



SBVC Academic Senate

Meeting Minutes

October 2, 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 3:04 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"> • Brown Act & Roberts Rules of Order presentation on October 30, 2019, in the Library Viewing Room. • Campus Committee Assignments: A dean may not assign, reassign, or relieve a faculty member from their committee assignment. Committee members can ask to change committees, but you may need to have a replacement from your division in mind for Curriculum, Program Review, Basic Skills, or ASLO. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ P. Ferri-Milligan: I did put out an email to Program Review Committee members that when they are absent they need to address it with their dean as a workload issue. ◦ C. Huston: I think we should establish a formal policy for committee absences. • ASCCC Exemplary Program Award: Call for nominations for the Exemplary Program Award. Consider a nomination to recognize our campus. I'll forward the email to the campus. • Sabbatical Applications: Due November 1, 2019. 	
4. Committee Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ed Policy [J. Bjerke] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. b. Personnel Policy [J. Notarangelo] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. c. Student Services [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We'll continue the work we started last semester on the grade appeal process. We'll also work on academic renewal process and the by-laws and definition of what the committee is. d. CTE [K. Melancon] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. e. EEO [R. Hamdy] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We meet tomorrow so I'll have a report at the next meeting. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>4. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<p>f. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flex day on Friday went well. • I want to remind everyone about three upcoming events: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Brown Act and Robert’s Rules of Order presentation is coming up. Encourage anyone who has ever attended a meeting ever to attend this. It will be really beneficial. It is still officially a Senate meeting, but please register so we have a headcount. ○ Can Innovate, an online conference through @ONE, is all about Canvas and good teaching practices. It’s on October 25, 2019. I’ll send an email out in a couple of days for register. I need some facilitators to be in the rooms with me for the breakout sessions. ○ The Great Teachers Seminar is happening on November 1, 2019, at Crafton Hills College. It’s really exciting; they have some great facilities we can use. An email went out about that as well. It’s an excellent event for new or seasoned faculty. <p>g. Elections [D. Burns-Peters]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are still accepting nominations for the Academic Senate President and the Program Review Chair. Please encourage people to consider the positions. • C. Huston: Are we taking nominations from the floor today? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J. Bjerke: I nominate Davena Burns-Peters for Senate President. ○ [D. Burns-Peters accepted the nomination during Announcements.] • D. Burns-Peters: We also have two adjunct faculty senator positions available and we have three nominations. I’ll pass it out the interest letters as well as the ballot, and let people review it throughout the meeting. Turn the ballots in by the end of the meeting. Pick two out of the three applicants. We’ll tally the ballots and bring it back to the Senate according to our by-laws. <p>h. Curriculum [M. Copeland]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update: We started the discussion on class caps two weeks ago in the Senate. I’m going to pass out that information with the individual department chairs so they can get it to their departments. I’ll have more information in a couple of weeks. <p>i. Program Review [P. Ferri-Milligan]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs Assessment is due on October 23rd. EMPs should have been given to the division deans on October 1st. • We have 2 upcoming workshops if you need help with your Needs Assessment documents: October 4th from 9:30 – 11 a.m. in B-204, and October 18, from 9:30 – 11 a.m. in B-204. • The Program Review Committee was asked by several departments to release the efficacy documents in the fall, so we are working to do that. They should all be out within 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>4. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<p>the next 3 weeks or so.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Program Review Chair came out for next fall. As you know the Senate approved a request that the position be increased from .38 to .58 release time. I sent an email to administration, but I didn't get a response. I'll keep up on that. If the strategic initiatives or strategic plan is changing, and if the college is in any way going to change the program review process, that adds to the workload that already cannot be accommodated by .38. I think it's too much work for a .38, so I encourage the Senate and faculty who are thinking of applying to advocate for an increase in release time, especially with Program Review's impact on the accreditation standards. <p>j. Accreditation & SLOs [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We had a good meeting yesterday. We have a fall draft of the ISER that the committee is reviewing. We also sent it to some people at the District to look for omissions or errors. We'll probably go campus-wide with the document at the next meeting. 	
