# SBVC Academic Senate
Meeting Minutes
October 17, 2018
AS/SS 207 3:00 – 4:30 P.M.

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|---|---|---|
| **1. Call to Order and Roll Call** | • Meeting called to order at 3:06 p.m.<br>• Roll call via sign-in sheet [see attachment: AS Documents, Sign-in Sheet]. | |
| **2. Public Comments** | • None | |
| **3. Senate President's Report** [C. Huston] | • [see attachment on the Academic Senate's website, under Agendas & Minutes, 10/17/18]<br>• BP/AP 2410: Went through as-is. We will have 4 consecutive meetings for anything that requires the Senate's review. The Chancellor is no longer the final say on academic and professional matters. The Board cannot change AP/BP 2410 or 2510 without collegial consultation.<br>• ASCCC Area D Meeting: A resolution for a vote of no confidence in the CCC Chancellor was considered. It will be brought back in the spring. Only a few college senates have passed a vote of no confidence resolution for the State Chancellor. SBVC may want to consider a resolution.<br>• Accreditation Faculty Lead: .6 reassign time. The deadline is 10/19/18 at 5:00 p.m.<br>• Sabbatical Leaves: The Board approved 2 sabbatical leaves. Deadline is 11/16/18.<br>• District Assembly: List of AP/BPS up for a 2<sup>nd</sup> read. Most are considered non-academic and professional matters. Only 5130 is, but I have not received any feedback on that one yet. | |
| **4. Committee Reports** | a. **Ed Policy** [vacant]<br>  • No report<br>b. **Legislative** [vacant]<br>  • No report<br>c. **Financial Policy** [vacant]<br>  • No report | |

| Topic | Discussion. | Action |
|---|---|---|
| **4. Committee Reports**, continued | **d. Personnel Policy** [J. Notarangelo]<br>• No report<br>**e. Student Services** [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr]<br>• Student Services committee will be working on the grade appeal process.<br>**f. CTE** [K. Melancon]<br>• No report<br>**g. EEO** [R. Hamdy]<br>• No report<br>**h. Elections** [D. Burns-Peters]<br>• No report<br>**i. Curriculum** [L. Hector]<br>• [see attachment: Academic Senate Bylaws: Page 12-13]<br>• We were charged to look at our by-laws after Program Review looked at theirs. Currently the Curriculum Chair has .58 release time. We want to be consistent with Honors and Program Review in processes. We added that it carries no less than .58 reassign time in ours.<br>• It was brought up that this might be something CTA should examine to secure the reassign time. I'm not sure how this aligns with faculty lead times. The pro of putting it into our contract is it's secured. A con would be that it would be much harder to change. Right now we are kind of crossing our fingers that we receive this reassign time.<br>• For now we wanted to include the "less than" language. The committee did not agree with term limitations. The language is similar to Honors, but the term is the same. Program Review suggested modeling the language of the Senate President. The Curriculum Committee did not feel this was appropriate for this position. The Committee did like the idea of alignment among the 3 committees, so maybe that is something to consider.<br>• **Questions/Comments:**<br>   ○ C. Huston: I thought it was .58 in the fall, but that it was less in spring.<br>   ○ K. Weiss: As far as terminology goes, release time is a union activity and reassign time more semantics.<br>   ○ L. Hector: Then we should say release time for all 3 committees. I think that changed under M. Copeland so that the semesters match each other.<br>   ○ **Motion 1**<br>**j. Program Review** [P. Ferri-Milligan] | **Motion 1**: **Move to add the minimum release time to .58 per semester for Curriculum Chair into the Curriculum Chair's by-laws and change reassign time to release time.**<br>1st: J. Notarangelo<br>2nd: C. Jones<br>**Discussion:**<br>• C. Huston: We will take that back to Honors and Program Review to see if they say release time.<br>**Approved:** Unanimously<br>**Abstentions:** None |

| Topic | Discussion. | Action |
|---|---|---|
| **4. Committee Reports**, continued | • K. Weiss: Come to the workshop on Friday if you need help. They're due Monday at noon. 12:01 p.m. is late.<br>**k. Accreditation & SLOs** [C. Huston]<br>• We are moving forward with aligning some of the accreditation standards with the committees and presenting to them. We want to get feedback from those committees to see how they align with accreditation standards and what evidence they have.<br>• We have faculty getting together tomorrow to provide feedback on the SLOs waiting in the queue for approval. We'll use our new SLO rubric.<br>**l. Professional Development** [R. Hamdy]<br>• No report | |
| **5. Additional Reports** | **a. SBCCD-CTA** [L. Lopez]<br>• No report<br>**b. District Assembly** [C. Huston]<br>• No report. | |
| **6. Consent Agenda** | **a. Minutes**<br>• **9/19/18**<br>• **10/3/18**<br> o **Motion 2** | **Motion 2: Move to approve both minutes.**<br>1st: D. Smith<br>2nd: D. Burns-Peters<br>**Discussion:**<br>**Approved:** Unanimously<br>**Abstentions:** None |
