

# SBVC Academic Senate

## Meeting Minutes

October 3, 2018

AS/SS 207 3:00 – 4:30 P.M.

Topic	Discussion	Action
<b>1. Call to Order and Roll Call</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting called to order at 3:02 p.m.</li> <li>• Roll call via sign-in sheet <a href="#">[see attachment: AS Documents, Sign-in Sheet]</a>.</li> <li>• C. Huston: Before we start the agenda, can we entertain a motion to add item 8e, Basic Skills Expenditure Report, to the agenda? It needs to be signed by the Academic Senate President and normally anything Basic Skills comes to this body before it's signed. It was due on Monday and I didn't sign.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Motion 1</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 1: Add item 8e, Basic Skills Expenditure Report to the agenda.</b>            1<sup>st</sup>: R. Hamdy            2<sup>nd</sup>: C. Jones  <b>Discussion:</b> None  <b>Approved:</b> Unanimously  <b>Abstentions:</b> None</p>
<b>2. Public Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>	
<b>3. Senate President's Report</b> [C. Huston]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">[see attachment on the Academic Senate's website, under Agendas &amp; Minutes, 10/3/18]</a></li> <li>• I'm still seeking one faculty to join the District Enrollment Management Committee (DEMC). They only meet one Thursday per month. It's a good committee to be on; we have many things coming down the pipeline that will affect how we enroll students (e.g. AB 705, Guided Pathways, new funding formula). Having a faculty voice from Valley College would be really excellent. Their other charge is to focus strategically on District-wide enrollment.</li> <li>• VPI recruitment is still on schedule. We still anticipate that the Senate's event will be held on Tuesday, November 13.</li> <li>• AP/BP 2410 went through District Assembly yesterday. There has been no change in language from what we discussed in the last Senate meeting. All the major faux pas have been corrected. They are scheduled to go to the next Board meeting for a first and second reading by the Board so it will be effective right after the meeting ends.</li> <li>• The Area D meeting is coming up on October 13 in San Marcos. We don't meet again as a Senate before the meeting. The resolution packets aren't out yet, but I will send them to you when they're out. Send any thoughts or concerns you have to me by Friday, October 12, and I'll take those recommendations to the meeting.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion.	Action
<b>3. Senate President's Report,</b> continued [C. Huston]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is still a seat open on plenary. We will have a voting delegate at plenary, but we currently don't have anyone listening to the breakout sessions. Plenary is in Irvine, so it's not far. Let me know if you're interested in going.</li> <li>• I will be at an accreditation site visit next week. I'll be replying to email in the evening. If there is anything urgent, contact R. Hamdy.</li> <li>• Kudos to our excellent workshops on AB 705 and Guided Pathways. We had fabulous attendance and good information and data was shared. The data was eye opening and informative; we need good faculty on committees and involved because this is coming down and it will impact us.</li> <li>• District Assembly met yesterday. I wanted to provide an update. Here is a list of BP/APs that had a first read. AP/BP 5030 was already pulled for further discussion. These items don't typically come to the Senate because they aren't 10+1 items, but we can provide feedback. I'm on District Assembly with B. Tasaka and G. Owens-Perry. The one with most discussion was 4060- it did go forward for a second read with edits that came from faculty/committees. It was recommended that it go to Emma Diaz in Adult Education. Additionally 4100 was pulled and it will be reviewed.</li> </ul>	
<b>4. Committee Reports</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Ed Policy</b> [vacant]               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. <b>Legislative</b> [vacant]               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. <b>Financial Policy</b> [vacant]               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. <b>Personnel Policy</b> [J. Notarangelo]               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> </li> <li>e. <b>Student Services</b> [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr]               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ C. Huston: Thank you giving me feedback on those APs/BPs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>f. <b>CTE</b> [K. Melancon]               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> </li> <li>g. <b>EEO</b> [R. Hamdy]               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are looking at by-laws for our committee. I sent out the by-laws and I'm waiting for feedback from the committee. We should have something ready by the next meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>h. <b>Elections</b> [D. Burns-Peters]               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We looked at our by-laws, but still haven't met with the committee.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion.	Action
