

SJECED DISTRICT COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 17, 2018
3:00—5:00 p.m.

SJCC – Technology Building Rm. T112

Attendees:

D. Budd (Chancellor), D. Smith (Vice Chancellor), B. Seaberry (Vice Chancellor), K. Garcia (Vice Chancellor)
K. Aytch (EVC President), B. D. Clift Breland (SJCC President)
J. Bills (AFT 6157), P. Fong (AFT 6157), J. Covarrubias (SJCC Academic Senate President), E. Narveson (EVC Academic Senate), S. Graham (EVC Academic Affairs), D. Hawkins (CSEA 363), Faustino Villa (CSEA 363), S. Alvarez (CSEA 363), A. Lopez, (CSEA), A. Herrera (MSC), A. Tanon (MSC), W. Watson (CEM), J. LeDee (CSEA)

Other Attendees:

A. van Ommeren, L. Owen, J. Pace, R. Brown, S. Brusseau

Absent:

D. Micetich (EVC College Council)
F. Gonzalez (DO Academic Senate President)
L. Harris (SJCC College Council)
EVC and SJCC Student Government

D. Budd commented on the great improvements made in terms of membership, committee charge, and the district-wide voice that attends this meeting. D. Budd highlighted the importance of continual focus on board ends policies, strategic priorities, and board policies and administrative procedures.

1. Review of the Agenda:

- a. Dr. Budd reviewed the agenda. No additional items were added to the agenda.

2. Approval of April 19, 2018 Meeting Minutes:

- a. M/S/C (Narveson/Hawkins) to approve the meeting minutes as presented.

3. College Highlights/Guided Pathways Update:

- a. EVC:
 - i. Guided Pathways: K. Aytch reported that EVC has established a workgroup and had Guided Pathways consultant, Rob Johnstone, present at PDD. EVC submitted its two-year work plan and received word from the State Chancellor's Office that it was approved. We will continue to address this work plan and integrate it into our strategic plan.
 - ii. San Jose Promise: K. Aytch reported that EVC has added 250 more students to the program and thus far is going very well. We are projecting to meet our numbers of approximately 300.
 - iii. Strategic Planning: EVC has partnered with Cambridge West who met with faculty, staff, students and administrators on May 4th. They will return on July 7 to present again with a goal of presenting in a workshop format for fall PDD.
- b. SJCC:
 - i. Guided Pathways: B. Breland reported that SJCC broke their groups down by classified, management and faculty. These groups will be going through orientation sessions this week to discuss the delineation of work. SJCC's plan was also approved by the State Chancellor's Office. SJCC has spent a lot of time bringing people up to speed in terms of what Guided Pathways is and is not, and how we can be successful at implementation and mapping. Rob Johnstone will be back for another visit in early June.
 - ii. San Jose Promise: B. Breland reported that of 500 applicants 212 are committed to the program, with 150 being accepted into the summer bridge program. Robert Gutierrez,

Beverly Stuart and Teresa Paiz have done great work with the summer bridge and guided pathways.

- iii. Strategic Planning: B. Breland reported that the contract was not approved by our previous consultant. SJCC is now looking at partnering with Cambridge West to stay on track with this project timeline.
- c. D. Budd reminded the group of the goal to update the campus strategic plans in line with the updated district strategic priorities.
- d. D. Budd highlighted the enrollment reports and noted that overall the district is up 4% in headcount for spring of 2018 and up 6% in FTES. D. Budd reminded the group that we need to have a way to provide weekly updates, which we are working on. Overall, there is great, collaborative work going on at each the campuses.

