

**San Jacinto College District Board Workshop  
December 14, 2015  
District Administration Building, Suite 201**

**MINUTES**

	<b>Board Workshop Attendees:</b>	<b>Board Members:</b> Marie Flickinger, Brad Hance, Dan Mims, John Moon, Jr., Keith Sinor, Dr. Ruede Wheeler, Larry Wilson <b>Chancellor:</b> Brenda Hellyer <b>Others:</b> Ann Kokx-Templet, Chet Lewis, Mandi Reiland, Steve Trncak
	<b>Agenda Item:</b>	<b>Discussion/Information</b>
<b>I.</b>	<b>Call the Meeting to Order</b>	<b>Workshop began at 5:04 p.m.</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Roll Call of Board Members</b>	<b>Board Members:</b> Dan Mims, Marie Flickinger, Brad Hance, John Moon, Jr., Keith Sinor, Dr. Ruede Wheeler, Larry Wilson
<b>III.</b>	<b>Adjournment to closed or executive session pursuant to Texas Government Code Section 551.072 &amp; 551.074, of the Texas Open Meetings Act, for the following purposes: Real Estate and Personnel Matters</b>	Adjourned to closed session at 5:04 p.m.
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Reconvene in Open Meeting</b>	Reconvened in open meeting at 5:34 p.m.  Anita Dewease, Bill Dickerson, Mini Izaguirre, Elissa Posway, Robyn Rice, and Laurel Williamson joined the meeting.

<p>V.</p>	<p><b>Review the 2014-2015 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report</b></p>	<p>Elissa Posway from Doeren Mayhew distributed the Audit Results document. She gave an overview of the audit process and findings. Elissa referenced page two of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) that lists an Emphasis of Matter that states the College adopted Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement No. 68 (GASB 68) and No. 71 (GASB 71). The financial statements now adhere to GASB 68 and 71, and the audit is not modified with respect to this matter. A significant change, as noted on page 14 in the CAFR, shows \$24.8 million net pension liability. On page 34, there is a six page foot note on Defined Benefit Plan – Teacher Retirement System of Texas that discloses the fact that the College and TRS contribute a portion.</p> <p>Dr. Wheeler asked if this is what was discussed about a year ago. Elissa said it is. The money has to be set aside but will probably not be used. The proportionate share will be constantly changing from year to year and is a soft number.</p> <p>Marie Flickinger asked where the long term investments on page 14 went. She understands restricted short term investments being gone, but why long term.</p> <p>Brenda Hellyer explained that the College used those funds to pay for the land purchase in Sheldon ISD. A reduction in cash also came from the funds used for the West Administration building renovation.</p> <p>Bill Dickerson explained that it also was used for pool accounts when a new bank account that was opened. When this occurs, it is considered long term.</p> <p>Brenda referenced page 52, schedule D of the CAFR. She explained that the College recognized a decrease in net position of \$28,146,257 as a restatement of the unrestricted beginning balance as of September 1, 2014 related to GASB Number 68 – <i>Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions</i>. This amount represents the College proportional share of the unfunded liability for the Teachers Retirement System of Texas as of the measurement date.</p> <p>Elissa stated that with respect to the audit, Doeren Mayhew was required to report the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant audit adjustments – None</li> <li>• Significant uncorrected statements – None</li> <li>• Major disagreements with management – None</li> <li>• Material errors, fraud, and illegal acts – None</li> <li>• Material written communications will be issued</li> </ul>
-----------	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single audit results can be reviewed on page 81-83 of the CAFR</li> </ul> <p>Elissa summarized that there were no findings to be reported. Also, federal grant reforms listed on page six of the audit results, show what will go into effect for the next audit.</p> <p>Brenda indicated that a summary of discussion items and 2014 schedule B are included in the folder for the Board’s reference.</p> <p>Brenda stated the decrease of \$4,186,587 in Net Position which is a combination of a decrease of Unrestricted Funds of \$14.5 million, increase of Restricted Funds of \$1.5 million, and an increase of \$8.8 million in Capital Assets Net of Depreciation and Related Debt.</p> <p>Brenda thanked the accounting staff for their leadership and work related to the audit.</p> <p>Robyn Rice, Elissa Posway, Mini Izaguirre, Bill Dickerson, and Anita Dewease left the workshop.</p>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Review Multidisciplinary Studies Associate Degree as Required by Senate Bill 1189</b>	<p>Laurel Williamson gave an overview of the multidisciplinary studies associate degree as required by Senate Bill 1189. The College implemented these degrees, effective Fall 2014. Tonight’s action item is documenting the Board’s official adopting of these degrees as the College’s multidisciplinary as mandated by the State of Texas.</p> <p>Dr. Wheeler asked if these are in demand. Laurel explained that a student comes and asks for the specific degree, and that degree falls within the multidisciplinary degree.</p> <p>Brenda explained that the College already had this in place but we had to call it by the proper name. Legislature passed this because they did not believe that colleges were offering these broader multidisciplinary degrees.</p> <p>This is tracked through My Sanjac GPS (Graduation Plan Strategy).</p>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>Discuss Textbook Adoption Processes</b>	<p><i>Clarifications in parenthesis.</i></p> <p>Brenda explained that in the last workshop, textbooks came up during the distance learning presentation when Marie Flickinger asked about how we were able to get to a college wide textbook</p>

