

Governing Board Meeting Minutes (Tuesday, February 28, 2017)

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Information: 1. 5:30 p.m. - The Meeting will be called to order at the District Board Room, 40 South Market Street, San Jose, CA 95113

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

Board members present:

- Ms. Mayra Cruz
- Ms. Wendy Ho
- Dr. Jeffrey Lease
- Mr. Craig Mann
- Mr. Rudy Nasol
- Ms. Huong Nguyen
- Mr. Scott Pham

Information: 2. Information on Public Comments and Disability Access

Information on public comments and disability access was provided in the board agenda packet.

B. APPROVAL OF CLOSED SESSION

Action: 1. Approval of Closed Session Agenda

M/S/C (Nguyen/Lease) to approve the Closed Session agenda as submitted.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON CLOSED SESSION AGENDA

Information: 1. Public Comments on the Closed Session Agenda

There were no public comments.

D. CLOSED SESSION ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Information: 1. The Board will recess to Closed Session at 5:30 p.m. to consider the following items:

The Board recessed to Closed Session to consider the following items:

PUBLIC EMPLOYEE APPOINTMENT/EMPLOYMENT
(Government Code Section 54957 (b))
Title: Dean

CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS
(Government Code Section 54957.6)
District's Negotiator(s): Kim Garcia
Employee Organization: CSEA

CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS

(Government Code Section 54957.6)

District's Negotiator(s): Kim Garcia

Employee Organization: AFT 6157

CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS

(Government Code Section 54957.6)

District's Negotiator(s): Kim Garcia

Unrepresented Employees: M/S/C

E. RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION

Procedural: 1. 6:00 P.M. - Pledge of Allegiance

Ms. Joy Pace, Board Clerk, led the Board and members of the audience into the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Action: 2. Adoption of the Agenda

M/S/C (Lease/Ho) to adopt the agenda as submitted.

Board vote was as follows:

Trustees Cruz, Ho, Lease, Mann, Nasol, Nguyen and Pham voted yes.

Information: 3. Announcement of Reportable Action Taken in Closed Session

There were no reportable actions.

Information: 4. Public Comments on Matters not on the Agenda

Dr. Calvin Gill, community member, announced the launch of an app called Courtesy app, which is an open resource designed to help students and local community members. He encouraged both colleges to download the app. We have so many local and on-line businesses included, and this app is designed to encourage students to focus on studies. He would love to work with our colleges.

President Mann stated he will charge the Chancellor to refer him to the right person at the district.

Information: 5. Announcement of Board Outreach Committee Appointments

President Mann reported that Trustees Cruz, Ho and Nguyen have been appointed to the Board Outreach Committee. When they meet, they will choose a committee chair and develop a committee charge. Vice Chancellor Smith and his team will provide assistance in scheduling meetings and providing administrative support.

Action, Minutes: 6. February 14, 2017, Governing Board Meeting Minutes

M/S/C (Lease/Pham) to approve the above listed minutes.

Board vote was as follows:

Trustees Cruz, Ho, Lease, Mann, Nasol, Nguyen and Pham voted yes.

F. CONSENT AGENDA

Action (Consent): 1. Adoption of the Consent Agenda

Hearing no requests to pull any items, President Mann stated the Consent Agenda was approved by general consent.

Action (Consent): 2. Management Personnel Actions

The Board approved the Management personnel actions as submitted.

Action (Consent): 3. Supervisory-Confidential Personnel Actions

The Board approved the Supervisory-Confidential Personnel Actions as submitted.

Action (Consent): 4. Faculty Personnel Actions - Regular

The Board approved the Faculty personnel actions as submitted.

Action (Consent): 5. Classified Personnel Actions

The Board approved the Classified Personnel Actions as submitted.

Action (Consent): 6. Hourly, Student Work & Volunteer Personnel Actions

The Board approved the Short-Term Hourly, Substitute, Professional Expert & Athletic Support Services, Student Assistant and Volunteer personnel actions as submitted.

