



**College Governance Council
April 27, 2016
Minutes**

Present

Tina Abbate, Elisha Blue, Vice President Gregory Brown, Peter Cammish, Richard Crapuchettes, President Celia Esposito-Noy, Tonmar Johnson, Jeff Lehfeldt, Shirley Lewis, Karen McCord, Leslie Minor, George Olgin, Christie Speck, Michael Wyly, Ralphine Andrus

Absent

Erin Farmer, Yulian Ligioso

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m.

Approval of Agenda

It was moved by Richard Crapuchettes and seconded by Jeff Lehfeldt to approve the agenda as presented.

The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

It was moved George Olgin and seconded by Elisha Blue to approve the minutes of April 13, 2016.

Ayes: 9

Noes: 0

Abstain: 0

The motion passed.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

ASSC Bylaws

Elisha Blue reported in place of Megan White.

The ASSC Bylaws were reviewed and discussed. Currently, there are inconsistencies regarding various positions in the Bylaws.

In Article III, Section IE, change to move responsibility for the ASSC newsletter to the Student Life Center.

In Article I, Section 1D, move to change number of coursework units from 5 to 6. Although Board Policy 5505 states that the Executive Officers shall have completed at least 6 units to run for office, we want to be in compliance with both the Ed Code 76060 which only requires a minimum of 5 units and board policy.

In Article I, Section IV, add to Associate Position that each member on the Senate can have an Associate Position. These are not voting positions.

Article V, Section IV Parliamentary Authority was added into the Bylaws so that the rules contained in the Robert's Rules of Order can be automatically adopted to the current edition.

There will be terms of office for Executive Officers except for Student Trustee.

Article III, Section IF – No one ran for Legislative Advocate position in the Spring 2016. Another election will take place in the fall 2016. This position is an elected position. After the President, Vice President and Student Trustee positions were elected in the Fall 2015 , a Legislative Advocate was appointed after all the Senators were in place. A position can be appointed with a 2/3 vote.

Article III, Section III - Students who are not part of the ASSC Senate can serve on on-campus committees and they can fulfill the duties charged to them by the ASSC Senate and/or Executive Board.

Dr. Esposito-Noy moved to accept the ASSC Bylaws as revised. Elisha Blue made the motion and seconded by Karen McCord. President Celia Esposito-Noy gave kudos to ASSC for being very thorough.

Ayes: 14

Noes: 0

Abstain: 0

Elisha Blue will forward the revised ASSC Bylaws to Sandra for inclusion in the Board agenda for the May 18 Board Meeting.

Student Debt Prevention Proposal

Elisha Blue reported in place of Megan White.

Vice President Ligioso met with ASSC regarding student debt and how it is affecting the college and asked ASSC to come up with solutions. Elisha reported that ASSC developed a committee to discuss solutions: Make it mandatory that all first-time students take a financial aid assistance class so that they are aware of what assistance is offered on campus. Many other colleges offer this type of financial aid orientation to help students become better prepared. Another solution is for students to attend seminars before classes start, during and after. When Financial Aid finds out that a student is not paying, have them meet with counselor to have the hold lifted and discuss payment plans to work towards payment of their classes. We are working with our debt collection agency, Concert? Another solution is that after two semesters of non or partial payment, students will need a co-signer to pay for their classes.

Vice President Gregory Brown stated that the spirit of the financial aid document is to be supportive of student needs, hold them accountable and give them opportunities to complete what they need to complete in order to reach a balance. There is some verbiage in the federal guidelines associated with federal financial aid of what we can or can't do. Because SCC had a high debt ratio for students several years ago, we ended up falling in a place with the federal government that we were required to have a debt management program within the college to bring the student loan debt down. That process is working with the private company and the Financial Aid office by providing students to obtain waivers, defer payments, pay less, etc. A suggestion is to have another discussion by Financial Aid and with ASSC on what's being done already and how can we marry what we have accomplished with practices that still comply with both state and federal regulations as it relates to Financial Aid. Tina stated that historically this project falls in Records & Registration and asked that they be included in this conversation.

There was question regarding financial aid literacy. We currently have two Financial Aid "window people" who have certification in Financial Aid literacy and are trainers. They have also done some outreach but are limited due to time and staffing. The Sparkpoint issue is still being determined as to where we want these activities to take place; looking at Financial Aid as one of the areas.

