

SBVC Academic Senate

Meeting Minutes

May 15, 2019

AD/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 3:05 p.m. • Roll call via sign-in sheet [see attachment: AS Documents, Sign-in Sheet]. 	
2. Public Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Avelar: We know that on the end-of-year report AB 705 will be topics of the next academic year. I want to make sure it's clear that it really applies to the English and math disciplines. In other disciplines it means that the prerequisites are all waived next year. We are going to invite counseling over for our division meeting so we can have a consistent message. • J. Bjerke: If any faculty are interested in a deep dive into textbook affordability and how it relates to equity, Guided Pathways, or other initiatives, there is a campus course that's a pilot right now; it's a self-paced course. • R. Hamdy: I want to thank Celia for all of her hard work [applause]. Here are flowers and a card. She's been an amazing leader and an amazing friend. 	
3. Senate President's Report C. Huston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for a great year! We did a lot of great work! [applause] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dual/concurrent enrollment: GPA, credit and noncredit classes ○ GE requirements for math ○ Consulting on AB 705, Guided Pathways, by-laws, etc. • There is a year-end summary; I know it's not all we do all year long, but I wanted to highlight some of the things we do. I know these meetings can feel like a lot of work, but we are doing really good work. • Next year we will be looking at our committee structure again. Think creatively over the summer. The CTA contract gives the Senate the right to assign committees. I know some people feel frustration with participation Let's think about committee structure to see what works for everyone so we can get everyone involved. • We are hoping to get the Statewide Academic Senate here to talk about the equivalency toolkit. • Kudos to Chef Meyer and the Culinary Arts students for today's refreshments. I also want to thank President Rodriguez. I stretched our budget very far this year and she helped us out. • We will need to elect the Senate President in the fall. Don't say you're too inexperienced or 	
Topic	Discussion	Action

<p>3. Senate President's Report, continued C. Huston</p>	<p>that you can't- you can! It's a really enriching position so give it some thought. It will challenge you and cause you to grow personally and professionally.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congratulate our Outstanding Professors; Amy Avelar is here. Also, to Rania Hamdy who got the Innovator of the Year award. Romana Pires and Yancy Carter also received awards from their division. We also had a lot of people advance in rank. • The Senate Retreat is August 14th from 10 a.m. – 2 p.m. We are going to start with an introduction to senate in the morning, and in the afternoon, we'll do teambuilding and planning. • Yesterday there was a vote of no confidence in the State Chancellor by the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges. What does that mean for our college? That's up to the body. As of last night, the Statewide Academic Senate had not held a vote of no confidence. They had some resolutions that included strong language and three very specific resolutions (listed in the Senate President's report). If we ever wanted to do a vote of no confidence it would take a first and second read. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D. Rodriguez: In the document that you read, did it list specific reasons for the vote of no confidence? ○ C. Huston: Yes, mostly around collegial consultation, the funding model, the online college, and a lack of engaging • New Save the Date: The Academic Academy in September 13 – 14, at the Queen Mary. If you're interested we'll have to do paperwork promptly when we get back in August. 	
<p>4. SBVC President's Report D. Rodriguez</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For summer and as we close up this academic year in terms of FTES we are closing the gap of where we should be. We are optimistic that we will be where we need to be. Fall is looking very strong. We are excited about that enrollment. • We have approximately a little over 1200 students that have gone through the whole process of filling out the application, doing financial aid paperwork, and are ready to start with us. Kudos to all of you who have helped in getting it ready. It's going to be a huge lift for our community. If you remember our initial goal was about 700 students. Remember that the District office has committed to fund as many students as needed. Our outreach has been out almost every night, even on weekends, promoting it to potential students. It's really good news. • M. Valdemar was voted as the CSEA Person of the Year for the state of California. We're excited about her and her accomplishments. She and I will be heading up to Sacramento to get her award from the Board of Governors. • The Spotighting event was a fun night. Congratulations to all the nominees and winners. Who knew that D. Lee had that voice? [laughter] 	
<p>Topic</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action</p>

