



SJECCD DISTRICT COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

November 29, 2018

3:00—5:00 p.m.

SJCC – Technology Building – T-112

Attendees:

- A. Lopez (SJCC Academic Senate President)
- B. Breland (Chancellor)
- B. Seaberry (Vice Chancellor)
- D. Smith (Vice Chancellor)
- E. Narveson (District Academic Senate President)
- E. Ayala-Austin (MSCC)
- F. Espinoza (EVC Academic Senate Member)
- J. Escobar (Acting SJCC President)
- J. LeDee (CSEA)
- K. Aytch (EVC President)
- P. Crawford (SJCC Academic Senate)
- P. Fong (AFT 6157)
- R. Pratt (EVC Academic Senate)
- S. Alvarez (CSEA 363)
- W. Watson (CEM)

Other Attendees:

- A. Oum
- A. van Ommeren
- J. Pace
- R. Brown
- R. Ledesma
- S. Brusseau

Absent:

- A. Lopez, (CSEA)
- A. Herrera (MSCC)
- D. Hawkins (CSEA 363)
- D. Micetich (EVC College Council)
- F. Villa (CSEA 363)
- J. Bills (AFT 6157)
- L. Harris (SJCC College Council)
- EVC and SJCC Student Government

1. Review of the Agenda:

- a. B. Breland reviewed the agenda with the District Council. No changes were made to the agenda.

2. Approval of the October 18, 2018 Meeting Minutes:

- a. R. Pratt proposed a change to the 10/18/18 meeting minutes:
 - i. Page 4, Item 6,C,i, 4th line be changed as follows:
 - 1. "With that understanding, the EVC Academic Senate along with the SJCC Academic Senate have ~~agreed to commission a district wide and concluded that a district office services~~ audit is needed. This will assist in the understanding of ~~DW and DS~~ DO Services provided and whether or not the percentage

recommended for ~~these that~~ areas is appropriate or if a different or more flexible percentage would be more appropriate.”

- b. M/S/P; Ayes – 15, Opposed – 0, Abstentions – 0, Absent – 7, Motion made by F. Espinoza; Seconded R. Pratt. The 10/18/18 meeting minutes were approved as amended.

3. **College Highlights:**

- a. B. Breland reminded the group that this item will always be on the agenda as a reminder to all of us in terms of what is happening at the college and the district office to serve our students.
 - i. SJCC ([Attachment A](#)):
 - 1. J. Escobar noted the importance of recognizing the work of the many individuals that participate in these many projects and initiatives.
 - 2. Accreditation Process: We continue to hold to our timeline and keep minutes. We will be creating a more detailed timeline related to actions and next steps and have also begun the draft process.
 - 3. Guided Pathways process is well underway with a retreat taking place a couple of weeks ago. The most recent work session was held on 11/28 with many individuals. Some next steps include engagement of more faculty specifically with program development and meta majors.
 - 4. AB 705: we are preparing for the retreat taking place this Friday, November 30th.
 - a. C. Frazier reported that we have our first two official AB 705 math student enrolled.
 - b. J. Escobar noted that the amount of work involved is huge and it is critical to understand the lifecycle of this work.
 - 5. PDD – Spring: VP Montemayor will begin a full matriculation process review from onboarding to graduation. Specifically mapping and technology will be looked at.
 - ii. EVC:
 - 1. Guided Pathways:
 - a. Working with Faculty and staff to explore meta-majors and career exploration.
 - 2. SJ Promise:
 - a. Continuing work on providing wrap-around services for cohorts 1 & 2, and have expanded a supplemental lab for cohort 3.
 - 3. Strategic Planning:
 - a. EVC is working with Fred Trapp and hope to bring a draft to College Council in December, possibly Feb.
 - 4. AB 705:
 - a. We are excited to highlight our work at tomorrow’s AB 705 Retreat. We are working to blend some of these initiatives into one to collaborate these initiative efforts.
 - iii. District:
 - 1. B. Breland reminded the group that we need to be fully compliant with AB 705 by fall 2019 with math and English courses.
 - 2. B. Breland noted that the next AB 705 retreat would take place at the district office tomorrow. This retreat will now include classified staff and part of the discussions around next steps and resources needed from district staff to move forward with this implementation.
 - 3. A. van Ommeren reported that district research would provide information in terms of what services and support that the district can provide. ITSS will report on the Self-Guided Placement Tool.
 - iv. Vision for Student Success:
 - 1. B. Breland reminded the group that this is something that has come from the State Chancellor’s Office asking:
 - a. For all colleges to commit to the Vision for Student Success that was put forward to increase transfer, completion rates, etc.