<p><b>4. Committee Reports, continued</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ C. Huston: You can meet on the 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesdays in this room during Senate meeting times.</li> <li><b>i. Curriculum [L Hector]</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We were asked to look at 4100 and 4060 and forwarded suggestions.</li> <li>• We also offered three workshops this last week leading up to the October 1<sup>st</sup> deadline.</li> <li>• We also have plans for English/math and the directions they're taking for AB 705. The chairs will be sharing with the curriculum committee and they will come to Senate at some point as well.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ C. Huston: Thank you also to your committee for getting that information back so we could take it to District Assembly.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li><b>j. Program Review [P. Ferri-Milligan]</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs assessments are due October 22<sup>nd</sup>. I know there were some issues with EMPs and other documents we requested.</li> <li>• We also have a workshop this Friday from 9:30 – 11 a.m. The committee will be there. Bring your documents for needs assessment and we will help.</li> <li>• We have one more workshop 2 weeks from this Friday.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ C. Huston: Is it still any area can submit a request? What's the best way for them to go about that?</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: We will get requests from different offices.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: And that's okay?</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: I'll run it by the committee. Some of those areas don't have efficacy, which is an issue, so I'll have to take it to the committee. What were you thinking?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: I just heard about the DE coordinator.</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: It went through as interdivisional and there's a form for that.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li><b>k. Accreditation &amp; SLOs [C. Huston]</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The committee met to align the rewriting of SLOs and aligning them with curriculum. There's a huge queue for the ASLO committee and we will actually discuss this a little later on the agenda.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>l. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our committee was supposed to meet on Monday, but we didn't have any conferences to approve. That's okay because I have a lot of new faculty to train. You're already doing a phenomenal job of submitting flex time. We like to close out early and often.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<b>5. Additional Reports</b>	<p><b>a. SBCCD-CTA [L. Lopez]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a negotiation meeting at the end of last month. They approved MOUs on procedural things; this time for union leadership and which colleges to compare us with for purposes of salary evaluations.</li> <li>• They also endorsed some folks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Area 6: James Holbrook</li> <li>○ Area 4: Sam Irwin</li> <li>○ Area 2: Joseph Williams.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>b. District Assembly [C. Huston]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I already kind of reported.</li> <li>• We also got a safety report from district police</li> </ul> <p>There was a quick rebranding presentation. I believe I have A. Rodriguez scheduled to share that with us at our next meeting.</p>	
<b>6. Consent Agenda</b>	<p><b>a. Minutes</b></p>	
<b>7. Old Business</b>	<p><b>a. By-Laws [P. Ferri-Milligan]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">[see attachment: AS Documents, Program Review Committee &amp; Faculty Chair]</a></li> <li>• Program Review was moved to the purview of the Academic Senate awhile back.</li> <li>• I took this to the Program Review committee and we would like to submit this to you as by-laws revision. There's no current by-law. The top part is what we have as the charge; I reworded it a bit. Realistically the Program Review Committee reports the needs assessment College Council and to the College President and the efficacy report to the Academic Senate and entire campus.</li> <li>• The Honors chair and Curriculum chair are both listed in the by-laws. The Curriculum chair does not have reassign time and the Honors chair had release time, which is actually reassign time now.</li> <li>• The committee wanted me to put in the minimum of reassign time for that position. We put terms to coincide with the [Academic Senate] President's terms which is 2 terms then go off, rather than 1 term and 1 year. The process for electing was in Honors and Curriculum chair, so I just took that. I don't know why we have 3 processes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ L. Hector: I just want to clarify, Curriculum does not have reassign time?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: You do, it wasn't in the by-laws.</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: The Curriculum was not, yet the Honors was very specific</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>7. Old Business,</b> continued</p>	<p>at .2 reassign time. When I took it to the Program Review committee, they thought we should put the reassign time in there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ C. Huston: You can always take the by-laws for the Curriculum Committee and bring back a proposal.</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: If it turns out that these are all the same process we can actually make one description for all of them as a process for electing.</li> <li>○ L. Hector: You aligned the term limitation with the President?</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: Yes, I don't remember why it changed, but it did under J. Stankas. We aligned Program Review with that. We also added the caveat that they can do it for 2 terms then have to go off for at least 1 term.</li> <li>○ L. Hector: You said Honors didn't have that?</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: Honors has 2 years then 1 [term off]. Isn't curriculum 3 and 1?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: I'm not fully sure what the 1 is.</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: Me either that's why we did it to align with the Senate President.