<p>4. SBVC President's Report, continued D. Rodriguez</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classified Professionals' week is upon us. If you have classified professionals in your areas, encourage them to participate. There is something like 20 – 25 workshops. They put together a well-crafted event. • Commencement is around the corner. I'll see you there in your regalia. • Kudos to all of you for all the work you do here on the Senate. I was looking over your list of accomplishments. 	
<p>5. Committee Reports</p>	<p>a. Personnel Policy [J. Notarangelo] No report.</p> <p>b. Student Services [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. </p> <p>c. CTE [K. Melancon] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a consortium in Ontario and we talked to the industry about what they'd like to see us bring into the colleges. The biggest thing is electrification- everything is going electrical, not just for CTE, but for many areas. The biggest question I asked them all, they being the people asking for students to go work for them, is "What kind of certification do they have to work safely on those vehicles," and they didn't have anything to say. So, we're focusing on this with other colleges for safety in working on these electric vehicles. Our college is on the map. </p> <p>d. EEO [R. Hamdy] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have to turn in a report every year; there was a lot of carry-over from last year. I'm going to work with K. Hannon on some sustainable training for EEO. That's good to have because laws change all the time. </p> <p>e. Professional Development [R. Hamdy] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you haven't received an email from me about turning in your flex report, I'll probably be emailing you personally. If you already did it, then thank you! • I really need to talk to my committee about a different way to get those activities in and approved in a more timely manner. It's a lot of work I want to encourage you to log flex activities right away; it's so helpful to the committee. • Classified Connection Week is the week of June 3rd – June 6th. J. Rodriguez and I and a few other classified professionals have been working really hard on that. If you're here on campus and you want to attend, don't hesitate to register. There's space for everyone to attend those workshops. </p> <p>f. Elections [D. Burns-Peters] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. </p> <p>g. Curriculum [M. Copeland]</p>	
<p>Topic</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action</p>

<p>5. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see attachment: Curriculum Committee Year-End Report] • This is an overview of what the Curriculum Committee has done over this year. We actually have 9 new degrees, and 8 of those are transfer degrees. The Curriculum Committee has been pretty busy, especially the past few months. I think our board document this month was a little over 100 pages. People are still making changes and there is confusion and concern. I share that confusion and concern. The Committee has been considering making recommendations on AB 705, but we haven't arrived at a decision yet, so stay tuned. If you're concerned on the impacts of English and math, let me know. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R. Hamdy: Can I ask about Courseleaf? Is that active? ○ M. Copeland: To my knowledge, it's in a holding pattern. ○ D. Humble: Actually L. Bixler is very familiar with Courseleaf. He's been talking to them about using the work we've already done to move it forward. Stay tuned. ○ M. Copeland: I'm really hoping we can get something in place near year because we need an updated process to update our curriculum smoothly. ○ A. Avelar: Is there a way to consider being more nimble when we're able to offer courses and programs? I know there are articulation issues, but not all need to articulate. ○ M. Copeland: Typically the only time it's a problem is when it's an articulation issue; more often than not it's a prerequisite or corequisite issue. It's also a catalogue issue. I hear your frustrations with the lengthy process of curriculum. Let me say as a faculty member if you're on the ball with it you can probably get it through Curriculum in a month or two. Then it has to go to the board and then to the state. Then it has to go to the state. The issue is when it comes back- has the schedule already been done and do we need an addendum? We can have conversations with the Office of Instruction about offering those more quickly. ○ A. Avelar: We were doing addendums for online classes, so can we do addendums for others? ○ M. Copeland: So, the Curriculum Committee approves curriculum, we don't schedule. You would have to talk to the Office of Instruction to lobby to get your course offered when you want it offered. ○ D. Rodriguez: I think we talked about, last year at some point, that we aren't big on doing addendums to the catalogue. Maybe we'll 1 or 2 per semester. If we have a class we know we can fill, then we'll go through the steps to do that. 	
<p>Topic</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action</p>