		<p>process on the distance learning courses. At that point, Laurel had mentioned the textbook procedures taskforce that is currently meeting. Brenda referenced the textbook procedures task force draft report and asked Laurel to give an overview. Following the draft taskforce report, there is an attachment that is a resolution from the Faculty Organization around textbooks that will be presented tonight to the Board through the open citizen's comments of the meeting.</p> <p>Laurel explained the background of the textbook taskforce that created this document. In 2013, we asked the instructional policies and procedures committee, which is a committee of our institutional effectiveness council, to review procedures around textbook selection. This is a review that is done periodically. In September of 2013, they submitted a draft of the procedures. Catherine O'Brien, is the chair of that group. Laurel reviewed the procedures and made a few changes. It then went back to the committee and a version was created that was sent out for full faculty review in November 2013. Minimal feedback was received and sent to the committee, and they made revisions to the procedures. Their final recommendations came to the Strategic Leadership Team in December 2013. There was a great deal of philosophical comment in that draft. We were looking for something that was procedures that clarified the process for selecting textbooks. Some of the narrative was removed in order to create the actual procedures. We also added a statement about the college wide selection process relative to the three student success courses (GUST 0305, EDUC 1300 and Psych 1300). That document which was approved by SLT, came out in January 2014 as the final version of the procedures. In the procedures, and also in the minutes of the workings of the committee, we said that we would review textbook selection processes every three years.</p> <p>We are reviewing it a little earlier than three years due to some issues that we felt sped up the timeline. For that reason, we decided to create a task force to look again at textbook selection with the key that we wanted to develop a college wide textbook selection process. We talked about the language and we changed from textbook to course materials. It is not really about just a textbook but it is about the supplemental materials that support the course. Course materials became the language that we used. A charter was put together that charged the task force to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs savings to the students</li> <li>• Value of supplemental materials</li> <li>• Bundling</li> <li>• Software associated with texts</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Length of adoption/review process for new editions</li> <li>• Rental options</li> <li>• Texts for multiple semesters</li> <li>• Procedures for using open source materials</li> <li>• E-text and e-text rental</li> <li>• Distance learning textbooks and materials</li> <li>• Dual credit an Early College High School parameters</li> <li>• Faculty-authored textbooks</li> </ul> <p>Laurel stated that the main focus was to be around developing a college wide selection process. We selected several subject matter experts to be included on the task force. Some of which include Hilda Boyce, Director of Auxiliary Services who is our textbook representative with Barnes &amp; Noble and Niki Whiteside, Vice President of Educational Technology. The bulk of the task force is faculty. The Co-chairs of the task force are Richard Bailey, Vice President of Accreditation and Special Initiatives and Sonya Prince, Professor of Integrated Reading and Writing.</p> <p>The handout includes the draft recommendations from the task force as well as the full membership listing. A couple of changes have been made which will then go back to the task force for review. Those include the timeline that they had was extended to Fall 2018, so we are asking that their goal be Fall 2017. Also, we have asked that they strengthen the section on the use of open source materials. Laurel believes this will be key to giving faculty some of the latitude that they need in choosing whatever they want for course materials. Because if it is open source, they really have a wide array of sources they can use without being tied to a textbook in any way. Laurel asked the task force to do some research on what we currently are doing with college wide selections, because some areas are already doing this. For Fall 2015, 62 of 238 or 26% of courses taught on more than one campus, are in full alignment, meaning that all campuses that teach the course are using the same text materials. Another 65 or 27% are in partial alignment, meaning that two campuses but not all three had the same text materials. That left 111 multi-campus courses or 47% unaligned. The task force report includes target goals for alignment of the remaining courses.</p> <p>Dr. Wheeler stated that we have been working on this for about ten years and it doesn't seem to be going well. He asked if we are ever going to achieve this.</p> <p>Keith pointed out that the numbers are improving.</p> <p>Laurel stated that yes she believes we will achieve this and that we already have a quarter of classes that have already</p>
--	--	---