| **7. Old Business** | **a. By-Laws** [C. Huston]<br>• L. Hector already discussed under the Curriculum report.<br>**b. BP/AP 4100**<br>• This one has gone back and forth with Crafton quite a bit. A. Aguilar-Kitibutr has looked at this quite a bit.<br>• A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: The language did not contain Associate in Arts-Transfer and Associate in Science-Transfer. Also, together with adding that language, there are specific requirements mentioned in Education Code. There is law pertaining to transfer that isn't only in Title 5. It has to be a completion of general requirements, so we added the word "Education" as well. At the bottom in References, we included those Ed Code sections 66746 (a) and (b) and Title 5 Sections 5502(b). My committee recommended that we consent to this and move it forward to District Assembly unless the body feels otherwise. | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|---|---|---|
| **7. Old Business**, continued | • T. Long: Certificate of Achievement has changed to a minimum of 16 units (instead of 18) and 24-quarter units and that's effective now.<br>• A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Our committee recommended that we take out quarter units because neither campus really uses it. Nowhere did we find quarter systems in our language. We proposed just striking it.<br>   ○ C. Huston: I would ask what harm it would do to leave it in there. We could suddenly switch to a quarter system. We could have students with really old transcripts or some who transferred in from a quarter system.<br>   ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Yes, but students for a certificate of achievement 50% of units must be from SBVC. I asked Admissions and Records about students with older transcripts. We can leave it in in consideration of students who may have been here long ago.<br>   ○ L. Hector: The Curriculum Committee looked at this as well. We agreed to the addition of the associate transfers.<br>      ▪ **Motion 3**<br>• C. Huston: The AP is a little more complicated. [See AP 4100 on graduation requirements for degrees and certificates]<br>• A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Crafton wants to have 2 APs because we differ in our graduation requirements. The argument is that there is no need to delineate the 2 processes because it will get published in the college catalogue. In other words, they are willing to have a single AP instead of two. Our committee suggested the phrase, "as applicable," but Crafton didn't want that. The concession to this was that we don't have to mention everything but our published materials should have our individual. They took out the 24 units in general education. Note that Crafton has 18 units requited but Valley has 24. We require communication and analytical thinking and lifelong understanding. On the other hand, they do have ethnic studies for their requirement. This is where they were saying we don't need to be very specific on this. If you look at the bottom you can see that the general education requirements must include a minimum of work in the natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, and language and rationality; ethnic studies must be offered in at least one of these areas.  They double count ethnic studies in 2 categories. Overall this is not what we submitted.<br>   ○ C. Huston: D. Allen from Crafton said that the AP delineates the minimum requirements from Title 5 and Ed Code. Either college has the choice to | **Motion 3: Move to approve the BP as amended with the reduction of units.**<br>1st: J. Notarangelo<br>2nd: M. Jacobo<br>**Discussion:** None<br>**Approved:** Unanimously<br>**Abstentions:** None |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|---|---|---|
| **7. New Business**, continued |     o  increase the requirements; if/when the college does so, the change should be put in the college catalogue and not the AP. Is that your interpretation also?<br>    o  A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: That particular paragraph that includes and enumerates the general education requirements stops at language and rationality without including ours, the ethnic studies portion. That's why we worded it "as applicable." I need our English faculty to help wordsmith it. How can we meld the two ideas?<br>    o  C. Huston: If it's not ready we can pull it until it is.<br>    o  A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Then I suggest we table this.<br>    o  J. Notarangelo: I don't think we can do it any better than you guys are doing it.<br>    o  T. Allen: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr is an awesome leader, just so you know. I learn so much from her.<br>    o  C. Huston: I agree! We'll bring the AP back then.<br><br>**a.  District Rebranding** [A. Rodriguez]<br>    •  C. Huston: A. Rodriguez was not able to be here today; he will come another day.<br>**b.  