<p>5. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Copeland: I think it would be helpful to have a process in place. Having a date so courses done by then can be part of Addendum A or Addendum B. I think D. Humble and I are going to talk about timelines and having processes in place. Certainly even non-transfer level courses, once they're approved there's no reason why we can't offer them. ○ K. Kafela: What's new about the nursing program? ○ M. Copeland: They completely revised their degree. Their accrediting body required it. ○ D. Rodriguez: They rewrote their curriculum to meet new standards. ○ L. Gregory: Is it less than the 45 units? ○ M. Copeland: I don't know off the top of my head. ○ K. Kafela: Can you give an example of which programs were deleted? ○ M. Copeland: Not off the top of my head. ○ A. Avelar: I can see why. Having this info as counseling faculty can help them advise students. ○ M. Copeland: We can certainly forward that information to Counseling. ○ D. Humble: I can say that a lot of those programs were old and needed to be deleted. Nothing current was deleted. ○ D. Rodriguez: If I heard correctly, we can get through the curriculum process from the time it goes arrives with the committee in a year's time? Because at one point it was about 2 years. ○ M. Copeland: Less than that. That's in a perfect world where everything runs smoothly. It also depends on when it gets submitted. And CID is also a process; I believe 60 days. ○ K. Melancon: Our technology went through in 6 months. ○ M. Copeland: CTE has other hoops to jump through because they have to go through the regional consortium. <p>h. Program Review [P. Ferri-Milligan]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I want to acknowledge that K. Melancon won an excellence in teaching award [applause]. ● [see attachment: Spring 2019 Efficacy Ratings (5/15/2019)] ● This year the Program Review Committee worked super hard. We had 48 full efficacy reviews including full efficacy, CTE reviews, and remediation reports from the last 2 years. All the departments have been notified. ● As many of you know, we don't make up the focus of the efficacy reports. They're attached to the strategic initiatives. We try to update the forms and review them every year. ● This year we have a lot more continuations. I think the reason is more people are coming 	
<p>Topic</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action</p>

<p>5. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to the workshops and working with committee members. That way the analysis gets brought forward and we can accurately see the programs. • We are always looking at solutions to various issues. We're hoping to link with C. Huston about an SLO workshop. Last year we took over the evaluation of those. And how to construct SLOs and SAOs that you can measure. I'm going to talk to institutional research. We use the EMP that's one sheet, but it's not tied to the Educational Master plan anymore. We're going to look for another way to get data to do needs assessment and efficacy. Program Review is tied to accreditation in many ways. We are trying to have a broad look of the campus. At one time the VPs sat on the committee because they know the breadth of their areas. Now we have designees. The committees made a motion that the VPs sit on the committee again. • The website is going to change over the summer. It has a lot of information and buttons on the side. There are buttons that are hard to maneuver. We want one report. The whole goal is that everything be really transparent: the process, the dates, etc. • I'm going to contact Crafton to see if they want to move forward with looking into an issue; we did get a motion of support from the Senate to move ahead with that. Programs are taken off of efficacy when they're outsourced. That outsourcing seems to create a problem in terms of efficacy. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: My department wants to work on the efficacy document in the fall and not the spring; is the template going to be the same? ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: The Program Review committee starts in August. We can maybe move up the review of the efficacy report because we usually don't revise it until the spring. We make the changes when we think our questions are unclear and we think people aren't answering them right. We'll review them early. Send me an email in September. ○ A. Avelar: Okay. I think I noticed that you were taking minutes and updating the website. That's a lot of work for the chair. Why is it all on you as chair? ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: I've taken minutes before. There's no support for Program Review in terms of that. Normally the dean should provide someone to take minutes, and W. Johnson has. Someone retired I believe. ○ A. Avelar: That's a heavy-duty committee. It should be consistent so the chair isn't doing it. We need those documents for accreditation ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: Thank you. I agree. The issue is when you chair a committee. The whole idea of having support is important. This is also an issue with honors, accreditation, and curriculum. We need to talk about that across committees. 	
<p>Topic</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action</p>

