

**SBVC College Council MINUTES**

**Date: September 23, 2015**

**Location: President's Conference Room, ADSS-207**

**Time: 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM**

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

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

**A=Absent**

**Guest(s):**  
 Bruce Baron, Chancellor - **A**

TOPIC	DISCUSSION and ACTION
Call to Order:	President Fisher called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m. President Fisher introduced Dora Demers, the new Administrative Secretary who will be taking minutes for this meeting and future meetings, and will get caught up on previous minutes.
<b>Chancellor's Fall Update – Bruce Baron</b>	Not able to attend.
Approval of the August 26, 2015 Minutes	Tabled.
Approval of the May 13, 2015 Minutes	Tabled.
Approval of the September 9, 2015 Minutes	Tabled.
Upcoming/Filling Positions – G. Fisher	<p>Dr. Kinde presented for discussion and approval the replacement of Algie Au, a former biology faculty member in the Biology Department once it follows the rubric for replacement facility. Dr. Kinde explains that there are currently 6 full time faculty for Fall 2015. 37% of their biology classes are being taught by full time faculty and that here is a need for this position replacement.</p> <p>President Fisher stated that College Council recognizes the rubric flow chart that was approved both by the Academic Senate and by the Council. President Fisher further stated that there cannot be a situation where one person comes to the Council and says this follows the rubric and it should be approved. It's important that the Council see the rubric and the job and that everyone agrees that it meets the rubric and therefore the Council can vote unanimously to proceed. The record needs to reflect that Council received it as an item and that they approved it so that there are no questions in the future as to how business was conducted in Council.</p>

<p>Upcoming/Filling Positions – G. Fisher (Continued)</p>	<p>President Fisher entertained a motion to approve the position.  Celia moved, Scott second. No discussion and the group voted as follows:  AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Bastedo, Beavor, Ferri-Mulligan, Hamdy, Hrdlicka, Huston, Kinde, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, Subero, Weiss.  NOES: None  ABSTENTIONS: NONE  ABSENT: Cota, Hector, Hunter, Miller.  Motion carried.</p>
<p>Retirement Vacancies – D. Bastedo</p>	<p>Dave said that there are two positions available that meet the rubric procedures and should be followed as stated by President Fisher. The council should first prioritize the two positions and should be hired. If we have money for six or eight positions, these two positions should be first hired and the remaining positions would go through the normal process. The rubric was made with this in mind. If they were retired this year, they would be an automatic thing through this Council. Dave suggested that the Council should vote or have a motion on these two priorities.</p> <p>Kay asked what two positions was Dave referring to.</p> <p>Dave stated he knew of two, the biology position and the aeronautics position.</p> <p>President Fisher reiterated that when Senate or Council makes a rule or creates a document that sets forth how it is going to make decisions, it must not operate ex post facto and thus should not go back into the past and affect any decisions already made. If there were any retirements within a two year period following the end of the cycle when decisions were made about the two positions that Dave identified, and they're not having any problems now because they're within that two year period but it had to start after they made a final determination with regard to the vacancies that would be filled. She asked Scott Stark to give a brief summary of the decision-making process.</p> <p>Scott said they keep hearing "what happened to the money" and explained that it was a unique process for the Summer of 2014. They were in the final budget stage, they had their raises, and they were still in the state budget crisis, and found themselves in a significant deficit prior to the final budget approval by the board. The Executive Budget Workshop Committee explained to them that they</p>