President Celia Esposito-Noy stated that up-to-date payment plans are primarily for non-resident fees, not designed for regular student fees. Many colleges developed a payment plan for non-resident fees. Perhaps look at this as a possible payment plan for collecting debt; this is usually housed in Business Services. Further discussions need to take place i.e. who will house it, who will follow it, who will keep track of payment plans, etc. We need to provide interventions sooner for students so that they can have options for paying. Payment plans are not always a save all as that is where uncollected debt comes from. Lots of students are eligible for BOGG waivers but students find out about it too late and are hoping to apply retroactively. They think

that once they apply, no further action is needed which can become problematic. Peter Cammish said that our consultant who has helped us with debt prevention stated that if you want a long-term solution to this, you've really got to engage the faculty as most problems lie with Curriculum. We need to help students understand when to use financial aid. There is a maximum amount that students can apply for during their academic career and there is a percentage assigned to under graduates.

There was another discussion on how we package financial aid. The standard practice with Financial Aid is to package with free money first (Bogg, Pell, federal work study) and then at the very end offer loans. Celia stated that this college, much to our credit, brought down the student loan debt significantly from 35% to 13%. Federal was threatening schools that if they did not bring down their debt, they could potentially lose eligibility to all or some of Title IV Financial Aid.

We need to recommit to learning about financial aid as it has changed significantly and to help expand this campaign to get the word out. We can provide a basic FAQ page on the website. Leslie, Vice President Gregory Brown & President Celia Esposito-Noy will meet to contact all teachers to provide basic information to all students at the start of each semester. Elisha is to take back to ASSC and meet with Greg and work on the language to keep the spirit and intent including additional information on what is currently available. Greg will also have Maureen Mason-Muyco, Interim Director of Financial Aid, work with ASSC.

Brown Act Committees Discussion

Dr. Shirley Lewis presented a draft proposal designating certain campus committees that should comply with the Brown Act: Academic Senate, ASSC, College Governance Council, Fiscal Advisory Committee and Bond Oversight Comm. Michael Wyly asked to include the Academic Senate Subcommittees based on guidelines from statewide academic senate.

Brown Act legislation ensures that Californians retain their sovereign rights by prohibiting the government from making decisions without public input or an opportunity to voice their concerns. A legislative body of a local agency is required to post notice of their meeting 72 hours in advance in conspicuous places and post their minutes online for the public to view. Our Governing Board is a legislative body of a local agency and certain bodies within our college were created by the Board to provide input and make recommendations to the Board when making decisions and taking action. Another key function of the Brown Act is that all decisions happen in a public forum and that no consensus is arrived at in any way outside of that public forum. Minutes can be posted online but also have to be posted physically in a space where it is accessible 24/7. There was a brief discussion regarding lack of compliance.

Michael Wyly has met with all public subcommittee chairs and conducted Brown Act

workshops. Some subcommittees are compliant where others are not due to low attendance or didn't know who sitting members were in order to determine a quorum. There was a brief discussion regarding the timeframe of 72 hours – 72 hours is 72 hours.

Conclusion is to bring this topic forward and how to train campus groups; possibly bring in a presenter from the statewide academic senate. Michael has a copy of the state academic senate PowerPoint regarding Brown Act compliance and one tailored to the SCC Academic Senate which includes Title V and 19+One. Celia stated that it might be a recommendation of the College Governance Council is that all college-wide committees first are informed of their compliance with the Brown Act and that the first meeting of the academic year, the agenda which should be posted 72 hours prior should include a review of the Brown Act compliance. Michael expressed his concerns regarding internal adjustments be made to be sure we are equipped to be compliant. We can offer this as a Flex Cal activity as an option. Michael added that if we structure the meeting similar to that of Academic Senate, we can begin with an hour-long Brown Act training. Frame the workshops to be college friendly vs senate friendly.

BP2005 & AP 2005 Participation in Local Decision Making

President Celia Esposito-Noy stated that at the last CGC we have not included the language changes that had not been submitted but was strike out in both language now.

Michael Wyly spoke about Policy 2005 that we “mutually agree” on all 11 items in Title 5 Section 53200c but there is a caveat that we would be moving to “rely primarily” on some future date, however, no future date has happened since the composition of the policy.