OEI** [D. Burns-Peters and M. Worsley]<br>    •  D. Burns-Peters: We are your co-faculty leads for DE. We are having a blast with this. Hopefully this will be brief and informative.<br>    •  As you know, we are part of the Exchange. We are one of [56] campuses currently participating in the OEI. One benefit is it has the potential to bring FTES; students from across the state can enroll in our courses. Our courses are already up there, but we are not badged yet and identified as quality courses. That'll make sense in a minute. This encourages a standard in the teaching quality and formatting of online courses. The Exchange lays out a list of requirements of what the courses should look like and what components should be involved. It really has to do with accessibility and predictability for what students see. It also should increase the usability and ease of using those formats. It also provides students with additional support services (tutoring, counseling, etc.) that may not be available to all online students without being on campus.<br>    o  J. Notarangelo: I want to point out that the exchange isn't a death match of community colleges. They're working with the Cal States and UCs on this | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|---|---|---|
| **7. New Business**, continued | as well. There's a huge influx of students who want to take a class at a lower cost. It has huge potential.<br>o D. Burns-Peters: There's a lot of potential. They're also looking at courses or programs which may have lower enrollment, and they want campuses to collaborate and share information so students can complete a degree/program being limited to their campus. They're also doing this with faculty to see if they can teach at other campuses, provided they're qualified.<br>• D. Burns-Peters: Expectations of the OEI include an implementation team and student services/support tools (Net Tutor, Quest, Proctorio. Name Coach, Cranium Cafe). M. Worsley and myself have participated in some trainings already. We are working on rules of engagement for some of these services. For example, Net Tutor and tutoring- what does this mean? It's an amazing tool.<br>o M. Worsley: Or if our Center is closed, they can use that too.<br>o K. Weiss: Net Tutor is somewhat limited though; we have a maximum of 500 hours per semester before they start charging us, so for now only online students have access to that.<br>o D. Burns-Peters: These tools are technically available to the campus, but we will implement them online first and foremost because without the OEI that's quite expensive.<br>• D. Burns-Peters: We also have Quest. We also want to look at ways we can use/modify it to make sure that our students are prepared to learn online. Proctorio will give us the opportunity to provide online testing in a secured format – for example, you can put it on lockdown or you can have students identify themselves. We haven't had training on that yet. Name Coach is a cool one because students can identify their pronouns and pronunciation of their name. That may not seem like a big deal, but when a class is online it's not always clear what gender a student may identify with.  It's being presented as an equity tool. Cranium Café is a tool for counseling; we have 6 faculty trained to use that.<br>o A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Is there a limit to the usage of Cranium Café?<br>o D. Burns-Peters: No. It has a limit to where it can be used, like faculty can't just use it because they have other tools, but counseling can use it.<br>• D. Burns-Peters: We are looking to have full integration into the Exchange by | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|-------|-----------|--------|
| **7. New Business**, continued | Fall 2020; by that time we will need 20% of online course offerings on the Exchange. We also want quality badging. Those classes with quality badges rise to the top of students' lists of course options.<br>• Between now and 2020, we want to integrate our student success support tools and training for those tools. We also want to train faculty on compliance with Title 5 and alignment with OEI standards and expectations. We need to make sure faculty are prepared to teach online and understand substantive interaction (both student-to-student and faculty-to-student). Just saying you will reply to an email in 24 hours is not substantive.<br>   o L. Hector: Can I recommend that you send the changes and language to Curriculum so we can capture all that to make sure we are in compliance. We can work with CurricUNET to capture all of that.<br>   o D. Burns-Peters: Absolutely.<br>• D. Burns-Peters: We also want to identify faculty who want to teach online and establish a local campus Peer Online Course Review process (POCR) ["poker"]. The idea is we will have a process on campus that will prepare our courses to be forwarded to the Exchange. They realize they will be inundated with courses so they want to reach out to the local campuses for screening. On that note courses will be approved by course and the course and instructor approvals will go together. If I teach ASL 109, then I'm approved for it. My colleague S. Grey will have to get her course approved as well.