<p>Retirement Vacancies – D. Bastedo (Continued)</p>	<p>have this many vacant positions available in classified, faculty, and they only have enough money for so many positions. They went back to the Committee and it was decided eight positions would be funded regardless of what the positions were. Same with classified, only enough money for three positions. They talked about it in Council and it was agreed that instead of refilling the eight vacant faculty positions, maybe that wasn't what the campus needed and they needed to look at program review priorities as well. So, they brought it back to the campus forum on October 16, and College Council voted on it October 22. What was yielded was seven faculty positions and one for program review. Three positions were selected for classified.</p> <p>David said the purpose was to use whatever monies we had to choose the faculty positions to go forward. If there had been more money there would have been more positions.</p> <p>President Fisher said prior to that and currently we have a soft hiring freeze, which means if a vacancy occurs, we do not automatically fill that vacancy. That we look campus wide to make a determination of what might be a higher priority and those conversations would come forward much as the biology position did today and there was an agreement that we really need that position filled. It's not to say that we would look at a vacancy and then fill the vacancy. We have a copy of the board and biology did not receive any votes whatsoever. So, biology would not be resurrected so to speak to bring that position back if we were just looking at the numbers, because there were positions that received votes, there were other positions that did not receive votes. Nursing for example had four position vacancies all together, and the nursing area decided that they would probably get by if they got two positions filled. And the nursing positions did not receive any votes. Was there a need? Absolutely and there remains a need. If we were in a different circumstance, or we we're talking about a different department where it might be questionable whether the department could truly show the need then I'd say, it's worthy of all of this debate. If biology goes through our existing process needs assessment, which will conclude by the end of this calendar year and it's not at the top or near the top of the priority, then we need to look at our program review priority system. If that position is not going to be filled, no positions are going to be filled until fall of 2016. Our goal is to begin the recruiting process during Spring. I wanted to reiterate what I</p>
--	---

<p>Retirement Vacancies – D. Bastedo (Continued)</p>	<p>believe is important. To retain our focus on our process and not undermine program review because to go back and pull something based on a flow chart that ignores program review is not what I believe is intended by this document.</p> <p>Dave said we made program review part of the rubric and we made this retroactive not to create a precedent that somebody else is going to come forward and say well, you did it over here so you've got to do it here. What we have is a rubric that we approved campus wide that says any retirement positions that successfully went through this should be rehired. We're just following the exact rubric and I know this is a process, but we want to rely on this and this committee and the faculty senate approved the fact that any positions that fell within the last two years before this was approved, should come right into this rubric and if they're successful and make it through, they should be rehired.</p> <p>Joan Murillo said this rubric was effective April, 2015 and we all developed this rubric and we approved it at the Senate and we sent it to College Council and you approved it, and so this isn't meaning to rehire whomever because they retired. It's meant to be a guideline of needs basically. For program review this is basically a flow chart of how to hire faculty or what the need is.</p> <p>Dave said we should either follow this or we should go back and amend it and take off the fact that it says that this was to apply for any positions that fell under the previous two years. As a committee we either need to follow it or we need to amend it.</p> <p>President Fisher asked do we need a motion?</p> <p>Jeremiah said if you want to consider amending or clarification on this, then it should go back to Senate for the October 7 meeting.</p> <p>Celia said if you're going to amend it, can I ask what the amendment will be? Just for clarification, it's working for Senate, it's working for faculty and not for administration?</p> <p>Jeremiah said it would be the removal of the two years retroactive.</p>
--	---

<p>Retirement Vacancies – D. Bastedo (Continued)</p>	<p>President Fisher said hopefully we will have money for new positions and we hire new positions based on the program review list. Am I correct program review chairs, is that how we have operated with our new positions?</p> <p>Kay said yes.</p> <p>President Fisher said Celia mentioned that senate and council agrees, but administration does not. It is here at council to be discussed. Administration's role is to guide the conversation because ultimately administration has to make a decision and that decision should be informed. It's administration putting all of the information on the table with the hope that we can all come to a consensus.</p> <p>Dr. Shabazz said one of my concerns with the two years that are listed is I have never seen an accurate list of what those positions are.</p> <p>Celia said the suggestion to go through to make two retirement positions and place them on top of program review, there's still not going to be money to fund them because the money that's coming in from the state isn't for retirement positions. It's for new positions only.</p> <p>Dave said what we're saying is the positions didn't go away, the money went away so we couldn't hire them back. We could only hire certain people.</p> <p>President Fisher said I'm just emphasizing the importance of program review.</p> <p>Kay said so when we're talking about new positions, all the budget that the BCNs those budget control numbers went away.</p> <p>President Fisher said they're still there and these positions have not been abolished. They're simply not funded and that's true across the board, faculty and classified. I have a list in my office of positions that were abolished in the past long before I was in this role. Someone just decided to do that without further conversation. So they are there, we don't have to create the positions, but they are new in the sense that there's no funding attached to them and they are in a place deeper than just on hold. As a District we decided it isn't appropriate for us to abolish positions on a whim without a conversation. There will be positions abolished but through dialogue and collegial conversation.</p>
--	---