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: If we want to adopt these changes this today we need a motion to approve the by-laws. If you want to take it home and read it then we need a friendly suggestion to read it next time.</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: Or do you want me to take something back to the committee?</li> <li>○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Can you clarify the .1?</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: The reassign time right now is they wanted to put a minimum for Program Review. It varies for Curriculum and Honors. Technically doesn't the [Senate] President decide reassign time?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: I have to look at the minutes? It was something decided one or two presidents ago.</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: The the committee wanted me to leave it on, but I argued to take it off.</li> <li>○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Can we get more information because Curriculum has more work than ever. Can we table this and bring them back? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Motion 2</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 2: Move to table this and bring them all back together.</b>  1<sup>st</sup>: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr  2<sup>nd</sup>: D. Burns-Peters</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P. Ferri-Milligan: What do I do now, nothing?</li> <li>• C. Huston: Correct, L. Hector can take it to Curriculum. I can pull up the documentation on reassign time and send it out to Exec.</li> <li>• P. Ferri-Milligan: I would suggest looking at Honors too. And what about Non-credit?</li> <li>• C. Huston: It's kind of a nebulous position. Non-credit depends on whether or not the funding comes through.</li> <li>• P. Ferri-Milligan: So I'll tell the Program Review Committee that we are going to do nothing, but know they approved this in terms of our committee. I'll take it back as a charge.</li> </ul> <p><b>Approved:</b> Unanimously  <b>Abstentions:</b> None</p>
<p><b>7. New Business</b></p>	<p><b>a. Term Class Lengths [T. Long]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">[see attachment: Research, Planning, &amp; Institutional Effectiveness]</a></li> <li>• C. Huston: This came up in a department chairs meeting and it caused a little</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>7. New Business,</b> continued</p>	<p>rumble. I want to say my bad and our [T. Long &amp; C. Huston] bad. T. Long &amp; I haven't had a chance to meet at all this semester and if we had met we would have seen it in Senate first. We are both sorry and I would like to ask that we be forgiven. We want to have a fresh look at this and "go boldly forward." The big thing about this is that we want to focus on what's best for students. We want our start/stop dates to align with that. We have our student initiatives and we've said our main goal is to improve student success, access, and retention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T. Long: We have about 56 classes for spring that aren't assigned. In other words we've scheduled them, but we don't have a classroom to put them in. All the deans have utilized their priority classrooms. It doesn't mean we can't find them, but currently our inventory is short.</li> <li>• C. Huston: That's how the conversations started at the executive levels. Under this new funding schedule we need to maximize FTES and get our students through to the next level. Maximizing success becomes a barrier because if we aren't getting funding we can't put them through. We have 23 different start/stop dates in the semester. We were given term lengths, sections offered for each term, retention/success, and hours/classroom utilization. The data was composite and that was one thing that frustrated the department chairs. Fourteen weeks was a recommended length for student success, but the data combined data for 13, 14, and 15 weeks. That was troubling. Fourteen weeks had 556 sections; 13 weeks had 149 sections. In my conversations with Dr. Long, we discussed that 13 weeks is marginally higher, but we would have to change 556 sections vs. changing 149 sections. Please note my tagline: there will always be exceptions (nursing, psych tech, police, etc.). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ C. Jones: Are you comparing types of classes? I would think science classes have to be long.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: Let's wait just a little longer for questions, then we can ask T. Long for the data we want.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• C. Huston: Eight and 9 weeks were combined data. The statement was that 8 weeks had high success rates. Nine weeks was most successful, but note that those are mostly programs like nursing and psych tech. The best thing we can really do is full-term. The draft recommendation of 3 types of terms was made to department chairs. Everyone felt boxed into these choices: 18-week full term, 14-week late start, or two 8-week terms. There is potential for flexibility and imagination.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>7. New Business,</b> continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ R. Hamdy: Was there thoughtful dialogue for 23 different start dates?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: There wasn't a lot of thoughtful dialogue after this was rolled out; it was more upset dialogue and misunderstanding. It came across as a directive. So we are starting the thoughtful dialogue now. We don't have to think in a box that says we only 3 choices.</li> <li>• C. Huston: At the Guided Pathways presentation we did an exercise where we pretended to be a student. I was a single mother planning to get a degree in Business Administration. My student could go to classes Monday – Thursday from 8 – 12 p.m. I was told I needed 2 particular classes in the first semester, so I went to the schedule of classes and discovered that I couldn't get the two classes I needed. So I decided to change my availability to working in the morning and taking classes in the evening. There was no way for my student to get the classes needed in the first term. We should at least have a conversation about this, look at data, and explore options. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ R. Hamdy: There are colleges that do this a lot of different ways. When you're at 16 weeks your success and retention is much higher. This is a good time to be reflective.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: That was some of the thought behind 8 weeks- when it comes to the point where we go to 16 weeks, the whole campus won't have to redo everything.</li> <li>○ T. Allen: Are they still talking about the 16-week calendar?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: Yes they're talking. The way I understand it is CTA is negotiating with the District. We have recommended a 16-week flexible calendar. The District, particularly the Board, wants a 16-week compressed calendar with a 2- or 3-week Winter intercession.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: That's not on the table anymore. We're past that.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: I want to put some faculty together to discuss this. Counseling would be good, CTE, maybe someone from every division. They can make recommendations and ask for data. That way you can see how it impacts your areas.</li> <li>○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: There will also be more changes in curriculum with pre- and co-requisites with AB 705.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: If we want to make a recommendation for the fall 2019 semester, the taskforce would need to meet and get feedback from department chairs by 10/19, draft to the Academic Senate by 11/07, draft to department chairs 11/16. We want to ask: is it logical, is it student-</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
7. New Business, continued	<p>centered? We want to recommend term lengths for face-to-face on-campus courses only. Online classes have a lot more flexibility and freedom. There can be separate recommendations online/hybrid/weekend. Volunteers?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: I wanted to comment. Thank you for your transparency in admitting that we all do this- what works best for me. Whoever did the practice session should be highly commended for having us go through this from the student's perspective. Having children of my own coming through the process right now I have a completely different perspective of the process I see some major deficits. I think we need to start using that perspective. Whoever did that, hats off to you.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: The other thing we need to consider is 23 start dates is a lot. Having gone to Cal State and knowing that CSUSB is switching to 16 weeks in 2020, I can't recall that many options for classes to start and stop. Our colleges are pretty extreme when we do that. I would also like us to consider that many of our students are transferring to CSUs and UCs and it's a failure on our part if that's the experience we are giving them here.</li> <li>○ T. Allen: I agree with what you're saying. If you take Mt. SAC who happens to be a feeder school for Cal Poly Pomona, they tend to try to align their schedules with Cal Poly Pomona (who just went from a semester to a semester system). How do we make that work?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: We're in negotiations.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: We can start this conversation now. Some of those reasons for adding late-start classes because 'we need to up FTES' as an argument isn't always doing students any favors. We want to put them in a situation where we make them successful.</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: I don't know that putting in a late start class means we are putting them in a bad situation. I think department chairs do that because we have students who need classes. Options aren't a bad thing; one size doesn't fit all. I think this conversation needs to have department chairs in this conversation because they schedule classes.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: How many department chairs are in the room? [Four people raise their hands].</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: I agree. I think there is good reason. Someone talked about the higher level/upper division courses- students may be able to test out and start those classes later. I would like to see some rationale for why</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>7. New Business,</b> continued</p>	<p>we start late. If we offer a late start, let's find a rhyme and reason and have a set date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: If the department chairs were upset about this it's probably not just because it was thrown at them, but because of what they're asked to do. I'm worried about the chairs.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: We can get it started here and extend it to all chairs to have a joint conversation.</li> <li>○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Is it possible to bring this presentation to the chair's meeting?</li> <li>○ T. Long- Yes, we are going to take it back to them. It would be nice to have a group that starts the conversation and we can take it back to them.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: We need some department chairs ahead of that.</li> <li>○ J. Demsky: Last senate meeting President Rodriguez &amp; Chancellor Baron sat there and sang the praises of late-starts because it raises FTES. As a historian, how did we get to offering 23 start dates?