<p>5. Additional Reports</p>	<p>a. SBCCD-CTA [S. Lillard]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report. <p>b. District Assembly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [see handout: Measure CC timeline] We looked over some APs/BPs. We also looked at the timeline for the Measure CC money. There is a RFQP for the parking garage. We should have already done one for the tech building. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. Baron: They hired the architect. C. Huston: Okay, so we are moving forward with our building projects based on the prioritization that was done in our master plan several years ago. 	
<p>6. Consent Agenda</p>	<p>a. Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9/18/19 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motion 1 Motion 2 	<p>Motion 1: Move to approve the consent agenda. 1st: J. Notarangelo 2nd: D. Burns-Peters Discussion: None Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>6. Consent Agenda, continued</p>		<p>Motion 2: Move to items 8a and 8b next so the Chancellor has time to update us. 1st: R. Hamdy 2nd: L. Burnham Discussion: None Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None</p>
<p>7. Old Business</p>	<p>a. Campus Committees [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I haven't received anything formal. It's mostly been people making off-the-cuff suggestions. • We have currently 17 committees and approximately 180 full-time faculty (depending on who is hired or retires). Curriculum and Program Review require 10%, so that takes 26 people off the top. That leaves 154 people for the remaining committees. That leaves about 10 people per committee. We could actually add committees if we see a need without disproportionately impacting the existing ones. We could also delete them. • One idea was to take SSSP and Enrollment Management and Student Equity, and reform them into SSSP/Enrollment Management and spin out Equity on its own. The other recommendation I heard was to break out Enrollment Management and Equity. I'm looking to see if this is the will of the body. If so, Exec will look at some of the recommendations. • C. Huston: Another idea was to work with the Foundation to develop a policy or by-law to ensure faculty participation in selection. Right now there is nothing that guarantees faculty on the Scholarship Committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D. Burns-Peters: Can you remind us how many faculty are obligated to that committee? ○ C. Huston: It's a very large committee. We tried to restrict it, but we were unsuccessful. • C. Huston: Another idea was to change representation for committees like Program Review. We could ask new faculty to serve on committees immediately. We could create a Grants and Initiatives Committee. We could have the Elections Committee make all the committee assignments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ L. Burnham: I was going to make a recommendation to have term limits so you don't have faculty continuously select the Online Committee. Hopefully that would lead to people being more involved. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>7. Old Business, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Huston: The idea of having a committee rotation for Program Review and Curriculum so everyone has a chance to serve and get a bigger view of the campus. ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: We were talking about best practices today. We've been assigned committees in the past. Keeping it at the division level seems like the better option. Maybe best practices is working with the divisions. ○ C. Huston: This is just the new stuff I've heard since then. ○ R. Hamdy: I think a good idea is to create minimums and maximums for each committee. You're right, we have so many faculty on the Scholarship Committee and the Online Committee. ○ C. Huston: Let me show you what went out last time. We had a list with the minimums and maximums for each committee. ○ M. Copeland: We have a process in the Humanities division. Maybe senators need to be charged with coming up with a process. ○ R. Hamdy: Let's really have a training for best practices on how to sign up for committees. Then we can go to those other ideas. ○ C. Huston: These ideas aren't about signing up faculty for committees, it's about blending committees or creating new ones. ○ D. Burns-Peters: I'm assuming we reassign people who sign up for committees where there isn't space? ○ C. Huston: Yes, but they get mad. ○ M. Worsley: I like signing up for my own committee, especially because there is a learning curve. Maybe we can assign to those who don't sign up. ○ R. Hamdy: I'm not comfortable with putting brand new faculty into committees. I've got 8 and they're already overwhelmed as it is. ○ D. Burns-Peters: It's nice to have that first year to get your feet wet. Can we build in that exposure? ○ R. Hamdy: Yes. ○ T. Allen: Going back to term limits, which I think is a great idea. How would that work for departments with specific department members to be part of it? ○ C. Huston: Take Basic Skills. You have 3 Reading faculty and they require 1. Then say 1 Reading faculty would take it for 2 terms, then another would have to step up. ○ M. Copeland: I understand the idea of term limits. We want to encourage faculty who don't work on high-work committees to move around. That could have the unintended consequence of removing hard-working faculty. I would be sad to lose them. I don't know how we would find a balance to that unless you exempt Curriculum and Program 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
7. Old Business, continued	<p>Review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R. Hamdy: I agree, I don't want to lose my people either. ○ J. Notarangelo: I'm not sure about term limits. The institutional memory of a committee is really important. ○ D. Burns-Peters: If there is no by-law indicating that faculty have to serve on Scholarship, I would like to revisit that. I know we need the faculty voice, but in that high-workload time I'm sure there are faculty who would be willing to speak up. ○ C. Huston: It's one of those things that would take months to complete the process. ○ L. Burnham: I don't think everyone said it's not a good idea to have term limits. I agree, not everyone is seeking out Curriculum or Program Review, but we should consider it. ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: I think new blood is needed for new perspectives. Sometimes we hold on to things and don't want to let go. ○ C. Huston: We'll take this to Exec and try to bring something back to the body. 	