- b. B. Breland noted he is proud to report that both SJCC and EVC have already certified ahead of the deadline.
- c. B. Breland noted that the next step would be to get an organizational commitment to these goals set forth by the State which will be submitted through this group and ultimately to our Board. The deadline for that commitment is May 2019.

4. Accreditation:

- a. B. Breland reminded the group that this is a standing item in an effort to stay at the forefront of everyone's minds. One question that came up was who will be the district office contact on this project. B. Breland noted that this has not yet been decided but we will have that information soon.
- b. EVC: K. Aytch reported that ACCJC pulled SLO's out of the Annual Report, which will lighten the load of that report. This information came from a webinar held last week that is still available for viewing. K. Aytch further noted that the critical area now is the timeline as we work to gather evidence for the draft mid-term report.
- c. SJCC: J. Escobar agreed that the timelines are critical. One of the QFE's includes documentation of a full list of all of the committees and their members.. We will be posting all of this information on the SharePoint as a way to enhance communication across the colleges.

5. Board Policies and Administrative Procedures:

- a. B. Breland thanked J. Pace for her great work on this project and creating a clear path of responsibilities as it relates to board policies and administrative procedures.
- b. J. Pace provided copies of the draft flowchart that reflects the BP and AP approval process ([Attachment 2](#)).
- c. J. Pace reminded the group of our Board Policy that speaks to the cyclical review of these BP's and AP's for accreditation.
- d. J. Pace noted that the packets provided at this meeting include the fall legal updates provided by the League.
- e. J. Pace noted that all information would be emailed to the District Council members and it will be up to those members to bring these items to their constituent groups for review, changes, etc.
- f. J. Pace reminded the group that the ACCJC Teams use BoardDocs as a reference tool to review the dates (reviewed, revised, etc.) as evidence.
- g. The group thanked Joy for her work to clarify this process.
- h. Follow-up Item: B. Breland asked that the District Council members review this process flowchart with their constituency groups and we will discuss this again at the December 13th District Council Meeting.
- i. Follow-up Item: J. Pace to edit the third column to state "College Academic Senate"
- j. Academic Senate will provide specific AP's to J. Pace.
- k. AP 4020:
 - i. R. Pratt asked that AP 4020 be voted on today. EVC Academic Senate has approved it as well as SJCC.
 - ii. M/S/P; Ayes – 15, Opposed – 0, Abstentions – 0, Absent – 7, Motion made by R. Pratt; Seconded E. Narveson.

6. San Jose Promise Program Update:

- a. District Update:
 - i. B. Breland reminded the group that the Promise program is a national movement with many different pieces connected to it and with all of these moving parts, can cause a lot of confusion. We are working towards creating a seamless process for our students. B. Breland thanked R. Ledesma for her work behind the scenes working with the City and potential funders. B. Breland also thanked D. Smith and his team for their work to obtain the funding for cohort 1 and 2 from the land-lease funds.
 - ii. R. Ledesma agreed that there is a lot of confusion with the multiple promise programs out there (San Jose Promise, Regional Promise, Silicon Valley Promise, etc.). R. Ledesma clarified that the Silicon Valley Promise is not the San Jose Promise.