Action (Consent): 7. Board Policies for Approval

The Board approved Board Policies 5220, 6300, 7310.

Action (Consent): 8. Bay Area Shared Regional ICCT Lab (BACCC NETLAB+) Memorandum of Understanding, Between Cabrillo College, the physical and fiscal host institution of the Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC), Participating Colleges, and Evergreen Valley College

The Board approved the Bay Area Shared Regional ICCT Lab (BACCC NETLAB+) Memorandum of Understanding, Between Cabrillo College, the physical and fiscal host institution of the Bay Area Community College Consortium (BACCC), Participating Colleges, and Evergreen Valley College.

Action (Consent): 9. Agreement Renewal between Saint Louise Regional Hospital and San Jose Evergreen Community College District for Evergreen Valley College Nursing Students' Clinical Experience

The Board approved the agreement renewal between Saint Louise Regional Hospital and San Jose Evergreen Community College District for Evergreen Valley College nursing students' clinical experience.

Action (Consent): 10. Curriculum Recommendation for Evergreen Valley College

The Board approved the curriculum recommendation for a new course submitted by Evergreen Valley College.

Action (Consent): 11. Memorandum of Understanding between SJCC and East Side Union High School District

The Board approved the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between San Jose Evergreen Community College District (on behalf of SJCC International Student Program) and East Side Union High School District.

Action (Consent): 12. Memorandum of Agreement between SJCC and Oversea Educational Agency

The Board approved the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between San Jose Evergreen Community College (on behalf of SJCC) and Institution Kazakh-British Study Center M&K.

Action (Consent): 13. Memorandum of Understanding between SJECCD and Milpitas Unified School District

The Board approved the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between San Jose Evergreen Community College District and Milpitas Unified School District.

Action (Consent): 14. Measure G-2004/Measure G-2010/Measure X Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee Appointments

The Board approved the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee applicants to a first term.

G. GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROGRAMS CONSENT AGENDA

Action (Consent): 1. Adoption of the General Obligation Bond Programs Consent Agenda

Hearing no requests to pull any items, President Mann stated the General Obligation Bond Programs Consent Agenda was adopted by general consent.

Action (Consent): 2. Measure G-2010 Bond Program: Evergreen Valley College Signage & Wayfinding Project #32121 - A Good Sign and Graphics Co. Deductive Change Order No. 002

The Board approved the Deductive Change Order No. 002 in the amount of \$(22,769.00) to A Good Sign and Graphics Co. for the Signage & Wayfinding Project #32121 at Evergreen Valley College.

Action (Consent): 3. Measure G - 2004 Bond Program: San Jose-Evergreen Community College Extension Project #309 McCarthy Building Companies, Inc. Change Order No. 007

The Board approved Change Order No. 007 in the amount of \$88,792.00 to McCarthy Building Companies, Inc. for the San Jose-Evergreen Community College Extension Project #309.

Action (Consent): 4. Measure G –2010 Bond Program: San Jose City College (SJCC) New Gym Sitework and Auxiliary Services Buildings Project #31125 Testing & Inspection Services - Smith-Emery of San Francisco, Independent Contractor Agreement (ICA)

The Board approved an Independent Contractor Agreement (ICA) in the amount of \$90,000.00 to Smith-Emery of San Francisco, (ICA) for the additional Testing & Inspection Services to the New Gym Sitework and Auxiliary Buildings Project #31125 at San Jose City College (SJCC).

H. ACTION AGENDA

Action: 1. Measure G-2010 Bond Program: Bond List Revision No. 30

EVC Student Trustee Bethel Kim joined the meeting.

Vice Chancellor Smith stated the revisions in the bond list include a distribution of election and EIR costs, which will be distributed across the projects.

M/S/C (Ho/Cruz) to approve the revisions to the Measure G - 2010 bond list, as presented.

Board vote was as follows:

Trustees Cruz, Ho, Lease, Mann, Nasol, Nguyen and Pham voted yes.