8. New Business	<p>a. Chancellor's Update [B. Baron]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● [see handouts: Re: Two solutions to fix Student Centered Funding Formula and address the \$57.5 million shortfall in state funding for community colleges in Inland California and A Call to Action] ● This handout is a letter we authored regarding the state budget for this year. The state has moved to a student-centered funding formula based on students' success metrics. It's only 10% of the budget, but it becomes significant because they reduce the budget for enrollment. So it's not only about people in seats, but also about them doing well. Last year was the first year of the implementation of the funding formula. Our district did really well. Some others did really well. What happened was the state didn't have money to provide funding for all the districts so you're rewarded for your good performance. We were shorted \$2 million in our budget this year based on last year's performance. As a matter of fact, every college in the Inland Empire has been shorted over \$20 million. Whereas the coastal colleges are getting a lot of extra money because they are in "hold harmless," meaning if you don't perform well your budget isn't cut. You're held harmless for 2 years. You don't have to assume a budget reduction at any one time. The whole implementation is a disaster and it really comes through the State Chancellor's Office. We went into action in the last few weeks. I've spoken to E. Oakley several times. I said our district lost \$2 million. I said that we're being punished and it's a disincentive to our faculty. I spoke to Assemblymember E. Reyes-Gomes and Senator C. Leyva. I really tried to make this a public issue. I told E. Oakley we are going to take this to the mat. Where this stands is, statewide the budget is \$100 million short to fund everyone appropriately. In the governor's budget in January 2021 is full funding for student success. The chancellor is 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>trying to send it to the governor to make it a funding issue as opposed to a very poor implementation. If there's not enough money they could have spread out the money they did have. They hurt the most economically disadvantaged communities, the ones that need it the most, much more than the more wealthy coastal communities. It's a political issue as well as a funding issue. This letter is one we authored and several other districts signed on. It went to the governor. We are going to continue to fight to make sure that we get that full funding. Our performance was well. It was really good. We had more students graduating, more learning certificate degrees than ever before, more persisting from year to year. We are doing a really good job. When you look at the data you see our performance, you see that you guys took it really seriously. There is a brief two-page whitepaper that J. Torres wrote. He did a really good job. Nobody else looked at it regionally. When you look at it regionally you see the inequity and the economic and what some people call racial discrimination. I'm proud we are leaders in working that through.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yesterday we were notified that we received a \$3 million grant from the Department of Commerce, the Economic Development Agency for not-for-credit job training at EDCT. A lot of that has to do with creating new jobs through contracts with employment and getting people interested in STEM and handing them off to the colleges for their education. Rumor control: I heard that the colleges are worried about EDCT offering for-credit or non-credit classes. They are not. They can't. I won't let them. They don't want to. That's your work. That's the work of the faculty on campus. All EDCT is doing is offering not-for-credit classes. If the campus wants to hold a non-credit or credit class at a different location than they have, that's fine. They will not offer any credit or non-credit classes. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Huston: Are they going to offer any classes that replicate what we offer here? ○ B. Baron: I hope not, but if you see something that does let's talk about it. For example, they have a pre-apprenticeship program, or they did last year, to get people interested in the construction trades. This is a program from Washington called MC3. It's a certificate, a not-for-credit program. You need a vehicle and a basic algebra knowledge. I think they either waived the algebra or they might hold a quick and down-and-dirty algebra down to the level of the class. If that's problematic, let's talk about it. They did offer an algebra class like you do here. They just offered a bridge to help students in the class. ○ C. Huston: How can we find out what they offer if there is no information available? ○ B. Baron: The whole district is redesigning their website. So they don't have a website 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>right now. You're welcome to meet with me and R. Galope to go over all the classes they offer now. Everything is transparent. The rule is not-for-credit or contract.