	<p>implemented this on their own. Also, there will always be exceptions. For example, honors courses selection process would be different because they are different from the other classes.</p> <p>Larry asked if we have someone that informs new faculty members that they are not able to choose a textbook just because they have used it in the past.</p> <p>Laurel explained that there is someone that does this but that decision is campus specific. Each department on each campus is currently choosing textbooks for that campus.</p> <p>Ruede asked how this effects students and is it negative.</p> <p>Laurel explained that the purpose of the original task force was to provide a process that would provide cost savings for students. As she looked at data two pieces jumped out at her. First, 55-60% of our instruction on any given semester, are taught by part time faculty. Additionally, part time faculty may teach on multiple campuses. This requires some faculty members to teach from multiple textbooks for the same courses. Another issue is the swirling of students between campuses. Many students end up repeating classes and may have to take classes on different campuses. They would end up having to purchase multiple textbooks to complete the course if repeated.</p> <p>Larry asked if adjuncts are choosing their own textbooks for the courses that they teach or does the department chair tell them.</p> <p>Laurel explained that adjunct faculty use the textbooks that are chosen by the full time faculty.</p> <p>Marie asked if basically half of our faculty have no say in the choice of textbooks.</p> <p>Laurel stated that this is true because textbooks are chosen by full-time faculty.</p> <p>Brenda pointed out that the task force report addresses rental options for students. Brenda has asked Barnes &amp; Noble for options on expanding the rental market. Nationwide Barnes and Noble book stores say that 85% of their textbooks are rentable. Currently, we are at 57%. There is a big difference purchasing and renting. We are also behind on digital options. Brenda would like us to get to better costs saving options for students. There are many areas we can look into that can help lower costs. The impact of publishers is included in the task force report. We need to establish procedures regarding relationships with publishers. Also, faculty authored textbook procedures need to be reviewed. Laurel stated that on the publisher piece, we are having issues</p>
--	--

