

SBVC College Council Minutes February 9, 2011

Deb Daniels, SBVC President, Co-Chair
 John Stankas, Academic Senate President, Co-Chair
 Damaris Castillo **A**
 Damon Bell **A**
 Achala Chatterjee **A**
 Larry Buckley
 Marco Cota
 Colleen Gamboa
 Jim Hansen
 Rick Hrdlicka **A**
 Courtney Hunter
 Celia Huston

James Smith **A**
 Cassandra Thomas

TOPIC	DISCUSSION and ACTION
Approval of December 8, 2010 Minutes	The minutes were approved.
Resolutions – John Stankas	<p>Academic Senate has passed the following Resolutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FA10.02 (Proposed Change to Graduation Requirements for Category V in the SBVC Associate’s Degree Option #2 • FA10.03 (Mandatory Assessment and Orientation) • FA10.04 (Promoting Faculty Dialogue Regarding College-Level Expectations in Reading, Writing, and Critical Thinking) • FA10.05 (Basic skills Courses and Alternative Delivery Methods) • FA 10.06 (Basic Skills and College-Level Courses) <p>In an effort to proceed with resolution 10.03, the group discussed goals and assignments to an Orientation/Assessment Taskforce. The following individuals will be assigned to the taskforce:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arleen Delgado • Marco Cota • Ailsa Aguilar-Kitibutr • Kay Ragan • Damon Bell • Larry Buckley • Paula Ferri Milligan • Calaeb Losee • Stephanie Briggs • Everett Garnick <p>Deb will send out the initial email assigning taskforce members and a chair will be elected at their first meeting.</p> <p>The group reviewed all other resolutions and gave consensus to accept resolutions.</p>

Budget Update - Deb Daniels	<p>Deb reviewed the Board of Trustees 2011-12 Budget Directions with the group. A brief discussion ensued regarding three possible scenarios on how the budget will impact enrollment and district reductions.</p> <p>Deb will hold an all campus meeting in March to discuss the budget and answer any questions the campus may have.</p>
Program Review Update - Celia Huston	<p>Cecil handed out and reviewed the "Program Efficacy Recommendations 2010/2011" with the group. Consensus was to approve the recommendations as is.</p>

OTHER

--	--

Resolution FA10.02 Proposed Change to Graduation Requirements for Category V in the SBVC Associate's Degree Option #2

Whereas, California Administrative Code Title 5 §55063 **Minimum Requirements for the Associate Degree** requires an area of emphasis of at least 18 units and general education requirements in Natural Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities and Language, and Rationality and the California State University General Education (CSU-GE) pattern requires an additional fifth area called Lifelong Understanding and Self-Development, and;

Whereas, the San Bernardino Valley College general education pattern for an Associate's Degree, Option #2 mirrors the CSU-GE pattern, except that the fifth area at SBVC includes only Physical and Health Education, a subset of those required by the CSU-GE pattern, and;

Whereas, students need a variety of skills including those of financial competence, parenting skills, career selection and career change assessment, and a broad concept of self and global understanding in order to become engaged in the 21st century;

Resolved, that the San Bernardino Valley College Academic Senate recommends a title change to Associate's Degree Option #2, Category V, to Lifelong Learning and Self-Development, and that the courses fulfilling this category be expanded to include courses that prepare students for the world of work, and to contribute and thrive as individuals in the community, and;

Resolved, that this requirement go into effect with the 2011-2012 SBVC catalog.

Resolution FA10.03 Mandatory Assessment and Orientation

Whereas, the July 2007 publication, *Basic Skills as a Foundation for Student Success in California Community Colleges*, listed best practices found in the literature that included:

- Orientation, assessment, and placement are mandatory for all new students
(Boylan, H.R., and Saxon, D.P., 2002. *What works in Remediation: Lessons from 30 Years of Research.*)
(Roueche, R.E. & Roueche, S.D., 1999. *High Stakes, High Performance: Making Remedial Education Work.*)

because student retention and success are measurably increased by the practice, and;

Whereas, in April 2008 the San Bernardino Valley College (SBVC) Academic Senate adopted the SBVC Basic Skills Plan, after nine months of vigorous campus dialog, and presented these recommendations to the San Bernardino Community College District Board of Trustees:

- Implement a mandatory assessment and orientation policy for students enrolled in or completing 12 or more units.
- Increase availability of assessment test
- Develop/Adopt test that is portable, allows same-day orientation and placement
- Mandatory orientation for all students
- Comprehensive review of orientation process and curriculum

in an effort to increase student access to assessment and orientation services, and;

Whereas, the SBVC campus has worked to increase the availability of assessment tests and is near completion of on-line orientation processes that align with the SBVC Strategic Plan's Initiatives of increasing student success and institutional effectiveness, and;

Whereas, current SBVC campus-wide dialog has again cited the need for mandatory assessment and orientation;

Resolved, the San Bernardino Valley College Academic Senate reaffirms its recommendation that assessment and orientation should be mandatory and will continue to work with the administration and campus committees to implement mandatory assessment and orientation.

Resolution FA10.04 Promoting Faculty Dialogue Regarding College-Level Expectations in Reading, Writing, and Critical Thinking

Whereas, the July 2007 publication, *Basic Skills as a Foundation for Student Success in California Community Colleges*, listed best practices found in the literature that included:

- Staff development opportunities are flexible, varied, and responsive to developmental needs of individual faculty, diverse student populations, and coordinated programs/services

to ensure students are well prepared and the quality of instruction, across the curriculum, is appropriately rigorous and vibrant, and;

Whereas, in April 2008 the San Bernardino Valley College (SBVC) Academic Senate adopted the SBVC Basic Skills Plan, after nine months of vigorous campus dialog, and presented these recommendations to the San Bernardino Community College District Board of Trustees:

- Host faculty and staff brown bag discussions to share information about how to effectively connect with students
- Training across the curriculum for developmental education strategies
- Specific training for discipline faculty on developmental education strategies for success
- Workshops regarding evaluation of reading, writing, and computational assignments across the curriculum.

in an effort to increase faculty dialogue regarding minimum expectations for college level work, and;

Whereas, even though the SBVC faculty have worked to increase opportunities for training and dialogue, specific workshops regarding cross-curricular expectations in reading, writing, and computation must be continuous and structured, and;

Whereas, current SBVC campus-wide dialog has again cited the need for faculty dialogue regarding faculty expectations of reading, writing and critical thinking in college-level classes;

Resolved, the San Bernardino Valley College Academic Senate supports the enhancement of professional development programs that promote cross-discipline dialogue regarding faculty expectations in reading, writing, and critical thinking in college-level classes.

Resolution FA10.05 Basic Skills Courses and Alternative Delivery Methods

Whereas, during the Fall 2007 semester the San Bernardino Valley College (SBVC) College Council and SBVC Academic Senate voted to include in Access Goal 1.1, as part of the campus Strategic Plan, the importance of expanding student access to basic skills classes, and;

Whereas, in April 2008 the SBVC Academic Senate adopted the SBVC Basic Skills Plan, after nine months of vigorous campus dialog, and presented these recommendations to the San Bernardino Community College District Board of Trustees:

- Support for faculty to develop noncredit courses to support developmental education such as Vocational ESL in a noncredit format
- Connect a first year experience, CTE academy, or middle-college type program connecting CTE education with basic skills acquisition for Associate's Degree completion
- Learning Communities and Summer Bridge
- Integrate student support into more instructional classes
- 12-unit scheduling block of math, reading, English, ACAD/SDEV to permit full-time status for students at the dev. ed. level
- Special sections of some classes, e.g., Math 952, Engl 914, Read 950, that focus on CTE students and allow students to progress in the sequence toward degree completion
- Summer Bridge Programs to create cohorts and prepare students for college level work

in an effort to expand learning opportunities and modalities that serve students, and;

Whereas, the SBVC faculty have worked to establish and expand learning opportunities and continue to investigate potential models to facilitate student success and expedite student progress in basic skills sequences, and;

Whereas, current SBVC campus-wide dialog has again cited the need for faculty innovation regarding the delivery and access of basic skills;

Resolved, the San Bernardino Valley College Academic Senate supports and encourages enhancements and innovations to increase access to and improve student success in basic skills classes including contextualized learning, acceleration models, and other pedagogically sound modes of delivery as determined by the faculty, and;

Resolved, the SBVC Academic Senate encourages faculty to develop models appropriate to the campus student population and encourages the administration to support such innovations in an effort to expand student access and expedite student progress.