<p>Retirement Vacancies – D. Bastedo (Continued)</p>	<p>Scott said the fall of 2016 and prior to that occurring we're going through a program review process where we're developing the most current need on the campus prior to actually having the money to do something about it.</p> <p>President Fisher asked Jeremiah do we need a motion?</p> <p>Jeremiah said we need to agree to send this to Senate for verification or modification.</p> <p>President Fisher said do we have motion to ask that the rubric be returned to Academic Senate for clarification or modification? Jeremiah entertained a motion to send the rubric back to Academic Senate for clarification or modification. Scott moved. Rick second. No discussion and the group voted as follows:</p> <p>AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Bastedo, Beavor, Ferri-Mulligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Huston, Kinde, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, Subero, Weiss.</p> <p>NOES: None</p> <p>ABSTENTIONS: None</p> <p>ABSENT: Cota, Hunter, Miller.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p> <p>President Fisher said we'll revisit this, I'll put it back on the agenda for the next College Council.</p>
<p>Huddle Request – G. Fisher</p>	<p>President Fisher said that Andre Wooten, the athletics counselor, came to this body after having gone to Academic Senate and received approval for, not technically a program, but a model of providing athletics with special services in a location that is convenient for the athletics there. When it was first presented here I had a number of questions that could not be answered. There were monies built in for paying a stipend to elevate that position to coordinator and what the needs are. It's really no more than taking what he does in bits and pieces here and there and putting it in a location and giving it a name. Nothing more than perhaps a stipend as he goes about putting together what is necessary to ultimately develop a program. He talked to Rick Hrdlicka about some computers that are no longer used, no cost involved, no secretary and occupying an existing space we have on campus near Rick's area. It's basically a classroom where tutoring can take place, and some counseling, and Andre is in agreement with the outline as I have presented it. Dean Cota is reviewing the data to see what a stipend would be necessary and looking at how many hours of backfill may be necessary in</p>

<p>Huddle Request – G. Fisher (Continued)</p>	<p>hiring adjunct counselors. There is money in student 3SP or student equity to pay for the adjunct counselors so this is just a win/win for everyone, particularly our students. Andre Wooten has agreed that if this proves to be successful he will vote it through as a program through our program review process so that we have consistency with the way we bring on new operations.</p> <p>Kay said would this program be housed under counseling?</p> <p>President Fisher said it's housed under counseling, Andre Wooten will be counseling and in addition to that his other duties will be addressed with a stipend.</p> <p>Kay said so, I see it as an activity that's very worthwhile, do all activities have to come to College Council?</p> <p>President Fisher said no, it came here, because it came as something huge that definitely would have College Council's approval because we were talking about a new position, a couple of positions in an entirely different circumstance than the one that I'm presenting now.</p> <p>Kay said so what do you need from this body?</p> <p>President Fisher said I'd like the body to agree or disagree that we should move forward with this. The last time we said we'd bring it back, because it started here, we need to finish here. If it had come here in this present form, we wouldn't be having this conversation.</p> <p>President Fisher asked Rick?</p> <p>Rick said well, I'll make a motion. I recognize that the Huddle will provide a service to our students. Dave Bastedo second.</p> <p>Joan said will the budget remain here, in a cycle from that?</p> <p>President Fisher said there's no budget involved here. It's part of counseling and the only cost that will come out of student services will be under the 3SP monies for additional adjunct faculty so that's existing.</p>
---	---