Advisory vote was as follows:

Student Trustee Kim voted yes.

Action, Presentation: 2. Budget Study Session

Vice Chancellor Smith reviewed the district's current financial picture. He reported the FY2016-17 ending fund balance is \$15.7 million. He reviewed the major assumptions, including ongoing property taxes, health premiums for Blue Cross and Kaiser and statutory premiums of STRS and PERS. He provided an overview of the major categorical programs as to where we were five years ago and where we are today. He showed a graphic portrayal of the ending fund balance and a chart of how the district's ending fund balance compares to other Bay 10 and basic aid districts. He stated the property tax history chart shows property tax revenue has increased almost every fiscal year.

Mr. Smith reviewed the development process for the Resource Allocation Model, the composition of the RAM committee, and the 2016 and 2017 RAM meetings schedule. We are working hard on this process, and people are showing up for the meetings and are very engaged. He discussed examples of brainstorming key issues. Mr. Smith discussed how the committee has reviewed the budget principles being presented to the Board at the meeting.

Trustee Cruz inquired about the categorical programs and grants that both colleges received and if there was a purpose for showing these particular funds. She also noticed the RAM committee had great membership but expressed concern that there are no student leaders included in the committee. Mr. Smith stated the composition of the committee was developed in consultation with the Academic Senate. Trustee Cruz expressed appreciation that part of what is being done is to brainstorm key issues. She recommended the committee brainstorm those questions that would get folks involved in seeing issues through the equity lens. How do I look at the RAM through an equity lens? It would be great to search across the state to see if anyone has developed a RAM through an equity lens. We continue to ask ourselves about how racial and ethnic groups are impacted. We have noticed over the past couple of years that a lot of you in your planning processes are considering the ends policies. It's important for the RAM model to also incorporate and advance the ends policies.

Trustee Ho appreciated hearing about the RAM processes. At what point would the Board be allowed to add their perspective to the RAM because as fiscal stewards of this district, it's important for the Board to add its voice at key junctures. Trustee Nguyen inquired how the answers to those questions lead to how we serve students. Mr. Smith answered that we are still a little early in the process. Last week the RAM subcommittee worked on the CTE analysis and how we have outcome measures such as increased graduation rates. We will present this information to the Board with the consultant. Mr. Smith stated he will introduce components of the RAM as we have them and plug them in as modules. Perhaps it will be a future Board workshop that engages the Board in a major way.

SJCC Academic Senate Covarrubias stated his concerns about listing the categorical programs as a funding opportunity since those funds are already allocated. He is not sure why it's critical to have those slides in this presentation. The RAM subcommittee is a labor-intensive committee. One thing we could do to not have students involved in every meeting but have presentations given to the ASG and student committees. He supports the idea of adding an equity based approach. AFT Executive Director Hanfling stated we are doing really well on a lot of fronts along with serving our students and having programs. We are \$30 million as a basic aid district over apportionment. We have a healthy reserve and are at the statewide average for basic aid. She discussed how the cost of living has gone up over 40% in the Silicon Valley over the last several years. She hoped that money was available for a much-needed COLA.

Vice Chancellor Smith reviewed the budget principles, which he requested the Board approve at this meeting.

Trustee Cruz recommended for Principle #1 changing the word "validate" to "affirm". The Board agreed to that revision.

Trustee Cruz stated Principle #8 is an existing board policy and shouldn't be a budget principles - decision was to add "consistent with board policies" to this principle.

Trustee Cruz stated regarding Principle #9 letter "e" that she is looking at it through an equity lens. She inquired how the amount of \$5 million was validated and if the decision has an impact on eliminating the opportunity and equity gap and how it advances the ends process. Mr. Smith answered that his job is to guide the district fiscally. He knows the history of the district and what the economic downturn did to this district. At that time the Governor recommended a rainy day fund. What goes up does come down. His interest is to protect the organization but not at the cost of lowering student programs and the quality of those programs. Trustee Lease stated he didn't see \$5 million as a high cap, especially since it will take 10 years to get there. There needs to be a little more discussion about what number would be reasonable. It will take us a while to get there anyway. Trustee Nasol recommended cutting the amount in half. Accessing the cap also requires Board approval. It will take us about 5 years to get to \$2.5 million.