<br>   o D. Rodriguez: Why is that? If your colleague agrees to teach in accordance with what you put forward isn't that acceptable?<br>   o M. Worsley: I think it has to do with the interaction component of teaching in general. They don't want to micromanage how courses are taught and one teacher is going to teach different from the next.<br>D. Burns-Peters: They also want to make sure you understand what's going on in the back end of the class. For example, Crafton has an example where they are given a ready-made class, but that faculty wants to make changes to the back end of the course and they don't know how.<br>   o J. Notarangelo: I want to add that I'm under the impression that if an instructor is otherwise approved in the OEI, if I shepherd my class though the OEI I am approved and I can teach other classes. Is that the case?<br>   o D. Burns-Peters: I'm not sure we will have to follow through on that. Those are questions we've seen come up. | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|---|---|---|
| **7. New Business**, continued |        ○  J. Notarangelo: So that would be a selling point in trying to get your courses approved for the Exchange.<br>       ○  M. Worsley: If it's not a selling point anymore we can find out the details of that. Having our own process of training will create a community of online teachers in general. They can be pretty disconnected from each other as of now. I still have a lot of questions- am I doing the right thing? What qualifies as good or substantive student-to-student/teacher-to-student interaction?<br>  •  D. Burns-Peters: What should you expect? We are going to request data, there will be trainings in DE, and hopefully consistent updates.<br>  •  Last but not least, what else are we doing in DE? It's not all OEI. We are looking to update our websites to make them more transparent and student friendly. M. Worsely and I are going through the Course Design academy so we know what it will look like. We are working with R. Hamdy to develop new training modules, beta anticipated Spring 2019. The committee completed an EMP, but decided not to do a program needs. It will go forward as it is right now as reassign time.<br>**c. SBVC Governance Handbook** [C. Huston]<br>  •  C. Huston: Last spring when AP 2510 came up, the language said we would rely on our governance handbook. Our handbook is 5 years old and still unapproved. I'm going to put this in the DropBox and ask people to look at it. The quickest thing to do is to hit ctrl+f and type "Academic Senate." The big one starts on page 3. It talks about the Board and College President. Our minutes said we wanted to keep AP 2510 until we approved the handbook. I want you to review it. There is language specific to the Curriculum Committee and Program Review. It will go to college council. It will go out to each shared governance committee that's listed. Please check it for accuracy and send me feedback.<br>**d. ASCCC Resolutions** [C. Huston]<br>  •  I just received an email while D. Burns-Peters was speaking stating that the resolutions were updated. I'll pull up the latest copy. Those going to plenary are under the ASCCC.org website and under Resolution Packed F18 Thursday final document. It's pretty straightforward.<br>  •  We will not be meeting again before I have to vote on these. Please give me your comments by November 3. | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|---|---|---|
| **7. New Business**, continued | • Resolutions briefly discussed and relevant comments:<br>   ○ 1.01: This had to do with the new online college. Addresses that the statewide Academic Senate will act as the Academic Senate for the online college until one is established.<br>   ○ 4.01: Assist was supposed to be fixed. This is used for articulation.<br>      ▪ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: It's good to give them a deadline because it's been promised for 3 years. The last resolved is good. I'm not sure about the first resolved- who the articulation officer be? Would that be anyone who volunteers? Wouldn't it be additional work for faculty?<br>      ▪ C. Huston: My interpretation is that this is a statewide committee and they will probably call for volunteers.<br>   ○ 5.02: New since Saturday. ASCCC recommend that local academic senates work within their colleges to identify and analyze costs as a result of AB 705 implementation.<br>      ▪ J. Notarangelo: The English department is actually pretty far along in determining rough drafts of funding effects of AB 705. There will be needs assessments for funding coming out.<br>   ○ 7.01: Redefining the Faculty Obligation Number (FON) to include noncredit faculty.<br>   ○ 8.01.01 and 8.01.02 (multiple measures amendment):<br>      ▪ T. Long: I just finished the AB 705 implementation survey, it seemed very clear that we should use high school GPA and I don't recall any other AB 705 language saying we use other multiple measures. It's interesting that the resolution says to add more to it.