<p>Huddle Request – G. Fisher (Continued)</p>	<p>No further discussion and the group voted as follows:</p> <p>AYES: Fisher, Gilbert, Bastedo, Beavor, Ferri-Mulligan, Hamdy, Hector, Hrdlicka, Huston, Kinde, Shabazz, Smith, Stark, Subero, Weiss.</p> <p>NOES: None</p> <p>ABSTENTIONS: None</p> <p>ABSENT: Cota, Hunter, Miller.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>
<p>College Council Meeting for October 28, 2015, tentative schedule <u>expanded to</u> 1-3:30 PM – Topic: Education Master Plan (EMP) &amp; Facilities Master Plan (FMP) – G. Fisher</p>	<p>I emphasize the importance of College Council's role. Every voting member of College Council is on the Steering Committee that will work with the facilitators that have been hired to draft the plans. They will be meeting with the Steering Committee which is all of us tentatively on October 28. So, instead of ending at 3:00 we'll end at 3:30 p.m. We will have a built in 1/2 hour 1:00 – 1:30 p.m. so we can address College Council business while this facilitator team can take us through their process. I'm aware of four meetings that are scheduled throughout the eight to eleven months process of getting us to a draft of those plans. So make a note in your Calendar and Dora will send out a reminder just to let you know.</p>
<p>Accreditation and Student Learning Outcomes – C. Huston</p>	<p>Celia said I'm working on the follow-up report, and I'm working with James on a survey to get feedback from the first round which will just be an outline of the steps that have been taken to resolve deficiencies up to this point. Once we get those back we can work out a narrative analysis on how successful it's been.</p>
<p>Educational Master Plan – J. Smith</p>	<p>The Educational Master Plan is moving along when it comes to individual departments. What we do will have to be coordinated with what goes on with the District. We should not underestimate our input into the District Strategic Plan. It is energized by a desire to have much more socialized District decision-making and that part of the perception is that it will reduce competition between the campuses if we see ourselves more as part of a unified district rather than separate and distinct entities. Part of what the consultants need to know is how the people on both campuses view their culture and the vision that they have on the institution within the communities. I think that we will have this data from EMSI and we may want to see how our CTE fits with the needs of the community in a more connected way. They need to see how the campus views them also. Some people felt that neither campus had a policy for looking at discontinuation and liability but Valley absolutely</p>



<p>Educational Master Plan – J. Smith (Continued)</p>	<p>does and has used it. The Educational Master Plan is going to sit under a larger umbrella although at the granular level it will be departments using data to set goals for improvement and at the campus level. We'll try to integrate those into a vision for the campus but it's going to have to fit under a bigger umbrella of the District's goal vision and integrate with all of the components and entities of the District.</p> <p>President Fisher said I will continue to emphasize the importance of us being involved and I don't mean just sitting at the table, I mean having your voice heard and your ideas there to be incorporated into where we stand in this big picture.</p> <p>Scott said the District's strategic plan is broader than what Crafton, Valley and some District people putting together had a plan for. So when I say under the District Strategic Plan it's really the broad strategic plan not the District Office Strategic Plan that we're operating under.</p> <p>James said that's why we need to take the meeting seriously when we come here. So when they come here, you know the whole ground up versus top down, that really requires us to be active.</p> <p>President Fisher said we need to come to the meeting with a list of questions for the facilitators. I will have the advantage of having an opportunity to meet with the facilitators as one of the members of the team, that's just Chancellor's cabinet, and then I'm also a member of this team. I think it's important for us to make certain how they're going to deliver to us information and make sure they understand some of the concerns we have about how this can play out. I felt that in the end with the District Strategic Plan that because we were there, because we participated, we helped to shape that plan. Otherwise, it would have been their plan and we wouldn't have been a part of it. So, we were heard in that way and we'll have to make certain that we continue that kind of deliberateness of including our ideas.</p> <p>James said I'll take your recommendations and there were various discussions back and forth, and sidebars with suggestions and input on how to restructure the Education Master Plan chart.</p>
---	---