Vice Chancellor Garcia stated that when we have bad times, so does the state. The major categorical programs will see a vast reduction. The \$5 million would allow us to keep those programs in place and will protect the programs that are really good for our students. Mr. Covarrubias stated the point was how did we arrive at the \$5 million and that question has not been adequately addressed. In the event of the sky has fallen scenario, how do we then prioritize? Ms. Hanfling reported that in a previous meeting, Trustee Mann stated the compromise which was not included in this presentation. The \$5 million stabilization fund is Mr. Smith's number. It will give us up to 12% reserve, and she thinks that is way too high. Ms. Hanfling stated that there are zero funds available at the negotiation table but yet we have \$500K available for a rainy day fund.

The Board agreed to change Principle #9e from \$5 million to \$2.5 million.

Trustee Ho recommended the Board discuss the future of the S.O.A.R. program stated in Principle #14. Trustee Lease stated at some point we may want an ad hoc committee to discuss these funds. EVC Academic Senate President Narveson read out an Academic Senate resolution regarding Budget Principle #14. Trustee Cruz recommended removing Principle #14. Trustee Lease stated that having the principle is OK because the Board has already approved that, but the second half of the statement needs work.

The Board agreed to remove the added language in yellow on Budget Principle #14.

Trustee Ho stated that Budget Principle #16 is not actually a budget principle but just something the district is

doing. Board agreed to delete this principle.

M/S/C (Ho/Cruz) to approve budget principles with the revisions discussed at the meeting.

Board vote was as follows:

Trustees Cruz, Ho, Lease, Mann, Nasol, and Nguyen voted yes.

Trustee Pham voted no.

Advisory vote was as follows:

Student Trustee Kim voted yes.

I. INFORMATION AGENDA - PRESENTATIONS, DISCUSSION ITEMS AND DOCUMENTS PROVIDED

Information: 1. FY2016/2017 Second Quarter Budget Report Ending December 31, 2016

Vice Chancellor Smith stated the 2nd quarter budget report was attached for information. No additional report was provided.

Presentation, Information: 2. Board Ends Policies Monitoring Report - Institutional Excellence and College Experience

Vice Chancellor Seaberry stated the Board would receive a report this evening on the College Experience and Institutional Excellence ends policies, although we won't be able to give you an actual measure at this time, but will focus on one measure for Institutional Effectiveness and two measures for College Excellence. The ends policies will be looked out more thoroughly during the Board's upcoming retreat.

Dr. Karolyn van Putten thanked Vice Chancellor Seaberry and IESS staff members, Ronald Lopez Garcia and Celina Gallegos, for their contributions to the presentation. She stated that the marker for progress on both ends policy dashboards is set at TBD because we are currently using different metrics than previous reports. Dr. van Putten reviewed the College Experience definition and metrics. She stated the two metrics used for this presentation are metric #3 and #5, both of which are based on results of the 2016 administration of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) conducted last spring. This data is relevant for making changes that would effect outcomes for our current student population.

Dr. van Putten continued her presentation by providing background information on the CCSSE survey and how it has multiple uses, and the focus of this presentation would be on its use as a benchmarking tool. The most valuable use of benchmarks is to see an individual college's deviation from the mean, and the standardized score provides an easy way to assess whether or not an individual college is performing above or below the mean (50) on each benchmark. For a breakout by student enrollment status, full-time students score higher on all benchmarks by as much as almost 12 percentage points. SJCC is notably higher than relevant cohorts for large colleges in Active and Collaborative Learning and Support for Learners and in comparison with Bay 10 colleges, SJCC ranks higher in Student Effort and Support for Learners. She reviewed the breakout by ethnicity results and stated we don't know who the "Other" is and why respondents would select that option. The benchmark results for males and females indicate the females are outperforming the males. For EVC, we also see that full-time students score higher on all benchmarks by as much as almost 10 percentage points. Dr. van Putten showed a chart highlighting EVC's performance where it is outperforming either large colleges or Bay 10 colleges; i.e. Support for Learners, Student-Faculty Interaction and Student Effort. The remaining benchmarks are relatively equal. In her review of ethnicity based results, she noted the results for White, non-Hispanic students were lower than all students. The meaning of these results is yet to be determined. She also noted the areas of improvement needed for Hispanic, Latino and Spanish students, especially in the areas