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Copeland: I don't think the concern from faculty is that they're offering credit or non-credit, but that they're offering classes that really should be for credit offered at Valley. ○ B. Baron: I'm willing to discuss that outside of this room. They provide training to over 100 employers. They offer us, I don't know, \$50 a student, to provide customer service training or this or that. I'm sure many of those classes are things you can come to college for and learn in a college environment. If there is that kind of overlap there's a discussion we should have, and maybe we should refer them to Valley. To me it's not a territory thing, it's just do the right thing. ○ R. Hamdy: Just before you get off the EDCT topic. You said with the \$3 million grant you would get them interested then hand them off to the college. Has that been worked out? I really believe that the students taking those classes have a misunderstanding of what they're taking. For example, they take a professional development class and they think they're earning credit at the college. Then they call me because they see professional development and they don't understand the process. Maybe we can use that grant to create a real pipeline or streamline the process. Right now that's not happening. ○ B. Baron: We had a few years ago an EDCT steering committee with J. Stanskas and Crafton's Senate President at the time. There were some other folks on it. Matthew Bison was on it, but he was a kingdom builder so the committee didn't work well. I'm open to resurrecting that kind of committee where we're working to see what's the best way to see being offered at EDCT and in instruction. I'm even willing to decentralize EDCT instruction. It doesn't matter to me if it's offered at EDCT or if classes are being taught in that manner to the college. We want to find out if this is what's going on or not because I don't know. I want to do the right thing. ○ R. Hamdy: I think with this grant if the ultimate goal is to help them further their education or give them Valley or Crafton as an option, then instruction or student services should be in those meetings as the grant gets rolled out. That way you don't have EDCT people give false information to the students and then they act on those assumptions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. Baron: The money is to buy a building. There is a building that San Manuel sold to us in Highland. It's sort of between Crafton and Valley. In that building is a maker space, so they had step camps, so we had a contract with the San Bernardino City Unified School District. They pay so much money over the summer and we had 5 and 6 year olds, up to high school students. They came and made things on 3D printers and 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>designed things. They were getting a taste of the technology. As the older students were taking classes they shared information about what programs were available in machining or at the colleges if they were interested in going into that. That's all done by EDCT without any specific label or discussion. Let's think about the best way, maybe District Assembly, or the Senate Presidents and I can get together.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Huston: We'll move it to Senate Exec and decide how to move forward. ● B. Baron: The other thing is as I was looking at the overall budget this year, we really need a new budget model. Last year I said we need one. We're working on accreditation and it's probably not the time to make changes to anything. I think we need to look beyond the 70-30 split. We need to look beyond how the District office is funded. Personally I'm not happy. The District office has about 19% of the unrestricted general fund budget. When I worked at the LA District, the District Budget Committee had a very hands-on role in how the central offices were funded. There was a very healthy discussion between colleges and the district office to explain why money was being taken from the colleges when you make the money. I've asked all of the directors at the central administration to review their budget and decide what is nonessential as a 5%-10% deduction. I would like to get that 19% to a lower number. If I fail at that, I'm going to personally look at budgets. I think there is a role for the Budget Committee to do more work so that the district office central services budget can be more transparent and there's an agreement on costs. These are costs that make sense. This year there was almost a \$2 million increase, mostly for police officers. The officers were working way too much overtime. So we hired several new police officers. It was brought to the District Budget Committee as information; it wasn't a back-and-forth discussion. I want you to know I'm sensitive to the funding plan the district offices receives. I think we need to look at process and I think that process is how we can be transparent and how we can get input. I want you to know I'm aware of that. ● We just mentioned we hired an architect. We are getting \$24 million from the state to help build the CTE building. Thanks to E. Reyes-Gomez and C. Leyva who worked hard for it because we weren't getting our fair share of state bond money. It comes with very tight timelines though. They'll be working with A. Maniaol to get faculty involved. There are already some preliminary drawings that we used to get the funding, but we want to start moving forward in a progressive way in consultation with faculty. ● The Promise