</li> <li>○ J. Smith: It was patchwork quilt and stop-gap measures. We did some so we could generate FTES when we absolutely needed it. The other was when we instituted waitlists and courses on demand, then we have these large waitlists and after courses started we needed the late-start class to accommodate those students. If it was the second/third week and we pulled the waitlist to see those students didn't get into a class yet, we started a 13/15-week course. It really wasn't a set of strategic actions; it was a set of stop-gap actions. We have a number of courses that range from 1- 6 weeks. There are a number that are with the police academy. It was a way to deal with emergency situations or short-term crises. Once things get instituted they tend to take on a life of their own.</li> <li>○ J. Demsky: I'm teaching a 15-week class this term, but it could easily be 16 weeks. Late-start anecdote: every semester I have a percentage (10-20%) who are only in that class because something happened in the first 8 weeks. It's a lifesaver for them to have the option to jump into a late-start class.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: It's something we want to have in a recommendation. This is the Senate's business and we need volunteers.</li> <li>○ L. Lopez: It sounds like we are going to rely on data. When there is a number associated to the term length why do people think that the number is the number because of the term length? Do 16-week classes have 68% success only because it's 16 weeks? We don't have that information. That</li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 2: Move to pull from the faculty chairs to develop a workgroup to address this issue with a Guided Pathways lens.</b>  1<sup>st</sup>: R. Hamdy  2<sup>nd</sup>: J. Demsky</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C. Huston: Are you recommending that senators be on this committee?</li> <li>• R. Hamdy: If they want to- anybody can be on it. It seems that the faculty chairs are the most concerned/ interested in this.</li> <li>• J. Demsky: I support the idea, but there's no way to compel the chairs to do it. Is there a</li> </ul>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>7. New Business,</b> continued</p>	<p>data won't help. The data is backward looking, so philosophy for example hasn't tried every term length. We would be limited to what we tried, if the goal is to increase these numbers, I should have the flexibility to try 15 weeks. If the It doesn't seem to be about student success numbers. If the numbers are higher for one group, but we don't want to make the greater change, then we should make the big change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ C. Huston: That's fine. I was just relating the rationale that was presented for 14 weeks.</li> <li>○ L. Lopez: The rationale wasn't about success numbers.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: It was about not making 556 faculty change how they teach their courses. They actually made a faculty concession. That's the type of stuff we need to have a conversation about. We need a small group.</li> <li>○ L. Lopez: My issue is that this wasn't initiated by the Senate. This came from the top down. This isn't a Senate issue. If it's a senate issue they should start the committee.</li> <li>○ J. Demsky: Who is the chair of chairs?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: There isn't one.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: Can I make a recommendation that you reach out to the faculty chairs and get the workgroup going from that group because they seem to be who will be particularly impacted. They can come back to the Senate.</li> <li>○ D. Fozouni: My question is does this apply to summer also or just fall/spring?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: Just fall/spring.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: Summer is 5, 7, and 5 weeks. I'll make the motion.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: We can decide not to deal with it like L. Lopez suggests, but then the Instruction Office will pick it back up and make a decision without our recommendation or input.</li> <li>○ T. Long: That's a possibility.</li> <li>○ S. Briggs: Whatever our body/campus decides, they decide. Considering what that decision is, we should consider our limitations as a campus. As we grow, we have some huge limitations in terms of space and how we are offering our classes and how some classes may be vacant 1-2 hours until someone else comes in. We find ourselves as we grow in a situation where we are unable to accommodate more classes, which then brings us to something else where we may have to offer more online classes. There are a lot going into. As I see it from my perspective, defining what our terms are and be more efficient in how we schedule rooms for students on campus.</li> </ul>	<p>way, J. Smith, to aggregate the data by department? Because that get's us closer to L. Lopez's point- which departments are lacking in success.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C. Huston: I'm going to add a <a href="#">friendly amendment</a> to include senators on that email.</li> <li>• C. Jones: I volunteer.</li> <li>• A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Me too. I'm a department chair. I take a friendly exception to what J. Demsky said, I am a doer and it's an overgeneralization.</li> <li>• J. Demsky: Agreed.</li> <li>• T. Vasquez: It would be helpful to know what the goals are before we set it up.</li> <li>• C. Huston: Look at the data and make an informed decision.</li> <li>• T. Vasquez: What lens do we want to use?</li> <li>• C. Huston: The cafeteria lens like J. Smith said.</li> <li>• T. Vasquez: I want that to be clear because everyone has a different perspective.</li> </ul>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>7. New Business,</b> continued</p>	<p>We need to consider that as well with regard to terms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J. Smith: In response to L. Lopez about the experiments, we can't randomly assign people to courses and see who does better. So we are always stuck with correlation.