- iii. R. Ledesma reminded the group that SJCC previously had their own promise program. Later there was a grant opportunity set forth by the State Chancellor's Office, which SJECCD won to open promise programs on both of its campuses in 2016.
 - iv. R. Ledesma clarified that through the grant we had funding to support cohort 1. Cohort 2 was only covered for the first year of the two-year program.
 - v. R. Ledesma reported that prior to the San Jose Promise Grant being awarded to SJECCD, she and previous Chancellor Budd met with the City of San Jose and agreed to a Silicon Valley Promise whereby the City would provide support and funding for Silicon Valley Promise Students attending SJCC and EVC. The City of San Jose and SJECCD also approached the Sobrato Foundation to see if they would be interested in taking part in this opportunity. Sobrato was interested; however, their requirement would be to make it a regional promise program that would include other CCD's in our area (Foothill-DeAnza, Mission-West Valley.).
 - vi. R. Ledesma reported that the first step of the Silicon Valley Promise was to engage a consulting group to analyze the potential of a regional initiative and how we could leverage existing promise programs and ultimately improve student success in a way to align with projected regional hires for 2025.
 - vii. R. Ledesma reported that with the Mayor's Office SJECCD will be launching a fundraising effort specifically for our San Jose Promise. Later we hope to develop an endowment fund where we can draw down funds made on the interest so we do not need to fundraise each year.
- b. Questions/Comments:
- i. P. Crawford highlighted that we have three times the need demographically than either of those other two districts involved in the Silicon Valley Promise, and cautioned against our students getting lost in the shuffle.
 - ii. R. Ledesma reminded the group that the Promise program overall has a very positive feedback and added that our promise program is the only one that has a two-year program.
 - iii. E. Narveson asked if cohort 3 would be as large as cohorts 1 & 2?
 - 1. R. Ledesma noted that we are unsure at this point, but we may dial back a bit and re-examine the program.
 - iv. A. Lopez noted concern that both Academic Senates have not received any information about the Silicon Valley Promise to date, and requested that presentations be made to those groups. A. Lopez further clarified that it is great that the district is fundraising for this program, but the district should not be running the program for the students.
 - 1. B. Breland noted that we are in the process of creating a leadership structure at the colleges that will generate a better channel of information to the faculty, staff, and personnel at the colleges. Right now we are in the process of setting the program up, and those like the City that want to be involved are coming directly to the Chancellor's Office until those proper structures can be set up at the college levels.
 - 2. Follow-up Item: R. Ledesma and her teams provide San Jose Promise presentations to the Academic Senates.
 - v. F. Espinoza noted that it would be helpful to have an understanding of what funding the San Jose Promise program is dependent on and how students can access it as he is receiving student questions around the San Jose Promise, but is unable to answer.
 - 1. Follow-up item: R. Ledesma will provide information at a later meeting to further clarify the funding sources and the flow of all of these overlapping programs (flowchart).
- c. Milpitas Promise:
- i. B. Breland noted that there is a Milpitas Promise Program that we wanted to make sure this group is aware of that does overlap with a small portion of the SJECCD service area.
7. Resource Allocation Model Update:

- a. B. Breland noted that the only update is around the performance audit looking at district-wide services. We are still working out the scope of work. The next steps will be to define that scope of work. Harvey Rose has been selected to conduct the audit.
 - b. R. Ledesma added that we would also be managing expectations within that scope of work, as the original timeline was quite aggressive as performance audits can usually take upwards of 4-6 months to fully conduct.
 - c. D. Smith noted that he was very impressed with the selected agency's breadth of experience and should do a great job.
 - d. C. Frazier highlighted the importance of aligning the district with student success
 - e. E. Narveson asked if/when we would restart the Resource Allocation Taskforce once this audit is finished.
 - i. R. Pratt commented that it is the feeling of the EVC Academic Senate that the RAM has completed its work with the model having been accepted. The next steps will be to provide recommendations to the model.
 - ii. A. Lopez noted that he and SJCC's Academic Senate is in agreement with EVC's Academic Senate.
 - iii. R. Pratt further added that the Senates are not waiting for the audit to be finished prior to moving forward with implementing the model, but rather integrate the outcome of the audit into the model.
 - iv. B. Breland noted the importance of institutionalizing the Resource Allocation Model review process.
 - f. J. Escobar noted the importance of documenting all of these processes that our shared governance has gone through. J. Escobar further highlighted that this performance audit does not have to do with the performance of district employees but rather linking the value of the service to the effectiveness of student outcomes.
8. Golden Handshake:
- a. B. Breland thanked D. Smith and Anthony Oum for their work behind the scenes on the golden handshake calculations. B. Breland asked that D. Smith and A. Oum provide an overview of the golden handshake and what it means to the organization and our obligation as it relates to the payback of the golden handshake.
 - b. D. Smith noted that our organization had 23 participants total with three of those agreed to be backfilled immediately (Dean, Chancellor, and Director of Nursing). The STRS Golden Handshake agreement language notes that we must pay STRS for the cost of providing two additional years of service to those who opt to accept this golden handshake. The result of those 23 participants was that SJECCD paid STRS approx. \$1.8M with a requirement that we must demonstrate a savings of that amount paid plus \$1 more. Thus to save, we must lag our backfills until the savings is realized.
 - c. D. Smith continued in working with the Cabinet Team and the Colleges, it was determined that we may backfill 2 full time positions at each college in 2019/2020 which will still allow us to fulfill our obligation by 2020/2021.
 - d. Questions/Comments:
 - i. A. Lopez asked if there was a consulting firm hired prior to doing the golden handshake.
 - 1. D. Smith noted that his team consulted with a PARS agency.
 - ii. P. Crawford noted concern around the clarity provided to the Faculty around the multiple full-time faculty losses whose workload consisted of approximately 20% of committee work including Academic Senate, Curriculum, etc. These losses have been compounded by the increase in workload due to State initiatives.
 - iii. D. Smith noted that the golden handshake contract language states: "Within a 5-year period a minimum of 65% of the retired FT faculty vacated through this program shall be filled." and this is what was agreed upon within the AFT contract. With our current backfills, we are far ahead of this.
 - e. C. Frazier noted an overall need for a clearer set of hiring guidelines and noted that the template created by the Administrative Services team is a very good start to a template that would possibly use in the future.
 - f. B. Breland thanked everyone for their comments and noted that there was never an attempt to severely cut the number of full-time faculty. B. Breland agreed that there could have been more