4. Assembly Bills:

- a. AB-19 – Requirements:
 - i. B. Breland reminded the group that AB 19 was approved; however, there was not a guarantee of funding. After the May Revise, it was reported that there are additional funds available (\$3.8M). Some of this funding will go towards colleges implementing AB 19 as long as those colleges are following a certain set of requirements: 1. Guided Pathways, 2. Maximizing the use of financial aid, 3. dual enrollment, and participation in AB 705. We are on the right track, but we need to review to make sure we are doing exactly what we should be doing to ensure we receive some of that available funding.
 - ii. D. Budd reminded the group that non-basic aid districts get to keep those enrollment fees; however, as a basic aid district we do not receive those funds. D. Budd further reminded that it is important to remember that if students are signing up as full-time students in the fall, they could be enrolled as promise students.
- b. AB 705 – Summer Plans:
 - i. D. Budd reported that those Board Members who attended the recent CCLC conference were made very well aware of AB 705. D. Budd thanked the Academic Senate for continually reminding us that we need to get ahead of AB 705. The Board will receive presentations from each of the colleges at the next Board meeting.
 - ii. B. Breland reported that the Chancellor has been calling together leadership teams to work on the plan in terms of getting ready for AB 705. B. Breland noted that we will plan a retreat this summer in terms of the different levels and what we can do differently. B. Breland highlighted the need for this work as we continue our mission of student success, and work to move away from institutional racism. Those students that continue not to succeed, continue to be students from underrepresented and/or marginalized populations. We need to be smarter, more intentional and focused.

5. May Revise:

- a. D. Smith reminded the group that the State has been heavily focused on the Funding Formula and Online College over the past year.
 - i. Proposition 98 - Distributed to K-12 and CCC systems. Typically, SJECCD receives 11% of this split.
 - ii. Apportionment - In January, the Budget increased the COLA to \$161.2M or 2.51 percent. The May revise has increased that number by \$11.9M or 2.71 percent. Please note, this does not apply to us as a Basic Aid district.
 - iii. Online College - After extensive input from leadership and all constituent groups in the system, the State has created a more focused framework as to how this program will be implemented with the checks and balances of our shared governance system.
 - iv. Deferred Maintenance - Reduced from \$275.2M to \$131.7M, with approximately \$1.4M.
 - v. Capital Outlay - This item speaks to districts that have not passed a local bond that have facility needs. SJECCD, at this time, does not participate in this State funding for Structures due to the strong local support of our bonds.
 - vi. California Promise - AB19 - State will be distributing \$46M. D. Smith noted that SJECCD would receive roughly \$500k.
 - vii. Financial Aid - The May revise adds \$13.5M one-time funds and \$5M ongoing for implementation.

- viii. Cost of Living - The May Revise adds a total of \$581k for COLA.
- ix. Lottery - Based on an ADA basis, which SJECCD participates in on an FTES basis.
- x. Mandated Block Grant - This is unrelated to our Basic Aid Status and we received approximately \$400k.
- xi. Open Educational Resources - The May Revise adds \$6M in ongoing funding.
- xii. Adult Education – W. Watson noted that we have been working on adding some policy language related to immigrant integration framework, however, this portion was cut in the May Revise. We, just today, received word that the Department of Finance will endorse the eight criteria as policy language, not in the budget.
 - 1. What this means for our District: SJECCD in partnership with Allies is leading the charge throughout the State of CA through these consortia to make this work. There is a real opportunity for us to do some great work.
 - 2. There is currently no funding for these data requirements. The first step would be to get these eight required criteria in place now, which will require all Adult Ed throughout California to report on that data, thus creating a need for the State to provide funding for those requirements.
 - 3. Allies, in collaboration with Adult Ed, has created an integration framework that is proving to be an influencer across the state to improve the way organizations respond to immigrant integration.
 - 4. CEM would be partnering with Allies, who will be on-site with CEM. W. Watson has been invited to serve on their Board.
- xiii. Strong Workforce: May Revise adds \$2M to the base.
 - 1. W. Watson noted that this is an additional project through K-12, not the Community College System.
- xiv. Funding Formula: D. Smith called attention to the May Revise update changing the Formula Split from 50/25/25 to 60/20/20 Split which consists of FTES/Needs Based/Performance Based.
 - 1. D. Budd clarified that the current SJECCD resource allocation model shows 69% distributed based on FTES.
 - 2. B. Breland noted that our district is in a very fortunate place, and we are looking at a turning point over the next two years.
 - 3. D. Budd noted that the SJECCD RAM has adopted a 3-year rolling average, which is the same rolling average that the State has chosen to adopt.