Resolution FA10.06 Basic Skills and College-Level Courses

Whereas, the July 2007 publication, *Basic Skills as a Foundation for Student Success in California Community Colleges*, listed best practices found in the literature that included:

- o Institutional policies facilitate student completion of necessary developmental coursework as early as possible in the educational sequence

because students succeed in college-level courses at a higher rate and if they possess the necessary basic skills, and;

Whereas, at the Spring 2009 statewide Student Senate plenary session, students voted to endorse the broad establishment of prerequisites and requested that faculty include the following in their discussions for implementation:

- o Availability of basic skills courses
- o Co-requisites where appropriate to help sustain student motivation
- o A clearly articulated phase-in plan for implementation

and;

Whereas, at the Spring 2009 Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) plenary session, the faculty voted to approve a Title 5 change to permit the implementation of basic skills prerequisites through rigorous content review. Avenues for incorporating the change to Title 5 are underway and research is being conducted to provide guidance in the rigorous content review process (expected adoption at the Spring 2011 ASCCC plenary session). This will supplement current Title 5 language that requires all college level courses to assess critical thinking through writing or computation and the current Model District Policy that requires appropriate skill prerequisites, and;

Whereas, current SBVC campus-wide dialog has reflected serious concerns regarding access, programmatic integrity during such a transition in the future – whether externally or internally determined, and implementation concerns;

Resolved, the San Bernardino Valley College Academic Senate supports the principle that most college-level courses require some competency in reading, writing, and/or computation, and;

Resolved, the SBVC Academic Senate encourages continued monitoring of state-wide events and determinations and begins planning how any change to our current model can successfully balance the Academic Senate's commitment to academic rigor, student access, and student success.

Board of Trustees 2011-12

Budget Directions

- Balance the 2011-12 Budget utilizing the District's 2009-10 "Fallout" and Fund Balance (Reserve) as appropriate to maintain programs, services, and the directions above while maintaining a minimum Fund Balance level of 15% (State minimum is 5%)
- Develop "transition plans" to minimize or mitigate future utilization of Fund Balance

Board of Trustees 2011-12

Budget Directions

- Allocate base funding to the colleges and other sites to be used to satisfy each site's highest priority goals and objectives (enrollment, programs, and services) consistent with the District's Resource Allocation Model
- Reallocate staff resources as appropriate throughout the District
- Consistent with each college's priorities and objectives, reduce 12-month faculty contracts to 10- or 11-month contracts
- Explore the feasibility of a Supplemental Employee Retirement Program (full year or mid-year program)

Board of Trustees 2011-12

Budget Directions

- Avoids layoffs, if possible, of all full-time and part-time permanent contract employees
- Full funding for contractual step increases
- Maintain resource flexibility by maintaining a “selective hiring freeze” as appropriate
- Maintain flexibility to fund up to the full cost of health benefits as negotiated
- Explore options to reduce the “General Fund” support for KVCR and PDC
- Bond funding to continue implementation of the District’s Facilities Master Plans

Other Budget Considerations

Full-time Obligation Number (FON) for Full-time Faculty

- Fall 2011 FON Requirement – 213.8 Full-time Faculty
- Fall 2010 (At Apportionment 2) – 217.8 Full-time Faculty

50% Law – 50% of expenditures are spent “in the classroom”

- 2009-2010 Reported 50% Law Compliance – 50.88%

Impact on Enrollment

Description	2010-11	2011-12 Scenario #1	2011-12 Scenario #2	2011-12 Scenario #3
	Potential Funded FTES for 2011-12	14,081	13,321	12,729
Potential Reduction in FTES from 2010-11		790	1,404	2,186
Potential Reduction in Head Count from 2010-11		2,125	3,777	5,880
Potential Reduction in Sections from 2010-11		213	378	588