</li> <li>○ L. Lopez: There are other factors.</li> <li>○ J. Smith: We have created all these different term lengths and now we can compare them. We can see where is the highest/lowest retention. That's the most we can do with the data we have. We do have all these different categories we can compare. Another thing we didn't do in terms of statistics is a space analysis. We are moving to R-25 that's supposed to maximize the use of our classrooms, but what are the unintended consequences as we move to a 14-week course. An unintended consequence is for a 14-week course, that room cannot be used for that class. Back to the Guided Pathways cafeteria example, I know we want to offer a wide range of options. The issue is when we are able to give students clear instructions of their options are, they have a higher likelihood of success. We found students sitting in classrooms waiting for a class to start on the first day, but it doesn't start for 2 weeks. This creates a greater confusion as a larger consequence of addressing a problem that is not necessary. When we move to something like the 16- and 8-week classes, we are trying to make efficient use of our space.</li> <li>○ P: Ferri-Milligan: Didn't that consulting firm do a space study? They spent months right?</li> <li>○ J. Smith: The problem is you can do a space study and you can do some focused use of the data you get.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: I motion that we pull from the faculty chairs to develop a workgroup to view this from a Guided Pathways lens, senators can be on this workgroup if they want to. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Motion 3 [with friendly amendment]</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>b. SLO Rubric [C. Huston]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ASLO committee met we thought now we have SLOs aligned with curriculum and there is a stop-check along the way for the committee to look at SLOs and ask if they are even realistic. We got into a long discussion about how we aren't discipline experts. We asked what can we identify about an SLO that's not discipline specific and doesn't put any constraints on chairs or faculty? We wanted to develop a rubric that doesn't require discipline-specific</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters: Maybe not as specific as the Guided Pathways lens, but the lens of student access, which is one of our strategic goals.</li> <li>• R. Hamdy: Also consider what our feeder colleges think.</li> <li>• T. Vasquez: If the body is saying that the chairs look at the data for a recommendation we should note that there are 2 types- qualitative and quantitative. Will we get resources for that?</li> <li>• T. Long: I'm asking for student input.</li> <li>• J. Smith: Qualitative is very time consuming. I think it's part of helpful decision making for us. If we assume why students make decisions we might be wrong. We will use a survey and focus group.</li> <li>• P. Ferri-Milligan: I would like to call for the question.</li> </ul> <p><b>Approved:</b> Unanimously <b>Abstentions:</b> P. Ferri-Milligan</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>7. New Business,</b> continued</p>	<p>points. We came up with these 4 points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The SLO must be student focused.</li> <li>2. The SLO must use an action verb.</li> <li>3. The SLO must be measurable so we can assess it.</li> <li>4. The SLO must align with course objectives and content.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a committee we can identify whether or not the SLO meets these criteria.</li> <li>• <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ T. Vasquez: What do you mean by student-focused? How would you assess that?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: "The student will ____." What will the students be able to do after they leave your class? It won't be, "Students have passed the class." You laugh like I haven't seen that. Generally all SLOs are student-focused because we've gotten used to that language. By aligning with curriculum, they are reassessed every 7 years (2 years for CTE). Then it's on record and nobody is going through different SLOs on the department webpage, CurricUNET, and VPI webpage. We won't have to ask, "Which one is right?" It will be on the course outline of record.</li> <li>○ L. Hector: Now for faculty to change they will go through content review.</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: What's the plan of action if you check no on any of those?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: There is a place on CurricUNET where we can leave comments. We can say this isn't an action verb, please consider using one from Bloom's Taxonomy. Then after that it's up to the Curriculum Committee.</li> <li>○ L. Hector: It's another level to check like Honors or DE.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: It's similar to what you do in course objectives.</li> <li>○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Would this be helpful in Program Review or efficacy?</li> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: It's not our purview. We look to evaluate that they're doing what they said they would.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: Curriculum is looking at are they there and reasonable? Program Review is looking at are they assessed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Motion 4</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>c. <b>Open By-Laws 130s</b> [C. Huston] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would like to open the by-laws in section 130, which is how we select senators. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Motion 5</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>d. <b>CHC Advancement in Rank</b> [C. Huston] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As we know, Crafton Hiss College does advancement in rank very differently</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 4: Move to accept changes to bylaw 304.