

SBVC Academic Senate

Meeting Minutes

February 6, 2019

AS/SS 207 3:00 – 4:30 P.M.

Topic	Discussion	Action
1. Call to Order and Roll Call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting called to order at 3:02 p.m. • Roll call via sign-in sheet [see attachment: AS Documents, Sign-in Sheet]. 	
2. Public Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None. 	
3. Senate President's Report C. Huston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see attachment on the Academic Senate's website, under Agendas & Minutes, 2/6/19] • Curriculum Chair: .58 reassign. Nominations are in progress. Interest letters should be emailed to D. Burns-Peters at dburns@sbccd.cc.ca.us by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 1, 2019. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Copeland: You can ask me if you have any questions. ○ Regional Curriculum Meeting on 3/8/19. • Bond Update: Updates at District Assembly yesterday. They are going out for RFP for a new Bond Program Manager. They're hoping to go to Board in April. They're also putting in the infrastructure for handling the bond and developing a cash flow management plan. The first building on the list is Tech. • IEPI-PRT Visit: I wanted to let you know that there is going to be another visit. It's a partnership resource team where they send people from other institutions to study a problem. The District asked them to study our IT process- looking at IT, TESS, staffing, etc. I would like to get two or three more faculty [in addition to the two who already volunteered] who are interested in technology at the District-level to participate. This would require face-to-face meetings at District. • College Council: S. Stark sent out an email earlier today with the full list of funding. • Legislation: I wanted to give you somewhere to look at legislation: www.faccc.org. We currently don't have a legislative policy chair. Interested parties should contact me. • Senate Proxys: Email btasaka@sbccd.cc.ca.us by 11:00 a.m. on Senate meeting days if you will be absent and if you have a proxy. 	
4. SBVC President's Report, D. Rodriguez [D. Humble]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Huston: This is our new Vice President of Instruction. • D. Humble: Thank you for having me in this meeting. I'm excited to be here and to work with all of you. • T. Allen: Welcome! • Others: Welcome! 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>5. Committee Reports</p>	<p>a. Personnel Policy [J. Notarangelo]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see handouts: Personnel Policy report and Advancement Memo 2019] • The advancement in rank process has begun. We are accepting applications until March 8. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Everyone has received two emails now- one on the process and the acceptability rubric. ○ We are in the process of forming the committee. The committee will decide on the cutoff scores for acceptance to a particular rank. ○ Two people who are normally on the committee are applying for advancement in rank so they cannot be on the committee this year. I need 2 replacements. It is about 1 hour of reading and 1.5 hours of meeting. Please contact me if you are interested. • We've been reviewing the AAIR process to see if it can be made more user-friendly and whether it should be made a District-wide policy so we have the same procedure as Crafton. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Our policy currently runs through personnel policy and it's given to professional development. ○ We reached out to Crafton to discuss aligning our processes. ○ If needed we will present two procedures to the Senate- the way that it currently is or a proposal for new proceedings. <p>b. Student Services [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>c. CTE [K. Melancon]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the agenda. <p>d. EEO [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>e. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We met on Monday and we had a lot of comments on advancement in rank that I will share with J. Notarangelo. • We still have money for conference requests. Please submit requests. • I've been working on one-on-one Oracle trainings that are open to everyone. Faculty, if you want to learn how to log into your accounts so you can see where your conference requests are. It doesn't mean you're going to do classified work, but it allows you to keep track. Managers can come as well. Tomorrow's appointments have already been double-booked. More are scheduled on the 21st. • I also want to encourage you, if there is professional development happening in any of your areas to please have it go through me. If you need professional development in your division meeting or any other meeting, come through me so our committee can track those and keep track for accreditation. <p>f. Elections [D. Burns-Peters]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Curriculum Chair position is open- I emailed it out today. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
5. Committee Reports, continued	<p>g. Curriculum [M. Copeland]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have a ton of courses we are approving. We are a little backlogged due to AB 705 stuff in the spring, but if you have something in the queue that you launched we should get to you by the end of the semester. You can email me with concerns. <p>h. Program Review [P. Ferri-Milligan]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report. <p>i. Accreditation & SLOs [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We met yesterday and finalized the SLO handbook, which we will address later today. We took a good look at how we are going to structure accreditation. We created a shared drive. We'll add to that drive so we can review it that way. Once we start getting information up we'll ask you to review it. We also assigned all of committee members to work with standards and to liaise with committees. <p>j. Ed Policy [vacant]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report <p>k. Legislative [vacant]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report <p>l. Financial Policy [vacant]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report 	
6. Additional Reports	<p>a. SBCCD-CTA [A. Avelar]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have negotiations on Friday. <p>b. District Assembly [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I had a couple of updates in the President's Report. We talked a lot about alignment with vision for success and how the numbers are wrong and very confusing. I think J. Gilbert will be at our next meeting to clear up some of the confusion. We are seeking a replacement representative for the term starting in 2019/2020. Announcements will be going out. 	