<p>5. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs assessment will begin early in the fall. I'll send out an email. <p>i. Accreditation & SLOs [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We've done our interviews. We collected our data. We have a lot of evidence. • The Vice President for our area, G. Momjian, came and shared info. • The thing I'm liking from ACCJC these days is they're giving the same consistent message for over 2 years. They aren't looking for every little flaw. They are looking for colleges to highlight successes and support areas where they're maybe falling behind. The attitude is the college is already accredited and they want to support that. • We should have a rough draft for our committee in August and a first draft to go out to the campus mid-fall. • I got invited to go on another visit for Madera Center, so it's a candidacy visit. I'm really glad to go out on a visit. <p>j. Non-Credit: [A. Ababat]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>k. Ed Policy [vacant]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report <p>l. Legislative [vacant]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report <p>m. Financial Policy [vacant]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report 	
<p>6. Additional Reports</p>	<p>a. SBCCD-CTA [A. Avelar]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voting closes on Friday. All members are eligible to vote. Contact Ted Phillips at Crafton or you can vote by paper ballot by going to the Union office. It's a lot easier online. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R. Hamdy: People are finding their email from T. Phillips in their spam inboxes. <p>b. District Assembly [A. Avelar]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The smoking policy where Crafton wanted to make the entire district non-smoking failed. It was a tied vote and the Committee Vice President had to break it. Please note that the existing policy allows Crafton, or any part of the District, to go smoke-free if they wish without imposing that on the rest of the District. • We're dark until August. 	
<p>7. Consent Agenda</p>	<p>a. Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5/1/19 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Motion 1 	<p>Motion 1: Move to approve the consent agenda. 1st: D. Smith 2nd: J. Banola</p>
<p>Topic</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action</p>

7. Consent Agenda, continued		Discussion: None Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None
8. Old Business	<p>a. Student Equity Report [C. Rodriguez, M. Cota, and S. Thayer]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Huston: The report was emailed out to everyone. C. Rodriguez, M. Cota, and S. Thayer are here to answer questions. One reason this is coming to us for a second vote is I have to sign it in the summer. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: Can I make a suggestion that we trust our Senate President’s judgement? Because I think if the turn-around time is quick not everyone will have the time to read it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Motion 2 	<p>Motion 2: Move to trust the judgement of the Senate President.</p> <p>1st: A. Avelar 2nd: K. Kafela</p> <p>Discussion: None Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: P. Ferri-Milligan</p>
9. New Business	<p>a. Preliminary Budget & Bookstore [S. Stark]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is just a summary. • As many of you are aware we start our developmental budget process in January based on the governor’s budget proposal. March is the big month where we put all of our expenses together. In May, very recently, the governor had a revised report. I read it for the first time this morning to see what some of the key points are. Highlights of the May revise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The January proposal had strong workforce program on a 1-time money deal. The revise said that it will be ongoing funding. ○ Cola: 3.26%, so it went down a little bit. This affects the rate we get for FTES. That 3% isn’t bad considering what we got in the last several years. ○ Growth funding is only .5% across the state for additional growth; for us that would mean about 57 FTES. ○ Cal STRS recommended a \$1 billion payment into Cal STRS. It would limit what the colleges have to put in. ○ Potentially we got news 3 or so months ago that there is a deficit factor on our budget this year. Every year they say we have so much money. They we get an IOU for what they can’t pay out. This year it was a \$5 million deficit factor for the District. I read in the May revise that there is enough revenue in the state so that this will probably go away. We don’t know about next year. That’s a big deal. 	
Topic	Discussion	Action

<p>9. New Business, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Our CTE building was added to the governor’s proposal for funding: \$34.4 million. That’s really good news. It’s not the finalization yet, but it’s on his plan now to fund the CTE building. That will allow our bond money to go a lot further. ● This is the developmental budget as it stands. I just submitted the last piece of this yesterday (an adjunct faculty adjustment for an increase in salary). Now fiscal services is preparing this for a tentative budget to go to board. We’re operating on that tentative budget for June, July, and August. Then the board approves it in September. Here’s where we’re at on the tentative budget. ○ New funding formula this year – student-centered funding formula. This is based on performance issues. We don’t have our numbers versus Crafton’s yet, but it seems like we’re getting very close with Crafton. It looks like it will come out to a 70%-30% split. Until we get a Resource Allocation Model (RAM), it will be divided almost at 70%-30%. ○ The income from the state is \$101,507,197. ○ The total district revenue is \$109,905,894 in our general fund. This is not categorical money or from the Department of Education. ○ The shared cost (what we pay based on our percentage of FTES of the total cost of the district office services): -\$15,946,505. ○ This is the first time we broke \$60 million. Academic salaries went up about \$2.5 million based on the increases. Last year our big jump was for classified. Everything went up. Our salaries and benefits are about 91% of our overall budget. I’ve watched that number grow from the high 80’s to the low 90’s over the last 6 years I’ve been here. We did not hold back this year on our 4000’s (supply budget) and 5000’s (contract services budgets). When you grow in FTES certain things have to give: you need more paperclips and toilet paper, and specimens to dissect. We didn’t go overboard but we wrote what we needed to operate the campus. ○ We have a \$62,505,170 total budget. Crafton has \$30,946,826, for a total of \$116,681,021 (District = \$23,229,025). That’s a deficit of about \$6.7 million this year. The Board want our piggy bank to be at least 10% of any given year. ○ We’re being paid back about \$2 million for expenses for FCC reimbursement. That puts us at a deficit of \$4,775,128. ○ Projection of site fund balance at year-end is \$17 million dollars. That’s 14.88% of the piggy bank reserve. ● Let’s take a look at next year (2021). All things being equal, people will move up steps, Cola, etc. You can see in the fund balance we have almost a \$5 million deficit next year and that brings us to a 10.7% piggy bank reserve. 	
<p>Topic</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action</p>