Edits to the policies included Students (Title 5 Section 51023.7) top of page 3, last sentence “These recommendations and positions developed by the students shall be give...” should be “given” and Policy 2005 Procedures under References, “Governing Board Review March 5, 2019” should be 2016.

There was discussion regarding representatives to Policy 2005, #2 Make-up of the College Governance Council. There was a motion from Jeff Lehfeltdt to modify the representatives to state 2 classified representatives from CSEA and 2 classified representatives from Local 39. This was seconded by Richard Crapuchettes.

Also, under Policy 2005, #2, there should be a break down in faculty – 1 faculty from Academic Senate and 1 from SCFA. Additionally, student representation should say 2 Students represented of ASSC.

Celia stated the value of terms limits is to get new faces and fresh approaches. Term limits were discussed.

The modifications in the policies will go forward to the Board Adhoc Committee, then the Adhoc Committee (led by Rosemary Thurston) would bring it to the Board for acceptance of the modifications and approval.

The last page “Participatory Governance Process for Participatory Governance Model’ is a guideline on how to get a new policy and procedure through the governance process. We need a subcommittee to determine to reveal the charge for this committee and what the process is and putting it into some sort of format. Michael Wyly suggested we need a good tracking mechanism to track where the document is and can serve as an educational tool.

Peter Cammish, Michael and Shirley Lewis will work as a subcommittee to put together a procedure that includes a tracking mechanism about where things are and how they are moving through in order to get eventually to the Board. Celia suggested eliminating this page and in lieu of this page create a procedure to accompany this policy that would essentially outline the steps and how to track where we are with items going to the CGC. The subcommittee will then bring to CGC once they have put a procedure together.

There was discussion regarding appointments to this committee during the summer. Technically and formally if you can’t be here for a meeting, you cannot tell someone to attend the meeting in your place. They must be appointed; you cannot have replacements, substitutes or alternates. If we can find a replacement for Dr. Karen McCord and Tonmar Johnson at the beginning of the summer, then we would have continuity. Karen will send Celia an email regarding who she and Tonmar Johnson will appoint to attend the meetings. Michael stated to be Brown Act compliance that if we announce a date and even if there is nothing on the agenda, we’re obligated to meet that day to show up and entertain any public comments before leaving.

The schedule for the summer will be to meet June 8 and 22, no meetings in July and resume the 2nd and 4th Wednesday in August, August 10 and 24.

IEPI Discussion

Peter Cammish distributed an Indicators Worksheet and tables/graphs related to the success rate. For everyone’s information, the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative (IEPI) is a state initiative to have colleges look at itself and decide a set of indicators of how effectively they are serving students. There is no number 1-7 indicators as they belong with the Fiscal Committee. Peter has met with a team which included members from Basic Skills and BSI to discuss short-term and long-term goals. The indicators listed were provided from the state. The red box are goals set by this committee last year, and the two yellow boxes are goals set from this group this year. Peter stated the he will send a pdf to everyone so they could share with others.

There was discussion regarding #15 Successful Course Completion and the related table which is very difficult to set in terms of goals. The BSI group says #15 goes beyond basic skills so they wanted CGC to provide feedback. Looking at the grid, Peter believes that we can attain smaller gains with specific groups and increase success. The long-term goal is six years from now. One tactic to increase the success rate is that by raising the grades received in some of the classes, you can raise the success rate beginning at 2.5 percent. Based on the Success by Ethnicity chart, we have some equity problems here, however, by changing the ethnicity level, we can increase the success rate.

A “D” grade is no longer a standard state passing grade, however, it can count for certain areas. Satisfactory academic progress is defined differently depending on who or what you’re talking about. Tina Abbate evaluates degrees depending on the option a student chooses: Option A and Option C in certain areas allow for the D grade to be used to fulfill the degree. Option B, IGETSE, for those students who will most likely transfer to a UC but will also have the option to transfer to CSU, a “C” grade is acceptable. There was further discussions on what grades for specific subjects are accepted.