<br>      ▪ L. Hector: I think I've seen other multiple measures, especially in math- they said to use the last successful math class they took.<br>      ▪ J. Notarangelo: Students can ignore the assessment if they want. It's kind of toothless to do multiple measures if students have the opportunity to ignore them.<br>      ▪ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: If you say high school GPA plus our curriculum redesigned, we aren't even halfway to firming up our plans but they are adding more. As J. Notarangelo said, students can just self-place. The Academic Senate from the state used the phrase guided self-placement.<br>      ▪ J. Notarangelo: Let me be clear, is English comfortable with this? No. But we are preparing. | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|---|---|---|
| **7. New Business**, continued | ▪ T. Long: Another thing with this is I think I already have a big list of concerns from the English department regarding implementation. You can self-report a high school GPA, but if you're asking for more than that you need to ask for it somehow. You can't gather that information unless you're going to meet with students. How do you combine all of that data? The cost could be huge.<br>▪ C. Huston: The language urges us to consider; it's not legislation.<br>• 9.01: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: It seems like the state Academic Senate is coming up with guidance, not mandating anything. Perhaps you can mention the impact on our population.<br>  o C. Huston; there's a lot of concern for veterans who might lose benefits once they get a degree. It might be better for their benefits if they aren't auto-awarded a degree.<br>  o A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: That's part of counseling.<br>• 9.02: There is a difference in approvals for credit/noncredit curriculum processes.<br>  o T. Long: The problem is state approval. The time for approval of noncredit classes is longer. There's supposed to be a Title 5 change. They've been talking about this for a long time and it will streamline the process at the state level.<br>• C. Huston: I'll email this to everyone. If you have a strong feeling that you want this voted up or down, please let me know by Saturday, November 3. | |
| **9. SBVC President's Report**<br>D. Rodriguez | • As we close up the enrollments, the analysis of our enrollment for the fall term, we are below our projections. We are about 125 – 128 below in FTES. We are putting things in place for the spring to catch up. Keep in mind we also have the front end of the summer. I think we'll be okay.<br>• You may have heard some buzz about a rebranding of the District and changing logos. The District may move forward with rebranding themselves, but the colleges' logos will both remain the same. Everyone has come to the conclusion after talking to a number of stakeholders.<br>• VPI search- there was a little bit of a hiccup. The HR specialist who was assigned to it is no longer with the District. It took a little longer to assign someone to the position. We are still pushing for our timeline so we can get the successful candidate to start in January.<br>• Strategic planning- I think I chatted with the group about the flow chart and what | |

| Topic | Discussion | Action |
|---|---|---|
| **9. SBVC President's Report**, continued<br>D. Rodriguez | we are trying to develop in terms of our overall strategic plan. We want to align it with AB 705, Guided Pathways, etc. I'll send out a template to college council to help work on it and populate the template. Whoever your representative is on college council, they may be coming to you for input and advice on what we should put in the document.<br>• Talking about Title 5 and the non-credit curriculum and how it's a slow process at the state. I was meeting with some stakeholders to change the law and have non-credit move at the rate of credit so we can be nimble and move along in a timely manner.<br>• You've all head me mention the promise program. The District is going to put aside $10 million for a promise program. Our promise program is essentially Valley Bound. We are looking to upscale the program to include more students and also to extend it to 2 years. I'm not saying this is the golden ticket for all students because the students still have to do work. Some students may opt out.<br>  o T. Allen: If we can extend that it would be a dream come true. The program offers some great incentives though.<br>  o D. Rodriguez: It really does. It would be a tremendous positive impact in our community.<br>• D. Rodriguez: We are looking to help 2,000 students a year across the District. I'm passionate about it. We are also reaching out to business partners for funding and it's catching some interest. I'm excited about that. I think we can roll this out and start our promise program in the fall. | |
| **10. Announcements** | • None | |
| **11. Adjournment** | • Meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m. | |