of Active and Collaborative Learning and Student Effort. And similar to SJCC, female students rule!

Dr. van Putten provided a definition of Institutional Excellence ends policy. She focused on the Institutional Learning Outcomes metrics. She reported that in 2016, in preparation for the accreditation visit, EVC decided to use the CCSSE to assess all five of its ILOs, in addition to the usual benchmarking data reviewed previously. On a scoring scale of 1 to 4, EVC averages below 2.5, and EVC uses this scoring to determine areas for improvement. Although there are a few additional places where some intervention would be appropriate, the primary conclusion, supported by all disaggregated data is the need for more learning opportunities and interventions that will demonstrate or better prepare students to contribute to the welfare of their communities. SJCC's ILOs are similar to EVC's although there are some distinct differences, primarily the inclusion of Technology and Aesthetics/Creativity. The college adopted the term "General Education" SLO as that "common core of knowledge consistent with a liberally educated or literate citizen." Each semester the college assesses one GE SLO using a survey administered to students near the end of their programs of study. In the area of communication ratings, 50% of students responded "very effective" closer to graduation. Dr. van Putten ended her presentation by stating the importance of the Board to revisit their ends policies and associated metrics in coordination with strategic planning.

Trustee Cruz stated that Assessment of Communication is interesting because this particular example notices where the student was when they first came in and their confidence they felt in communication upon completing their program. The ILO seems a little bit different for both colleges. For the EVC college desegregated by age and gender, it was interesting to see that this would be the one that would be lower in score, especially since at EVC where they have been working for a number of years in providing service learning opportunities for our students. This is one of the areas that we must be alerted to how much more important it is that our students continue to develop competencies. She hopes the review of this data is an opportunity for the colleges to look at this area. Is it time for a more concerted effort in civic and community engagement? In some instances we see a negative figure and this particular benchmark is different for White students. If the colleges have seen the information, what meaning did they make of this particular data?

Vice Chancellor Smith announced the Chancellor will be holding a leadership meeting to review some of this data.

Trustee Nguyen inquired what we are prioritizing to get that fixed. She would like to see what specific things the colleges are doing to bring that number up. Vice Chancellor Smith stated the confluence of resources, outcomes and colleges' independence help move the needle. We hope the results are improved. Trustee Ho was curious about the response rate of SJCC, which is 4%. Is this really an accurate picture of the assessment of this particular indicator? What processes are in place for the IESS to provide an example that is more meaningful and more adequately represents the students. A 4% response rate tells her nothing.

Dr. Seaberry stated that each college has an institutional effectiveness committee to discuss this data, and they have a lot of different metrics they are looking at as well.

Mr. Mark Gonzalez agreed the sample size is only 4%, and we should go back to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC). This is good information to take back to the IEC, especially on the problematic one.

J. BOARD MEETING EVALUATION

Discussion: 1. Board of Trustees to Discuss Board Meeting Performance

Trustee Lease stated it was good that Board members and constituents to weigh in on the budget. Trustee Ho

stated the monitoring reports are a good way for us to assess how we are moving the needle towards student success.

K. CONTINUATION OF CLOSED SESSION (If needed)

L. RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION

Information: 1. Announcement of Action Taken in Closed Session

M. ADJOURNMENT

Information: 1. The meeting will be adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Dr. Deborah Budd, Board Secretary