Program has been an amazing success. We budgeted and expected 1000 high school students and had about 1800 high school students. The interest from the 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>students, high school counselors, parents is just phenomenal. We've already started to recruit for next year. We've been going back and forth. People have been saying we should reduce the program so it fits the budget. My philosophy is a little different. This program can be a game-changer for the Inland Empire. We have the most college-going rate in the state, and one of the poorest college success in the state. It will do two things. One it will change the college-going rate. We will capture more students going to college. Two all the student support build into it, I think we will get more students through college in 2 years which is a miracle because it takes most 6 – 8 years on average. That would be amazing if we can get them through in 2 years with a certificate or degree. I'm going to look at non-general fund sources like the FCC money, which of course is allocated to a number of things already, but I want to make sure we fund the Promise. I'm fundraising with corporations and vendors and I'm trying to raise money. We put aside \$5 million a year, but it's more like \$9 million a year that we need to pay the gap between students and their financial aid. I guess what I'm saying to you is the Promise is a huge success. I really appreciate all the support we've gotten from Student Services faculty and staff. If we can have a good year and show the persistence of first-year Promise year students to the second year of college, we have good data to go raise money. We can really say we are keeping students in college. No district in the state has a promise program like ours: textbooks are completely paid for, a Chromebook is handed out to those who need it, there's a \$300 support stipend, plus all the back-end support like SI. I'm committed to it 100% and we are looking to fund it from a source that does not affect the colleges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You probably heard we are looking to negotiate the purchase of the Swap Meet property across the street. We think the future of Valley College is going to be too tight. We're pretty landlocked and we need to look to the next 10 or 15 years. I envision that we have that. President Rodriguez talked about the Student Services building being there or student housing, with a bridge across Mt. Vernon. Owning that land is essential to the future of this college. The owner wants to sell; he wants to retire. So it's going on the market. We are looking to negotiate the price. Or if we want we can look into eminent domain which allows an entity like ours to take property, but we still have to pay a fair price. You'll probably hear more about it. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> P. Ferri-Milligan: I have 2 English 101 classes with AB 705 curriculum filled with Promise students. They are some of the most hard-working students I have ever had. Although some of them are not very knowledgeable about college, I want to reiterate that support services like tutoring and SI are the key to keeping them in college. They need to make 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>contacts with the tutors to reinforce not only the curriculum, but their value. The other thing is I'm not a numbers gal. Last semester you talked about having some funds to hire and that you were doing a hiring study. Is that no longer going on?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B. Baron: Those are good questions. First of all, as part of the program, we gave each college extra funding for tutors, SI, and a coordinator to run the program. I'm not sure exactly how it's organized here. I'm sure S. Thayer knows all about it. It would cover the fees needed to manage those services. Last time, I thought for accreditation we had to do a formal staffing plan. I thought as part of the work of the staffing plan we would define our goals for faculty numbers and make a decision about the FON and the 75-25, which would be very expensive. It turned out we don't have to do a staffing plan for accreditation anymore, they eliminated that requirement. So we kind of put that project aside to work on accreditation. ○ C. Huston: We still have to show how we meet the standard for planning how we staff our campus, so there is still a requirement but it doesn't have to be a formal plan. We had a lot of conversation on our ASLO committee, we weren't necessarily comfortable not having a plan, but we haven't had a chance to talk about it yet. ○ B. Baron: We're still looking at ourselves. We don't have as many faculty as the FON tells us to. I would like to have a lot of full-time faculty, but the truth is we can't afford it right now unless we totally look at the budget and reprioritize how we spend our money. When I got here we had a 30% fund balance and I thought that was high. Now the Board says it has to be 10%. We are now at deficit spending. Right now every budget for the next 4 years we are spending more money than we are taking in revenue and we are getting to that 10%. I promised you that we would get salaries to the median and I made a big investment in that. All of you are worth paying a better wage to. Right now I don't see how we can afford to create full-time faculty. The money I said we had, about \$800,000 was a line item from the state. They were holding us to creating full-time faculty and I had to use the money to pay out the raises. It was a choice the Board made because that was a high priority. I'm open to discussion. We can have 100% full-time faculty, no offense to adjuncts. That's the answer. I'm not happy with the answer. Every employee at EDCT except R. Galope and his secretary is funded through grants. So it's a low impact on the general fund. ○ M. Copeland: The salaries for employees at EDCT are from grants as well? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> B. Baron: Yes. It was a decision made years ago that the Vice Chancellor of Economic Development really should be a general-funded position and not paid on soft money. The Board moved that to the general fund, and his secretary, but everyone else is paid out of 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>grants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Worsley: Speaking of money, thank you for the talk of reprioritizing the District budget and making that more transparent. As someone who was very confused by the last report we got and not seeing those numbers, that's very comforting. I can't help but think this is an opportunity for shared governance. Would you keep us informed as far as marketing materials for the Promise Program? I've asked a few times for literature as I go to the high schools to recruit students for music. I've got literature for us, but I don't have any for the Promise Program, which is a wonderful selling point. Just in terms of keeping the ground forces involved. ○ B. Baron: Did you get anything from A. Rodriguez for this? ○ S. Thayer: It's coming shortly. It'll be in the outreach office and there will be a flyer. ○ B. Baron: I'm willing to put a batch in every faculty mailbox. ○ M. Worsley: Or email- we can print it too. ○ B. Baron: I'll send it out to all faculty. <p>b. White Paper: Call to Action: Why California Needs to Fully Fund the Student Centered Funding Formal (SCFF) or Review implementation Strategy to Fulfill the Intent of the Law [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● [see handout: A Call to Action] ● Item 8b is the handout. B. Baron discussed it as part of the Chancellor's Update. ● I put this on our agenda because Crafton's Senate passed a motion of support. I wanted to bring it to you to see if you wanted to motion to support it as well. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Motion 3 <p>c. Grants – Intent to Apply Form [J. Oxendine]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Unable to attend today. Will reschedule. <p>d. Institutional Effectiveness Partnership (IEPI) Innovation and Effectiveness Plan [J. Gilbert]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There was a desire in the Chancellor's Cabinet to review TESS. We had two options. One is to hire a consultant to look at it. Our history is we spend a lot of money on them, we don't like the findings, then we ignore what they say. The second option is the Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative offered by the state. We've done it once before. Crafton has also done it. The District did it for the 4 deficiencies identified in the last accreditation. That was led by G. Kuck when he was here. We realized we could do it again. It's \$200,000 and we could use it to review TESS. At the time, there was no permanent CEO so I was asked to lead it. ● The process: A letter of intent is sent to the IEPI group in broad terms. If they agree, a 	<p>Motion 3: Move to support the White Paper.</p> <p>1st: M. Copeland 2nd: M. Worsley</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● B. Baron: When you say "support the White Paper" what form does that take? Do you send that to the State Chancellor? ● C. Huston: I don't see why not. Is everyone okay if I write that and sign it? ● Consensus: Yes. <p>Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>Partnership Resource Team (PRT) is formed and makes 3 visits. The first visit was April 15th. They met with Chancellor’s Cabinet, a morning faculty time slot, a group that the vice presidents were on, and communications and web development (directors of marketing, researchers, analysts). They sent us our options. Based on that, they sent out a drafting group. I worked with L. Bixler, who is now the CTO, and District officers, then we got together in April and drafted the first version of this. The second visit was the same PRT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They cancelled the day before the second visit was scheduled and have since rescheduled for September 16th. This is after the PRT and their feedback. I’m here because the Senate presidents sign off on this. • It’s going to Crafton’s Senate on October 16th, then back to District Assembly. I wanted to get your feedback. On the last page you see the breakdown of the \$200,000. That’s not set in stone. As a follow-up, the same visiting team will come back as a progress report. The drafting team agreed to meet monthly. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Copeland: Is this the collegial consultation or has there been faculty? ○ J. Gilbert: Yes, there were time slots for faculty and the Senate Presidents. ○ R. Hamdy: I just wanted to note that for those who don’t know about TESS. They have a lot of old tech that doesn’t really function. Oracle is a good example. This is a process to go through for the Chief Technology Officer (CTO). ○ J. Gilbert: I’m overseeing the AP/BP process at the District right now I also threw in those that haven’t been updated since the 90’s. One was on email. We’ve been working on this data warehouse project. We realized we don’t have a database. ○ R. Hamdy: Even security. Ours was wide open until L. Bixler got here. ○ C. Huston: Our practice at Senate is that the president doesn’t sign anything about money until it’s approved by the body. <p>▪ Motion 4</p> <p>e. 2020 – 2021 Calendar [J. Gilbert]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a nutshell we had 177 days before. We now have 175, the minimum for a flex calendar. Ultimately there are 2 days less, in essence there are 2 instructional days less in the fall and 2 less in the spring. Normally in the calendar committee we roll over the calendar. • Basically, it boils down to two things: if it starts on a Monday or a holiday, then we start on a Tuesday. Make sure Veteran’s Day falls on Veteran’s Day. With the change, could we have a Thanksgiving Break? Yes. There’s 9 professional development days. The ratio is 2 flex days and 7 inservice days. We did embed one in the spring but could not in the fall without finals going into the week of Christmas. 	<p>Motion 4: Move to support the IEPI Plan. 1st: J. Notarangelo 2nd: L. Burnham</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Huston: To be clear, this is money to do work that’s not out of our pockets or the District’s; it’s from the state. • D. Burns-Peters: Do we still have the opportunity to provide feedback if we see a gap? • J. Gilbert: Yes, send it to me. <p>Approved: Unanimously</p> <p>Abstentions: C. Jones</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional days: 166 instead of 170 (2 less each term). • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ R. Hamdy: This is already on the district website. ○ J. Gilbert: The Calendar Committee met and rolled over the calendar for 2021 – 2022. The calendar committee works out of the contract. ○ L. Burnham: What’s the logic of the flex days embedded in the semester? ○ R. Hamdy: There comes a point where we all need to meet to discuss a big initiative like Guided Pathways. We’re trying it to see how one embedded day works. ○ L. Burnham: They should know how disruptive that is for people who teach labs. When you have a Tuesday lab for example it throws everything off. ○ R. Hamdy: That’s duly noted. We did try to balance how many days there are. We think it is good for the campus to have an all-campus workday. ○ L. Burnham: Or if you do it, maybe do it Monday/Tuesday so they’re next to each other. ○ R. Hamdy: That’s noted for next time. ○ C. Huston: This is approved already. ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: What does this mean for noninstructional faculty? ○ J. Gilbert: The language in the contract as far as the days, as far as registration and counseling times, it’s near what we have now. ○ R. Hamdy: 200-day faculty went to 198. It’s in the contract. ○ J. Gilbert: In terms of workload it should be similar. ○ M. Copeland: Quick question on scheduling. Since there are 2 fewer instructional days will the times be the same? ○ D. Humble: We’re working on some calculations right now. We’ll bring that back for consult. D. Kalantarov is working on it too. We think it’ll help. ○ D. Burns-Peters: With the increase in inservice days, what’s the committee or person who decides what those look like? ○ C. Huston: R. Hamdy. We can schedule time to work on Program Review or SLOs. ○ R. Hamdy: This is what we talked about with CTA. One day in each semester will be reserved for what we know as opening days. These are required days, so they’ll have to check in with their dean. A lot of it is based on faculty need, like if they need curriculum review. ○ D. Burns-Peters: I would like to know how to reserve days for distance education. ○ C. Huston: We can also get department chair training or committee chair trainings. ○ C. Huston: We can get department chair training or committee chair trainings. ○ R. Hamdy: HR will also have some of that time set aside. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
8. New Business, continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Huston: The committee also did a lot of research about local school districts and made sure that our thanksgiving and spring breaks align with them. ○ J. Gilbert: We looked at the most recent calendar from our service area school districts to see when they're off. 	
9. SBVC President's Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No report. 	
10. Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A. Maniaol: This Friday is national manufacturing day. We're having an open house. ● D. Burns-Peters: You've probably seen the emails go out about the online training. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Copeland: If you teach online you need to get certified. It's time consuming, but it will make you a better teacher. [applause]. ○ D. Burns-Peters: Please encourage faculty to apply. And I accept the nomination for Senate President. 	
11. Adjournment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m. ● Next meeting: October 16, 2019, at 3:00 p.m. in AD/SS 207. 	