7. Consent Agenda	<p>a. Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1/16/19 <p>b. By-Laws</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Election of Regular Senators 131 – 139 Election of Adjunct Senators 150 – 156 Elections Committee 314 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motion 1 Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C. Huston: If you had a chance to look at the election of regular senators, the by-laws were very different from what we were actually practicing. A. Avelar: You said we have more senate seats open due to growth positions? C. Huston: We have more senators from the Science, Counseling, and CTE divisions. 	<p>Motion 1: Move to approve the consent agenda. 1st: M. Copeland 2nd: R. Hamdy Discussion: None Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: A. Pave</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. Old Business</p>	<p>a. SLO Handbook – Action Item [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SLO Handbook was sent out. There was a formatting error that has since been fixed. Unfortunately the file was one of those that was deleted just before we started. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ T. Vasquez: I had a tiny comment on the loop. ○ C. Huston: Closing the loop and starting over? ○ T. Vasquez: I feel like the loop itself is more self-explanatory. It’s not a big deal. ○ C. Huston: You want to see the front logo updated? We can take that as a friendly amendment. ○ T. Allen: Which one are you talking about? ○ C. Huston: I’ll open it so we can all see it. ○ T. Vasquez: My recommendation was just to remove the circle that says, “Close the Loop and start cycle again,” because you’re already in a loop. ○ C. Huston: Part of that is the accreditation language. We are trying to follow their language. ○ J. Notarangelo: Change the language, right? ○ T. Vasquez: No, take that circle out. When I read it, I think go back to step 1. The graphic itself doesn’t tell me. ○ A. Avelar: It’s not meant to go from evaluate back to establish. ○ C. Huston: We actually define close the loop in our documents. It talks about teaching and learning. ○ J. Notarangelo: I see. So it’s actually a process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Motion 2 	<p>Motion 2: Move to approve the SLO Handbook. 1st: J. Notarangelo 2nd: M. Copeland</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Avelar: Maybe we can look at renaming that part. • C. Huston: We can approve the handbook in the meantime. We’ll bring an update back when we get the SAO part of the cloud open. I would be more open to changing the word “establish.” <p>Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None</p>
<p>9. New Business</p>	<p>a. GPA requirement for all Concurrent Enrollment Students – Action Item [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a refresher when we met in November, we looked at the GPA in the context of CTE courses and made it possible for our CTE students to take anything that’s a 100-level course or above with a 2.0 GPA. We also made it possible for all of our students to take up to 11 units. • We had some intermittent conversation on changing the GPA for all dual and concurrently enrolled students to 2.0. • K. Melancon, P. Quach, and I researched this. Other schools are all over the place. Some schools have no GPA requirement. Some have 2.0. Some have 3.0. Crafton has a 2.5 requirement. We collected some success data from Crafton and also Chaffey (requiring a 2.0 GPA). There is a lot of data on dual and concurrent enrollment. It talks about how much more successful the students were in their high school. Their GPA was .24 higher than those who were not taking college-level courses. It also talked about the college-going rate of those students; they would come into the college as a high school student, stay in college, and transfer. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>9. New Business</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We didn't really find anything about a GPA requirement other than schools get to set their own. We found one study saying that students with less than a 3.0 GPA did benefit, but it was given as a range without specifics for each GPA. • The proposal is to change the GPA requirement from 3.0 to 2.0 to increase access to all high school students. Other colleges offer 2.0 and we want our local students to come here and stay here instead of going to another school. • Questions/Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: Since CTE already has the 2.0 requirement, does CTE have any data about success? ○ K. Melanchn: Not in concurrent/dual enrollment because it's too new. We don't have enough departments doing it. My courses were sort of a prototype. It's going, if we can keep our students in the country. We had something like 19 students start the program last year, and about 15 were sent back home to another country. It was successful in the sense that we started strong. Those that are left are still continuing and one has a job offer after he finishes high school this year. ○ A. Avelar: We don't have enough data points, but it seems like with our small sample size there was success. Would it make sense to make this a District-wide thing? Should we open conversation with Crafton to see what they think? ○ C. Huston: We can take that to them, but we currently have different requirements. ○ A. Avelar: One thing is if you see that from the District's perspective is if we do everything differently, it's hard for students to see us as one district. ○ C. Huston: We can take that to Crafton's Senate, let them know we are making this change, and invite them to change as well. We can also make sure that the next Senate President in a year or two has a say. When you consider AB 705 and you have people coming in without completing high school and declaring what their GPA is, why limit those in high school? In terms of success, just because a student is admitted to the campus doesn't mean they can override our co-requisite and pre-requisite courses. ○ A. Pave: I'm not as familiar with Valley's process yet, but the first part is important: seeing that these students academically qualify. If we have that part in place, I'm fine with a 2.0 GPA. The other thing is that the student should not have any failing grades. We should put something in there to show that the student has some kind of level of consistency at the high school level. If students are only getting A's in one area and are failing everywhere else, they may not succeed. ○ M. Copeland: From a curriculum perspective, it's important to keep in mind that we want to offer quality programs that serve students. We don't want to enroll as many students as we can. I know administration has to think about numbers, but from a faculty perspective certainly our goal is to offer quality instructional programs. ○ C. Huston: I agree. I would argue we want to let high school students have access to those 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>9. New Business, continued</p>	<p>quality instruction programs, not getting butts in seats is not nearly the consideration it used to be.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Copeland: We want to consider that the new funding formula is going to be partially based on student success. ○ M. Jacobo: I wanted to respond to A. Pave’s comment. The Middle College High School often admits students with low GPAs: like 1.8 or 1.9. Sometimes we think it’s a college prep school, but it’s the opposite. High school just isn’t working for them Ninety-something percent go to universities. I think that if a student has one failing grade, it might just be that high school isn’t working for them. That might be a good model. ○ K. Melancon: When we started looking at making it a 2.0 GPA across the board, we never once thought of moving students through like cattle. We still expect quality all the time. ○ J. Notarangelo: I can see a student screwing up in Art and still being successful in this program. I think we approve this and move on, and see if the data supports our decision. I would caution against being too prescriptive. ○ J. Bjerke: I think students can have a bad year and rebound from it. I score AP exams every few years, the numbers show that students who take a college-level course do much better later on, even if they don’t succeed on that AP test. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Motion 3 <p>b. Update GE Math Requirement – Action Item [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Math department developed a new course, Math 096. It’s a hybrid course that combines Math 090 and Math 095 in response to AB 705. The response I got from the Math department asked if this wording could be added. If students complete 096 they have met the requirement. The wording would be “Completion of MATH 095, or MATH 096, or a higher level course...” <p>c. Advancement in Rank [J. Notarangelo]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Executive Senate we had this discussion on advancement in rank and its revision, there was hearsay that Crafton considered opening AP/BP 7210 to revise it. The issue is we are in compliance right now and they are not. I haven’t heard anything from Crafton. My proposal is they can contact our Personnel Policy then we can discuss revising our policy. If it doesn’t work out, we can still continue to review our policy based on whatever feedback we get from Professional Development, other faculty on campus, and the Senate. • Questions/Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L. Gregory: Why aren’t they in compliance or what do they do? ○ J. Notarangelo: I don’t even know what they do. They go by longevity. ○ L. Gregory: I came from Crafton. Once I got tenure I moved to associate professor. ○ R. Hamdy: That’s not the way it should be, it should be assistant professor at tenure. What we do is Personnel Policy sends out an email. Advancement in rank is just an advancement in title, there’s no monetary tie to it. You have to write a letter and go through a process. What Crafton does is instead of making you write a letter and go through the process it’s 	<p>Motion 3: Move to approve change the GPA to 2.0. 1st: A. Avelar 2nd: J. Bjerke</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Huston: Do we want to add that we want to reexamine the data in two years? • Consensus: Yes. <p>Approved: Unanimously</p> <p>Abstentions: L. Gregory</p> <p>Motion 4: Move to approve the wording, “Completion of MATH 095, or MATH 096, or a higher level course...” 1st: D. Smith 2nd: L. Gregory</p> <p>Discussion: None</p> <p>Approved: Unanimously</p> <p>Abstentions: None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
9. New Business, continued	<p>just automatic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Jones: But also we're one step down from them, right? Because I'm still an instructor. I don't even get assistant professor until I'm tenured. ○ R. Hamdy: That's what Crafton does too. ○ L. Gregory: No, I was hired as assistant professor. When I got tenure I became an associate professor. ○ R. Hamdy: That's interesting, I didn't realize that. ○ C. Jones: I shouldn't be able to transfer to a sister college and have a sudden title change. ○ R. Hamdy: Well it shouldn't because of the AP. Take whatever it is that you're thinking, and email it to J. Notarangelo so they can compile it. ○ J. Notarangelo: What I really want is how you want to fix it. Everyone has our rubric, tell me what you want changed. Don't tell me what you don't like. My understanding is we are in compliance and they are not. ○ R. Hamdy: We have the opportunity to have dialogue and possibly change the AP/BP. My committee thinks we should be more in line with Crafton. ○ J. Notarangelo: And I think Crafton should align with us. Remember that this process has existed at Valley College for 90 years. I have no horse in this race. Professional Development already knows that Personnel Policy is on board, we want to revise the process. We can resolve this no matter what. ○ L. Gregory: Crafton wants to revise this policy? ○ C. Huston: Yes. They were told they can't print business cards because they weren't following policy. ○ J. Notarangelo: Let's adopt what we want and put it in place. ○ R. Hamdy: Joe emailed the policy, so review it and email him what you want. 	
10. Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Ababat: The blue flyer is for information/dissemination. The non-credit program wants to grow. We need your participation. We need volunteers. Meetings are every other Wednesday, aligning with Senate meetings, from 1 – 2:30 p.m. in AD/SS 200. ○ M. Copeland: I want to add that non-credit is wonderful, but there are some state guidelines. Number 9 for example, there are some state guidelines that your course needs to fall under in order to be considered for FTES. If you want to start a non-credit course, you can contact me and I'll let you know. ○ A. Avelar: I just recommend that if you plan to disseminate this that you put an asterisk by #9 with a disclaimer that it may not be the same. ○ R. Hamdy: We should not disseminate this flyer. It doesn't have your contact info, when your committee meets, etc. Can you hold off on disseminating this until more people have seen it? ○ K. Weiss: Civil Rights Concert on 2/22 at 7pm in the auditorium. 	
11. Adjournment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m. • Next meeting: February 20, 2019. 	