involvement from AFT members seeing as how many of those individuals at the negotiating table are now gone from the District.

- g. B. Breland noted that there is a way to rehire more, he will support it and clarified that there is no intention of keeping funds away from being able to hire the people that will serve our students.
 - h. Follow-up item: B. Breland proposed that a smaller workgroup be convened to include CalSTRS experts to attempt to further understand the technical aspect of agreement.
 - i. Follow-up item: D. Smith will reach out to consultants and include the following individuals: Phil Crawford, Chris Frazier, Paul Fong, Alex Lopez, and Anthony Oum.
 - i. P. Fong asked K. Aytch how EVC was able to re-hire more full-time faculty this year.
 - i. K. Aytch clarified that EVC had more traditional retirements this year than golden handshake retirements allowing EVC to backfill those positions immediately as they were not part of the STRS obligation.
9. Committee Reports:
- a. District Budget Committee:
 - i. D. Smith reported that there is no report/news since the District Council last spoke.
 - b. District Technology Planning Committee:
 - i. B. Seaberry reported that the committee last met on November 8 where they discussed goals for the year, which included an annual progress report of the tech plan, as well as a goal to revise the tech plan. We heard reports from each college committees and we finished an overview of currently underway projects. B. Seaberry noted appreciation for the faculty that attend these meetings.
 - ii. B. Seaberry noted that the committee discussed optimizing resources in alignment with the district priorities and as a way to better process requests that are received.
 - c. Institutional Effectiveness Committee:
 - i. A. van Ommeren reported that the November and December committee meetings have been cancelled due to time/date conflicts as well as committee direction and function. A. van Ommeren noted that the committee would like to look for a co-chair in the event she is unable to attend future meetings. The committee will be reviewed and retooled after the first of the year.
 - d. College Council:
 - i. EVC:
 - 1. K. Aytch reported that EVC's College Council reviewed three key items:
 - a. Institutional Effectiveness presented a resource allocation model for internal program reviews for discretionary dollars.
 - b. The QFE Communication plan was discussed in how shared governance committees will report based on a certain timeline to the college council.
 - c. Faculty hiring was also discussed.
 - ii. SJCC:
 - 1. J. Escobar noted the following items that were discussed at SJCC's College Council:
 - a. Strategic Planning updates have been provided to the CAC.
 - b. Website updates as a means of communication improvement.
 - c. Centennial anniversary is coming up quickly in September 2021.
 - d. Operations manual laying out and documenting the way that we do business at the colleges including the various initiatives taking place.
 - e. District:
 - i. B. Breland reported that the Board has established a sequence with the Board Legislative Committee to review our options in terms of workforce housing for fulltime staff. We will be sending out a survey to our fulltime staff to gather information on current housing, commute information, etc.

10. Adjournment:

- a. The 11/29/2018 District Council meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.