</b>  1<sup>st</sup>: M. Worsley  2<sup>nd</sup>: T. Allen  <b>Discussion:</b> None.  <b>Approved:</b> Unanimously  <b>Abstentions:</b> None</p> <p><b>Motion 5: Move to open by-laws in Section 130.</b>  1<sup>st</sup>: P. Ferri-Milligan  2<sup>nd</sup>: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr  <b>Discussion:</b> None.  <b>Approved:</b> Unanimously  <b>Abstentions:</b> None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>8. New Business,</b> continued</p>	<p>than we do. They do not follow the AP and they've been informed that they don't follow the AP and their professors aren't really professors. Crafton wanted to open the AP, but I didn't want to do that because then there is a 60 day clock. They propose that the AP has 2 processes for advancement in rank- one for each college. They propose we have our process, the AP we've followed for a number of years, and I know we aren't completely satisfied with this. I know there is often frustration that's expressed. Then they want their process; they don't apply for advancement in rank, they are given advancement in rank. They sent Los Angeles Community College District's policy, saying that each college shall respect the rank from the other college. That's one of their proposals: do what you want, we will keep our process and you keep yours. We could also have a conversation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ P. Ferri-Milligan: Having gone through this process, to me it's nothing if you don't earn it. I don't know that there's a case to get full professor by just being there. I think some people do work harder than others. We used to give them out before; it was tightened up over the last 10 years.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: It started in 1990 I think. Eventually they will take it to District Assembly to open the AP and ask for a separate policy.</li> <li>○ T. Vasquez: What happens if they transfer?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: We would honor their status from Crafton and vise-versa.</li> <li>○ T. Allen: Is that only with us and Crafton, or other schools?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: That's just us and Crafton.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: I just want to say that Crafton and Valley are on two very opposite ends of the spectrum. I know that there are a lot of people who love our process and I would never say to throw it out the window like Crafton does. As everyone can see, this was approved in 1990. Maybe we can come more in the middle between the two processes? We don't have to be completely aligned, but we can open it up for dialogue. I've seen lots of colleges do it lots of ways and ours sounds very rigid.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: We can look at other colleges.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: T. Long, at Mt. SAC don't they start you at the title 'professor'?</li> <li>○ T. Long: Yes.</li> <li>○ T. Allen: A lot of schools are doing that.</li> <li>○ D. Fozouni: I agree with P. Ferri-Milligan that automatic advancement does not make sense to me, but their titles make more sense. Coming in at the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<b>8. New Business,</b> continued	<p>probationary period as an assistant professor, then getting tenure as an associate professor, then once you pass certain requirements you become full professor. It's more consistent with other colleges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ R. Hamdy: I think it's time to reevaluate. We can find a happy middle ground that preserves the integrity of our process, but doesn't cause disdain for lack of a better word.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: Why don't I gather more data and schedule coffee with Senate President and we can revisit this? Okay, I'll go find more information. I wanted to get a feeling for what's going on with you all.</li> </ul> <p><b>e. Basic Skills Expenditure Report [C. Huston]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C. Huston: This showed up on Monday when it was due. I had not seen it before. We have a practice, especially with Basic Skills, that anything the president signs comes to Senate first. This was just a report of how the money was spent. It's the year-end expense report for 2016 – 2017. It was sent in without the signature with the caveat that we would look at it today and my signature would be forthcoming. It gives the amount we were awarded, \$138,337, and how it was broken down and spent according to the Basic Skills Committee. J. Murillo is the faculty chair of that committee.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Motion 6</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 6: Move to approve the signature.</b>            1<sup>st</sup>: T. Vasquez            2<sup>nd</sup>: P. Ferri-Milligan  <b>Discussion:</b> None.  <b>Approved:</b> Unanimously  <b>Abstentions:</b> None</p>
Topic	Discussion	Action
<b>9. SBVC President's Report</b> D. Rodriguez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report.</li> </ul>	
Topic	Discussion	Action
<b>10. Announcements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Fozouni: <a href="#">[see attachment: Horror Film Festival]</a> This is the 4th year of our Horror Film Festival. It will be the 4 Thursdays in month of October. Please tell your students- events are highly fun and educational. Thanks to the senators who have served on panels.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M. Worsley: Is it exclusively for our students?</li> <li>○ D. Fozouni: I don't make that decision, it's open to the public.</li> <li>○ T. Allen: I tell my students it's a cheap date</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>11. Adjournment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.</li> </ul>	