<p>Strategic Planning – J. Smith</p>	<p>James said okay, so the next part of this is, should I update this? There were other various discussions and sidebars regarding input and reorganizing the Strategic Planning Chart. James said we'll revisit this one more time.</p> <p>James also said we have the raw data from the feedback on the Mission Statement Survey and will present it. He said we need to discuss what format we want to use.</p>
<p>Program Review – P. Ferri-Milligan</p>	<p>Paula said the process has started. The needs assessment forms went out. We're having our first workshop on Friday. The most notable change was the one to the Technology Committee. The needs assessment is slated for November 6 and November 13 and we'll be meeting in B118. So we'll take the faculty staff positions first and then we'll go from there.</p> <p>President Fisher said to Kay I do see the list of the Program Review Committee members and I recall reading the list and questioning the absence of any student representation on the committee and I saw Paula and we talked briefly about it and apparently whomever is the student appointee, they have not interacted in such a way as to be listed.</p> <p>Paula and Kay said we will be there.</p> <p>President Fisher said you're taking care of that, okay. The other thing I noted in looking at the list of names is I wasn't able to identify counselors or librarians, non-instructional faculty who represent areas in student services. So, who are they if you'll just tell me.</p> <p>Paula said Andee Alsip. She's from Student Health.</p> <p>President Fisher asked what about counselors?</p> <p>Kay said we don't have representatives from every department, we have representatives by division. Because the Senate appoints members to committees, Andee is the representative from Student Services as a division.</p>

<p>Program Review – P. Ferri-Milligan (Continued)</p>	<p>President Fisher said okay, but I will just make the point that the composition of the committee is heavily influenced by instructional faculty. Even more specifically, instruction, not admin services, equally represented, and not student services, equally represented. I'm not stating that I believe we need to take any action now. It's going forward as we look at the committee charge and whatever was appropriately decided by Academic Senate, that's a piece that is not getting incorporated in such a way that we have that representation.</p> <p>Kay said it's through our administrative procedure, that committees are assigned. Jeremiah could take a look at that certainly.</p> <p>Jeremiah said we could focus on that.</p> <p>President Fisher said something to be considered. I'm not saying that you need to change the policy. I just took note of the fact that those areas do not have the same representation.</p> <p>Celia said I remember when there was a lot of representation that came in and voted in blocks.</p> <p>Kay said and that is something that we are trying to reduce because it is a committee that's supposed to have a global add on and they are not advocating for their programs, they are looking at data and making data driven decisions.</p> <p>President Fisher said I just encouraged the Vice Presidents who have designees to pop in occasionally and just be a part of the conversation.</p>
<p>Committee Reports (start at 2:30 p.m.):</p>	<p>Rick said with the Technology Committee our plan is a three year plan because technology changes so fast so we'll be reviewing our plan this year, and we'll have a new plan to the committee by the end of the fiscal year.</p> <p>President Fisher said great, that's excellent. Are we still on a five year rotation?</p> <p>Rick said we are on a five year rotation.</p> <p>President Fisher asked is there a plan to perhaps change that rotation? Is that under discussion?</p> <p>Rick said no. Just that, but that takes budget.</p>