President Celia Esposito-Noy inquired if we have done any surveys as to why students drop. Per Peter, we have not. We need to create mechanisms. Dr. Karen McCord stated that she has such information for all students that start as UMOJA students. Celia asked that Karen share this information with the group. What are we doing to our students to get above those standards; what support mechanisms are we using? Michael Wyly said that we’re already looking at D students and want them to be C students, and we are already pointing at the need for additional support mechanism for those students to be successful. The standards of the course aren’t changing; the question is how we get these students above the standard. We should utilize cohort models like UMOJA which has so many resources available to their students; however, because there are so many resources, it makes it difficult to expand. Of all the resources provided and of those resources, which ones are the most successful? Karen shared a model college in New York in which students in the program receive a bus/train pass for transportation which helps to raise their success and completion rate. Hopefully, when that initiative gets back on the ASSC ballot in August, this will pass and help some students here. We need to work on building capacity so that we can do the kind of data collection that we need to do to inform our decision making.

There was continued discussion on the total enrollment and average pass rate course chart specifically with the math courses. Celia said that we should ask Basic Skills to review the Math 330 class and put forward some recommendations on what could happen to change this success rate. VP Gregory Brown will share this information with the Basic Skills committee along with integrating the new institutional effectiveness grant that recently came in and will bring back his findings to this committee.

Celia asked if we have a requirement for faculty to advise students on their mid-term progress. Michael answered that because of the institution of Canvas, it has become easier for students to inform themselves and keep track. There are no real set standards. This would be an appropriate topic for the Senate. We need to look at timely interventions and points which could possibly reduce the W grades. We could work with colleagues to develop a document which would be updated and readily available for faculty. Karen said that the special programs like EOPS, UMOJA and even financial aid sends out the mid-term progress report but what is most effective for UMOJA has been the follow up after the student misses the first day or two – it really makes a difference. This method has helped to reduce the W grade. The earliest intervention is the most effective. Richard Crapuchettes added that we could encourage faculty to give quizzes by which students can evaluate how they're doing before the mid-terms.

We also need to emphasize broader and more robust discussion on equity – perhaps a topic for Flex Cal.

George Olgin added that from English Basic Skills using the Institutional Effectiveness grant starting this summer is to have some of this training for faculty that are teaching Basic Skills English to focus on student affect and building self-efficacies. . With their long-term target, Basic Skills can be the model to address equity. We should have a joint meeting with the Basic Skills group in the fall to discuss equity.

Back to #15 there's multiple issues that affect the bottom line. George asked what data we are using in terms of enrollment management when it comes to scheduling. Celia asks the Deans every Wednesday morning regarding what's happening in courses, scheduling, etc. Michael said basic skills students don't stop having basic skills needs just because they're not in basic skills classes. A successful basic skills student is eligible to take transfer classes. Tonmar added that we need to develop a climate where we're not holding the student's hand but show them "how to fish." Our job is to make sure those students that we can push forward are prepared. This is part of the enrollment management issue.

After a lengthy discussion on indicator #15, it was decided the short-term goal is 72 and the long-term goal is 75. VP Leslie Minor was talking about the trends and the percentage increase from year to year which is the best predictor. Peter will send this out to everyone so that it can be shared with their constituents to get additional feedback and be able to sign these off at the next meeting.

Looking at indicator #17 Completion of Certificates, Peter said we don't know what a reasonable number is to raise the certificates. We could be offering too many. Karen added that we really need to work with our students regarding their goals as many of them become too comfortable

here; sometimes we have to push them out. It's more people with single degrees as opposed to the same people with multiple degrees. Vice President Leslie Minor stated that when this was written, they were talking about single students.

The final indicator that this group must decide on is FTES. There are so many variables involved but we have to accomplish it every single year. Our funding is dependent upon not only declaring the number but hitting it. However, we have set numbers that we have to give to the state as it is part of our 320 reporting. We also have set numbers based on expectation that we're going into stability. Next year we have to get back up to the numbers. Peter said that in terms of simplifying this number, the argument from this committee is talking about access and trying to grow this college. There are people out there that need education and not just about tracking new people and about retention. The State allows 2% growth per year. Maybe when we set a target between now and 2020-2021, it is linked to that. We need to really determine what our real FTES is. Celia suggested talking with Yulian about what he is predicting and/or reporting. There should be some consistency, and we should bring the numbers to closely align with 320 reporting.

Other Business

Jeff Lehfeltd discussed Nurtured Incompetence. There really is a distinction between people with learning disabilities or those who come from disadvantages vs nurtured incompetence. We need to look at how we address this and aligning resources with needs.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Ralphine Andrus

SGC Minutes 04-27-16: ra