		<p>with McGraw-Hill with some of their bundles and software. They have links that take you to outside sources, and those can export student information, which we are not allowed to do. In order to get access to the outside sources included in the bundles, students would have to export their information. This has caused road blocks in the use of these products as well as with Banner and Blackboard.</p> <p>Dr. Wheeler asked if copyright infringements have anything to do with this in any way in terms of costs and use of books. Laurel said no it does not. The College does not have copyright on any of these, so it does not have any effect on us or this process.</p> <p>Laurel explained that she spoke to Dr. Coppola at Tarrant County College, and they implemented college wide textbook selection about three years ago. They are also multi campus and have had similar growing pains that we are experiencing in terms of making the decision. In the first year, they said students saved \$117,000 based on their work with publishers (and open source material). We are not to the end of our process with the task force, but we will recommend that some of our team go to Tarrant County College to get more details about their process and experience in transitioning. Tarrant does not use Barnes &amp; Noble, they use Follett.</p> <p>Brenda explained that Tarrant faculty did have concerns about SACSCOC. Brenda is not aware of any issues there (because faculty will continue to select the materials). There may be a misperception that the Chancellor wants to pick the textbooks, which is not true. The focus needs to be on what is best for students.</p> <p>Dr. Wheeler stressed that this has been a struggle for 30 years and it comes up every couple of years. He wonders if we are making progress.</p> <p>Laurel said we are making progress and we have a timeline for Fall 2017. There was a college wide process at San Jacinto College at some point. Although, she did not know the exact point in time that this occurred, the process was extensive. This time the task force, has been charged with developing a process that is not divisive and is fair and equitable for all campuses.</p> <p>Discussion occurred if we could accomplish this change by the proposed timeline.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Brenda stated that the committee is continuing to work and that tonight there will be a resolution presented from the Faculty Organization.</p> <p>Laurel said that we also need to be looking at our dual credit ISD's and Early College High Schools. We need to have a structure in place to decrease the burden on parents of students in those classes.</p> <p>Marie asked why we have a resolution against college wide textbook selection, but a task force with faculty on it that are contributing to the procedures. Is there just a small or separate group that are against this?</p> <p>Brenda explained that there is a lack of understanding in what we are trying to do in some regards and this is an issue that the faculty organization has taken on because there are some who are against it. There are many who understand that this is a process that will save students money and impact student success.</p> <p>Brenda thinks we can get there but we just have to work together. Laurel stated that there is a difference between the general faculty population and perhaps the faculty organization and its choice to take up this as an issue, not saying that it is right or wrong. There are perhaps two distinct populations within faculty. Laurel talked to Richard Bailey about faculty participation on the task force, and he explained that they had some people who were opposed to it at first. They had to get past whether we are going to do it, but focus on how we are going to do it. Once they got over that hurdle, all of the members on the task force support the recommendations that came through (based on the parameters given to the members).</p> <p>Marie said it looks like some of the members of the task force were on faculty org at some point.</p> <p>Laurel agreed. Brenda and Laurel explained that many of the faculty representatives on this task force came from the faculty organization (because we asked for its help in developing membership).</p> <p>Brenda explained that the plan is to keep working through the pieces, getting the input, and then making sure that we are coming back and looping back to the Board. She has heard numerous times from the Board that they would like this implemented. You have asked, "How do we reduce textbook costs to students?"</p> <p>Marie said that it is better for the students so it needs to be done.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Brenda explained that initially there was an email that did not have a clear message, and it caused a negative perception of this concept. Brenda sent a follow up email to clarify, but the first email caused issues that have not yet been resolved. We will continue to work this issue.</p> <p>Ruede stated that the campuses used to look at themselves as individuals and did not want to do what the other campuses were doing. At the time, administration was not willing to address this which is why there are so many textbooks. Once we adopted that one college model, we began working through the issues but cannot expect it to happen overnight. Laurel said we will have it straightened out by Fall 2017.</p> <p>Larry and a few other Board members agreed that the process has seen progress.</p> <p>Dan stated that Brenda, Laurel, and all working through this are going to need Board support. They are going to get some push back so they need support from the Board. Marie stated the Board has pushed this because of the concern about cost to students.</p> <p>Laurel explained that in the spring, we are going to bring in some representatives from other colleges and also internally, who are successfully using open source materials. We will do some very targeted workshops in large areas like Comp I &amp; II, mathematics, and the social behavioral sciences, and have faculty show them what they are using. We are also planning to engage the library staff in what is available in open source materials so they can show the faculty what is available. Right in our backyard we have Rice University and its OpenStax which has a phenomenal wealth of instructional materials. Also, faculty from other colleges will be brought in to show how they wrote their on textbooks and placed them on Blackboard free for students and then supplement that with open source materials.</p> <p>Marie stated change is difficult. She referenced, for example, for the implementation of no-late registration. Many were against it but it was a good decision for students. Marie reiterated that the Board is for this and are asking for this.</p> <p>Brenda asked that tonight the Board listen to the Faculty Organization.</p>
--	--	---

<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Calendar</b>	Brenda reviewed the Board calendar
<b>IX.</b>	<b>General Discussion of Meeting Items</b>	<p>Brenda informed the Board that the helicopter training purchase request will be postponed. Brenda will like to do some more leg work on this item.</p> <p>Larry asked what are we doing with the Hwy. 225 maritime facility, and why do we need this building for three more years. Brenda explained that the action item in the board book for this evening has a lease extension for the facility for three years at approximately \$98,000 a year. This facility will be used for additional areas for CPD.</p> <p>Larry asked if the College will need this long term or can we get these classes back on campus. Brenda believes that after the Petrochem building is built, and additional space becomes available, we should be able to move these back onto a campus.</p> <p>Larry asked if the Rizzo and Associates contract is for the bond, or renewal of a previous contract. Brenda explained that it is for the Center for Petrochem, Energy, and Technology. We started this planning early because of needs in industry.</p>
<b>X.</b>	<b>Adjournment</b>	<b>Workshop adjourned at 6:46 p.m.</b>