<p>9. New Business, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next year (21-22) out, instead of a \$5 million deficit it's only a \$1,952,874 deficit and we start to recover. We're at 8.99% in our piggy bank. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The May revise isn't reflected in this. That's all going to affect us for the good. • The next to the last year out on this projection you can see we have a little excess (\$1 million). • The 23-24 forecast: quite frankly a 5-year forecast can change a lot; there is a projected \$4 million excess and a 13% threshold. • There's a lot that's going to happen before finalizing in August. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D. Smith: The piggy bank fund- how is it invested? ○ S. Stark: That's just in our county treasury. It has to stay very liquid. It's earning, what, 5% interest? But it's very safe. ○ D. Smith: That's the best we can do? ○ S. Stark: Yes. There are other investments with an expected 4.5% per year. Those are some of the endowments that will help pay for promise program, media academy, etc. That's invested, but our piggy bank money stays in the country treasury. ○ A. Avelar: Definitely seeing that we have the allocations to Crafton, Valley, and District, it would also be nice to see how the campus has its budget in place. I think that's part of the accreditation process as well. ○ S. Stark: To see how the campus distributes its money as well? Yes, we have a report on that. ○ A. Avelar: It would also be helpful to see the actuals to see the patterns in the district. In terms of piggy bank, the state recommends a 5% reserve so having double or triple of that is fine. It's been very conservative, but we also want to make sure we staff appropriately. ○ S. Stark: This is the Standard IID person for ASLO. ○ C. Huston: Can we invite you back in the fall before this goes to the Board and to talk more specifically about the campus processes? ○ S. Stark: Yes. ○ A. Avelar: And the bookstore? ○ S. Stark: There is a lot of concern with the price of books. A. Avelar brought me concerns. We looked at this with the vice chancellor and my colleague at Crafton, M. Strong, and talked to the regional vice president for Follett. It turns out that some of it is miscommunication. What it came down to is Follett was unaware that there was special arrangements with the publisher to bring the price down. One thing we're going to 	
<p>Topic</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ tighten up is if you make arrangements with the publisher to get a good deal that we communicate it with the bookstore manager. I have a list of answers for A. Avelar that are specific to Chemistry. The other thing I noticed is the language on how books are priced and Follett's profit margin. We're going to do an amendment to the contract with very clear language so everyone can understand exactly how pricing works on books. ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: This makes the case for efficacy and outsourcing. If the program was more tied to the college and if it was understood the scope and vision of the college, they wouldn't be able to do this. I'm glad you said this. ○ J. Bjerke: If anyone wants to know what others are experiencing as other colleges also outsource their bookstores, there is a webinar on May 23rd. I can send you the link if you contact me. ○ J. Banola: I had a student email me about the summer book. She said it was supposed to be \$99, but ended up paying \$200. ○ A. Avelar: When we get that special deal with the publisher, we put the ISBN in manually, but it defaults to the national. So we've already done the work, but they don't check what we put in manually. ○ J. Banola: We have a special edition, but it's only supposed to be \$99. If you buy it somewhere else it should only be \$150. ○ A. Avelar: They told me it's supposed to be 25% for their profit margin, but they have freight costs, etc. So at most 10% more on top of that. Even with correct information it's up in the 40%. ○ C. Huston: Talk to faculty in your divisions to see if they're experiencing this as well. Give it to S. Stark. ○ S. Stark: Let's take a look at it. ○ R. Hamdy: Can we also invite the book store manager to a meeting? I think a lot of us don't even know who that is. ○ S. Stark: Robert Vega. He came back with a lot of good information. It doesn't all go in the direction that the bookstore was wrong; there were some misunderstandings. We'll get out some information on some things that need to change in protocols. ○ C. Huston: We'll try to get both of you to our first meeting next fall. 	
<p>9. New Business, continued</p>	<p>b. CCCCO's Vision for Success numbers [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see attachment: San Bernardino Community College] • I want to share this with you from the Board report. The Chancellor's office has required the District to set numbers to the goal. I want to remind you that in march we already took a position on the Vision of Success, but as a faculty we didn't agree to these numbers. We 	
<p>Topic</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action</p>