6. Board Policies & Administrative Procedures:

- a. D. Budd thanked Lisa Owen for all of her work on the BPs and APs over the last year and announced that Joy Pace will take on this responsibility in the new academic year. D. Budd further thanked the Academic Senates for their great work over the last year to keep all of these moving.
 - i. Packet A:
 - 1. AP 4020:
 - a. Passed by the SJCC Academic Senate; currently with EVC Academic Senate for its first reading, and will be placed on EVC's first fall meeting for action.
 - b. J. Covarrubias reminded the group that the District Senate cannot act on an AP or BP until both College Academic Senates have passed an item.
 - 2. BP7250:
 - a. Passed by the SJCC Academic Senate.
 - b. Did not pass EVC Academic Senate and will be held for discussion until fall due to questions.
 - 3. AP 4055:
 - a. Passed by EVC Academic Senate.
 - b. Passed by SJCC Academic Senate.
 - c. B. Breland asked why the word articulation was removed from the language.

1. E. Narveson noted that articulation was changed to agreement as we have articulation agreements with colleges but not high schools, as high school courses are not the same as ours, thus we enter into agreements with high schools.
4. AP 5030:
 - a. L. Owen provided a copy of the actual Education Code in terms of what we are required to provide. This language is already included in our AP.
 - b. D. Budd reminded the group that as we implement our land-lease, some of those funds should go to pay these types of fees in the future.
 - c. The group agreed to remove all language beginning with the green language and then implement an ad hoc committee (student services, health services, admissions & records) in the fall to review the fee structure to then update the AP within the first two meetings of the year.
 - d. L. Owen called for a vote to approve that we are keeping all language above the green listed in AP 5030, and approve the AP with this language.
 - e. M/S/C (Aytch/Narveson) to approve.
- ii. Packet B:
 1. L. Owen called for a vote to approve Packet B as is.
 - a. M/S/C (Aytch/Narveson) to approve packet B as is.
- iii. Packet C:
 1. L. Owen noted that Packet C consists of those small changes and updates provided by CCLC.
 2. L. Owen reported that some of chapter 5 will rollover into the new academic year, as some of the committees were not able to review items.
 3. The committee agreed to review these items during the summer and place these on the agenda for the fall.
7. **District Council Survey:**
 - a. A. van Ommeren reported that the highest and most positive response was that the charge and agenda items are consistent and in line with the charge of the committee, with the lowest response level around the question related to the committee members adequately communicating back to the constituency groups.
 - b. A. van Ommeren noted that overall there is a theme of creating better communications district-wide.
 - c. D. Budd noted that ideally we could tie this survey with those other surveys across the district (college council, district council, academic senate, etc.).
8. **District Technology Planning Group:**
 - a. B. Seaberry reminded the group that the question was raised as to if the District Technology Planning Group should be changed to a Committee rather than a Group.
 - b. K. Garcia cautioned in terms of number 2 of the charge and the need to have a direct line of communication back to the various constituency groups. How will these individuals connect with those that are affected by those projects?
 - c. B. Seaberry noted that one way includes the college tech committee chairs, which do sit on the district wide group, and those individuals are tasked with reporting. Additionally, having cross-constituency on the group, those constituencies do receive feedback on the priorities.
 - d. B. Seaberry further noted that the priority is to ensure alignment with the district and college technology plans. B. Seaberry added that in terms of constituency participation, each year, each of the constituency groups are asked for who they would like to serve on this group.
 - e. D. Budd called for a motion to make this group a committee.
 - i. M/S/C (Smith/Aytch) to approve the change from District Technology Planning Group to District Technology Planning Committee.
9. **RAM Highlights:**
 - a. E. Narveson reported that the Resource Allocation Model Taskforce is in recess until September 14. The committee felt this was a good time to recess as the change in leadership and possible

membership approach. The Co-Chairs of RAM plan to meet with out-going Chancellor Budd and incoming Interim Chancellor Breland for input before the RAM reconvenes in the fall.