<p>Committee Reports (start at 2:30 p.m.): (Continued)</p>	<p>President Fisher said it's morphing into something more each time we renew, its more new, but at the same is it more reliable with a longer life in terms of functionality?</p> <p>Rick said I don't think we could extend it past the five years.</p> <p>President Fisher said so that seems like the limit. About five years. I know we're on the rotation, I know that it's a solid budget for the rotation District wide.</p> <p>Rick said there are some changes that are going to impact the department that keep coming. Microsoft just announced that they're using 2016. It looks like they're going to go into a mode like what Adobe is doing, where every year they're going to release a new version. If they're going to release new versions every year, that puts quite a load on our staff to keep everybody up to date. So I don't know how we're going to deal with technology's pace that is starting to move on.</p> <p>President Fisher asked anything else?</p> <p>Scott said I've got a Budget Committee Report. Last week the Budget Committee voted on the fund balance. We got a little over a \$3M fund balance projected for this year. It's all projection. They made the recommendation that the entire fund balance be available to this committee for our decision on program review, urgent emerging needs and all the things we that we might use one time monies for. So, that was the big thing that came out of Budget Committee last week.</p> <p>President Fisher said we should applaud Budget Committee for giving us that latitude to make decisions about the entire fund balance. We'll talk more about the multi-year budget projections and what we project will be the impact on the fund balance as we go through 2017-18 etcetera. At least we as a committee can make some decisions once we get that program review listing out and what we want to do. This is also a good way for us to approach it in College Council, to look at a stated sum of money, dollars, to look at this year's program review list and make allocations that can hopefully be distributed by November so people could have a little money for Spring. Otherwise, this program review list that's coming forward from program</p>
--	--

<p>Committee Reports (start at 2:30 p.m.): (Continued)</p>	<p>review is for 2015-16. We'll talk about it in Cabinet once we look at some hard numbers and then come to you with what it's looking like and looking at this year's program review list.</p> <p>Jeremiah said it's one time monies. So it's not something for hiring of full time positions or faculty because that would be ongoing so we're talking about a one time thing so we can bolster some of our budgets to get some of the equipment and some of the other things that we need.</p> <p>President Fisher said the things that we do without or have done without. Anything else?</p> <p>Rania said what is the process if there's a need like in my building where we need extra benches.</p> <p>Scott said that is something that could be brought up with the Facilities and Safety Committee and if there's funding available for it, it's the Facilities and Safety Committee and then it can be implemented. If there's no funding attached to it, then it's Facilities and Safety Committee in an urgent emerging need request to this body right here.</p> <p>President Fisher said because it wouldn't be on the program review list, we go to that, and that's why we wouldn't allocate all of the money for program review. We could spend 10 times the amount we have in our fund balance so there needs to be money set aside for those emerging and emergency needs such as that which you would bring through the process and you have the forms and we've done that and you're familiar with that process.</p> <p>Kay said so how do we request campus wide benches, or chairs, or seating outside those classroom areas? There should be a way so it's not coming from an individual for a building but campus wide we need seating outside the classrooms.</p> <p>President Fisher said it would be an emerging funding need, it's one time. We just need to identify the locations, get an estimate of the cost.</p> <p>Kay said so who initiates that?</p>
--	--

Committee Reports (start at 2:30 p.m.): (Continued)	<p>President Fisher said whoever has the need. Talk to your colleagues in your building and ask them if they have needs. Anyone of you can bring the request forward. It's a collective process, this is what we need for North Hall. I'm looking at this as what we need for seating areas for students on this campus but if we don't know where, we'll have no idea of how much.</p> <p>Dave said we can start with a campus initiative to do this and then let people feed into that. See where the needs are and collect all the needs.</p> <p>Scott: We could do that through Facilities and Safety and then bring it to this body for further process.</p>
<b>OTHER:</b>	
Adjournment:	Meeting adjourned at 2:58 p.m.
<p>Next College Council Meeting: October 14, 2015          Academic Year 15-16 (bi-monthly, 2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesdays from 1-3 PM)          10-28/15  <del>11-11-15/11-25-15</del>  <del>12-09/15/12-23-15</del>          01-13-16/01-27-16          02-10-16/02-24-16          03-09-16/03-23-16          04-13-16/04-27-16  <del>05-11/16/05-25-16</del></p>	