<p>9. New Business, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • already took a position and voted on it, so I wanted to share this with you as information. Based on the Chancellor’s office, these are the numbers everyone has been asked to strive to. District has to report these numbers. There is no penalty if we don’t reach them. We’re going to work towards them and be involved. We’re going to be innovative and help students succeed. • It’s an information item because I have to sign off on it, and I’ll be sharing our position with the Board tomorrow night. <p>c. 2019 – 2020 Academic Senate Executive Committee [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R. Hamdy and B. Tasaka were already elected. I was able to talk to many people chairing committees. I want to point out that we have an Ed Policy chair! J. Bjerke is going to do it for us next year [applause]. • I have R. Hamdy tentatively in as EEO chair, but she already has 2 other positions on the executive team. Is anyone interested in EEO chair? • R. Hamdy: They only meet once a quarter. They have a lot of impact on what happens districtwide. • By our by-laws we don’t need to vote on the Executive Committee. By practice we get a motion of support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Motion 3 <p>d. Strong Workforce Update [A. Maniaol]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Maniaol was not present. 	<p>Motion 3: Move to support the Executive Committee. 1st: A. Avelar 2nd: J. Bjerke Discussion: None Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None</p>
<p>10. Announcements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Huston: D. Burns-Peters isn’t here, but she wanted to share briefly about the possibility of a motion to request that TESS turn on a feature in Canvas that allows Canvas to pull a student’s preferred name instead of their legal name. I would need a motion to add that the to the agenda. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R. Hamdy: I think there was a misunderstanding in the DE Committee. We can just ask that TESS turn on a feature for students to put their preferred name into Canvas. This is a technical issue and I don’t want to go down the slippery slope that every time there is a new feature we don’t need Senate approval. • D. Rodriguez: Mt. SAC’s Academic Senate put forth a resolution about EOPS and its minimum qualifications. I think Crafton’s Senate also did this. Has this body taken up this conversation at all? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Huston: No, but we can agendize it in the fall. ○ D. Rodriguez: My pitch is that we support Mt SAC’s motion to leave the MQ’s and the funding for those programs as-is. It’s my understanding that Crafton may be asking the Board tomorrow night to support. 	
<p>Topic</p>	<p>Discussion</p>	<p>Action</p>

<p>10. Announcements continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ S. Thayer: So, the State Chancellor’s office has updated the guidelines for EOPS. Right now, EOPS requires a full-time director. The question is why make the change to this program in particular. Mt. SAC did a good job in articulating their support for this program. It’s a model program and it supports their students. It serves the neediest population; that’s why it’s coming up. It’s relatively new – it only came up in the last month. ○ C. Huston: We’ll look into that. ● J. Bjerke: ASG was asked to come up with a dollar amount for a low-cost threshold and they said \$45. ● C. Jones: If anyone who might be MESA-related knows guest-speakers who could come speak to our students, please let me know. 	
<p>11. Adjournment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m. ● Senate retreat: August 14, 2019, 10:00 – 2:00 p.m. in the Middle College High School auditorium. ● Next meeting: August 21, 2019, at 3:00 p.m. in AD/SS 207. 	