Impact on 2011-12 Budget With District Reductions

General Fund Unrestricted Revenue	2010-11 Budget	Cuts in Revenue	2011-12 Scenario #1	Cuts in Revenue	2011-12 Scenario #2	Cuts in Revenue	2011-12 Scenario #3
State Base Revenue plus Growth	\$71,541,942	\$3,694,000	\$67,847,942	\$6,497,000	\$65,044,942	\$10,064,000	\$61,477,942
Other Revenue	\$3,174,684	\$73,416	\$3,101,268	\$126,692	\$3,047,992	\$169,054	\$3,005,630
Total Revenue	\$74,716,626	\$3,767,416	\$70,949,210	\$6,623,692	\$68,092,934	\$10,233,054	\$64,483,572
2011-12 Budget	\$73,676,657		\$69,862,704		\$68,562,704		\$66,162,704
Net Revenue Less Expenses	\$1,039,969		\$1,086,506		-\$469,770		-\$1,679,132
2011-12 Budget Increases							
Step & Column, Net FTE Change			-\$477,472		-\$477,472		-\$477,472
12% Increase in Dental Benefits			-\$51,440		-\$51,440		-\$51,440
10% Increase in Overall Benefits			-\$572,000		-\$572,000		-\$572,000
Grant Obligations			-\$169,000		-\$169,000		-\$169,000
Increased GASB 45 Liability			-\$650,000		-\$650,000		-\$650,000
Potential 2011-12 Budget Deficit			-\$833,406		-\$2,389,682		-\$3,599,044
Potential 2011-12 Budget Deficit Before Reductions			-\$4,647,359		-\$7,503,635		-\$11,112,997

Program Efficacy Recommendations 2010/2011

Committee Recommendations	Consequences	Next Report
<p><u>Contraction:</u> Program shows serious issues in the ability to serve the needs of the institution. The program may require restructuring or a scaling back of services to conform to the demands of the institution.</p>	<p>Program may not participate in Needs Assessment</p> <p>Programs on contraction are at risk for Program Discontinuance</p>	<p>Yearly progress reports with a full program efficacy in three years.</p>
<p><u>Probation:</u> Program submitted a document that did not withstand the minimum rigor of self-study required for accreditation scrutiny, or for programs that require the attention of the appropriate Vice President to meet the needs of the institution.</p>	<p>Programs will be required to submit a Remediation Report.</p> <p>The Committee will evaluate the Remediation Report to determine if the program can participate in the next Needs Assessment cycle.</p> <p>Programs on probation for two consecutive years are at risk for Program Discontinuance</p>	<p>Full report in next Efficacy cycle.</p> <p>Once off probation, full efficacy report in three years.</p>
<p><u>Probation</u> – No Documents Submitted</p>	<p>Programs will be required to submit a Show Cause Report explaining why Program Efficacy was not completed.</p> <p>The Committee will evaluate the Show Cause Report to determine if the program can participate in the next Needs Assessment cycle.</p> <p>Programs on probation for two consecutive years are at risk for Program Discontinuance</p>	<p>Full report in next Efficacy cycle. Once off probation, full efficacy report in three years.</p>
<p><u>Conditional:</u> Program is currently meeting the needs of the institution as demonstrated by the responses to the questions and the document's evidence of critical self-study in most areas. Information in one or two areas is insufficient and/or significantly out-of-date and program is given year to address them.</p>	<p>Program which does not satisfy deficiencies within one year or does not submit the update will be placed on Probation</p>	<p>Update report in one year. Next Efficacy in three years</p>
<p><u>Continuation:</u> Program is currently meeting the needs of the institution as demonstrated by the responses to the questions and the document's evidence of critical self-study.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Next Efficacy in three years</p>
<p><u>Hiatus:</u> Program is not currently offering classes but anticipates offering courses in the near future.</p>	<p>Hiatus status is active for three years.</p>	<p>Next Efficacy due three years after the program begins offering classes.</p>

DRAFT: Program Review Cycle 2011-2012

Efficacy Phase 1
Sept 2, 2011—Nov 18, 2011

Needs Assessment
Oct 7, 2011—Feb 3, 2012

Efficacy Phase 2
Feb 3, 2012—May 4, 2012

ADVANTAGES

- Efficacy is done in two groups of 14 rather than trying to complete 28 efficacies in one semester
- More time to process data for campus wide needs assessment

QUESTIONS

- Will data for first efficacy be available in time? Committee could do all AD/SS programs during the first efficacy which would leave only a few instructional programs that require data.
- Are Needs Assessment results available in time for budget and planning purposes (2nd week of February)