applause]. My request is if you could start with more positive stuff, I don't mind you pointing out our salaries, but for you to point that out, right out of the gate, as a faculty member it doesn't feel good. I'm going to ask that you be more factual and be more positive.

■S. Stark: Okay. I appreciate those comments. The view/philosophy that you just shared is not my intent. There is no blame here. We all agreed, myself included, across the district, that we need to raise our salaries. J. Torres said we need to do it and it was the right thing to do. We did it. There are implications, real life implications for us to be paid a fair and equitable salary. When I'm talking about budget, it's very factual. The fact is it's all of our salaries that's creating a deficit here, but we accept that. It's part of the deal. If we raise our salaries, there are implications. We accept it. The Board should accept it. The Vice Chancellor's office accepts it. There is no blame. We all agree that we needed increases in our salary. We deserve increases. We are all very hard-working. The people are what makes this college successful, as I was illustrating from a budget standpoint.

■D. Burns-Peters: So express it that way. It comes off in a very different way. Maybe you're in your budget zone, but presentation is everything. It was one of the first things that was said in the last three presentations. That's all I'm saying. Thank you though.

■M. Worsley: There are two gaps I see here. One is the volatility in the new funding formula and how we just got \$2 million taken away from us. You just said that we got salary increases that went up \$2.5 million. That's a lot. To have \$2 million taken from the new funding formula, is there a way to anticipate that and address that volatility? The second gap I see is the budget from P. Ferri-Milligan. Why aren't those numbers being reflected in the budget? The numbers are all connected, right? We should see all of it, shouldn't we? There's no transparency.

■S. Stark: I'm going to address the second part first. I've got limited time left up here so I'm showing a 30-thousand foot big-picture level, primarily of SBVC's budget. The District has its budget and it's certainly shown. The budget the Board approves is very detailed and there's a lot of information in it. All the information is there and I'm just not presenting it here. We can

Topic	Discussion	Action
9. New Business, continued	<p>certainly drill it down and take a close look at it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪D. Rodriguez: I'll take your first question. We don't exactly know why higher-performing institutions got penalized so deeply. We've talked about it at the district level. I'm in the process of scheduling meetings in Sacramento to ask why this is happening in our area. This is why we have the Call to Action. I also have a meeting with the president of the Board of Governors. How can you let this happen to the densest population of California? I think this will take a while but I also think that with the other CEOs of Region 9, it will almost force the state chancellor to pay attention. ▪M. Worsley: If you can keep us up to date about that, we would appreciate it. ▪D. Rodriguez: Definitely. ▪P. Ferri-Milligan: This isn't a Paula or a Program Review thing, but budget is an Academic Senate thing. It's good that you advocate at the state level, but we have issues that need to be dealt with. We as a Senate need to get more involved. Can I make a motion as well? ▪D. Rodriguez: Yes. The Chancellor has also reached out to our region's representative on the statewide budget committee to show and highlight this to them as well. ▪P. Ferri-Milligan: The Chancellor might want to reach out to the colleges more. Transparency is really important and I don't know if all processes and procedures are transparent. I don't get involved in budget, but when I see things that aren't funded for six years it's no wonder faculty and classified get discouraged. ▪S. Stark: The state is test-driving this funding formula. Even more than this big call to action, there is going to be more fine-tuning and adjusting as we move forward. ▪D. Rodriguez: As things come up and change, I'll try to bring them in as my report each month as I learn of the changes. 	
10. Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D. Rodriguez: I want to recognize M. Copeland's new book. 	
<p>The Academic Senate convened a closed session to discuss items related to SBCCDTA Negotiations for the duration of the meeting.</p>		
11. Adjournment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m. • Next meeting: September 18, 2019, at 3:00 p.m. in AD/SS 207. 	