- b. Percentages discussed at the last RAM meeting have not yet been approved and will continue to be discussed. Additional discussions have consisted of how we can differ the entities through FTES, incorporate strategic priorities and ends policies, revisit the goal and purpose of the taskforce, how we can define equity within the RAM, etc.
- c. The RAM is hopeful that it can complete its work by the end of the calendar year.
- d. B. Breland asked why we are not done with the RAM process. Is it due to membership changes, lack of resources, etc.?
 - i. J. Covarrubias noted that the RAM meetings began with a lack of focus and a zero-sum perspective, which quickly evolved into a lack of good faith in working with one another.
 - ii. B. Breland noted that many districts have struggled in dealing with these same issues and reminded the group that we are still very new to basic aid and the navigation of that. B. Breland further highlighted the fact that the State is implementing a hold-harmless clause much like our district. This will hopefully, allow guards to be dropped a bit in an effort to focus more on student success.
 - iii. E. Narveson noted that one of the challenges has been that we are trying to manage a RAM that includes two colleges that are virtually the same size, which makes the balance and ratio challenging. There are not many districts in this situation. Additionally, there were a lot of issues being laid out on the table in the beginning. We have gotten through most of that now and we are now in a good place to move forward.
 - iv. B. Breland agreed and is hopeful that the group is ready to move forward with concrete timelines, etc., and reminded the group that as a basic aid district, we are in a very good place. Our neighboring districts are looking at potentially huge budget cuts.
 - v. D. Hawkins asked if the RAM has yet to define what “Total Cost of Ownership” means to our district.
 1. E. Narveson called attention to the parking lot portion of the documents provided and noted that the group agreed to come back to that item in the future.
 - vi. D. Smith noted that a big fundamental overall might be fear and distrust. It is the RAM’s job to navigate how we can make all things equal with the nature of all programs and students different at each site. We have had very good continuity, and are hopeful that with the State turning to a hold-harmless model, this will help the RAM Taskforce move forward with a little less of this fear. D. Smith further noted that he is hopeful with a structured deadline, and time for the group to refresh will serve us all well.
 - vii. J. Covarrubias noted that the core issue is that the colleges are being held accountable (program reviews, etc.), and we all feel that the district should be held accountable as well. Additionally, there is an issue with where the lines fall in the votes in terms of favoring one college over another. Restructuring the RAM may be one of the initial steps to take as we regroup.
 - viii. D. Budd thanked the group for all of the great work and dedication from all participants.

10. Committee Reports:

- a. District Budget Committee:
 - i. D. Smith reported that the District Budget Committee met a couple of weeks ago and have our next meeting on May 24 where we will review the May Revise and Tentative Budget.
- b. District Technology Planning Group:
 - i. B. Seaberry reported that we have held our last meeting for the year. We made a total of 18 updates and added initiatives such as Guided Pathways and ways that IT can collaborate with student services. B. Seaberry reminded the group that these projects come from initiatives. B. Seaberry noted that the group found that there are some projects that should be prioritized for example, ERP upgrades, and Colleague upgrades, etc. In the fall our meetings will begin by reviewing surveys.
- c. Institutional Effectiveness Committee:

- i. A. van Ommeren reported that they held their second meeting thus far. There has been good attendance with the meetings primarily focusing in on updates as there is a lot going on at the State level right now.
 - ii. A. van Ommeren noted that the biggest agenda item still being discussed is the research approval process. We really need to come up with an approval process or process of using external evaluators to conduct research on our students. We are planning to bring this back to our September meeting.
- d. College Councils:
- i. EVC:
 1. K. Aytch reported that our program reviews were approved. We are also looking at a software to assist with the 508 Compliance.
 2. K. Aytch reported that in terms of accreditation, he has asked that the college council list district council on their agendas for accreditation purposes.
 3. K. Aytch highlighted the importance of finding students to serve on these committees.
 4. K. Aytch thanked Kim Garcia and Debbie Budd for their contributions to this committee.
 - ii. SJCC:
 1. B. Breland thanked the Center for Economic Mobility for making the relocation transition and opening up space. Faculty are now discussing requirements with CSEA to implement the new SIMS lab in the technology building.
 2. The discretionary budget request has been completed.
 3. SJCC currently only has a professional development fund of \$500. We are looking to increase that amount based on the actual professional development need.
 4. B. Breland reported that SJCC would have to go back out for a special election next week for a new Student Trustee.

11. Adjournment:

- a. D. Budd thanked the group for their work over the last two and a half years.
- b. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.