

## SBVC Academic Senate

### Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2019

AD/SS 207 3:00 – 4:30 P.M.

Topic	Discussion	Action
<b>1. Call to Order and Roll Call</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting called to order at 3:06 p.m. by R. Hamdy [Vice President]</li> <li>• Roll call via sign-in sheet <a href="#">[see attachment: AS Documents, Sign-in Sheet]</a>.</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Public Comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C. Jones: I want to remind everyone that the MESA program has several speakers coming up. Please let students know.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ November 7: We have the LA Coroner coming from 4 - 5 p.m. in PS 228</li> <li>○ November 12: We have a neuroscientist coming from 4 – 5 p.m. in HLS 145</li> <li>○ November 13: For our engineering students we have a product engineer from ESRI coming from 3 – 5 p.m. in HLS-135</li> <li>○ November 20: S. Bandgasser will do a presentation on Growth Mindset from 3 - 5 pm in the Library Viewing Room</li> <li>○ December 11: for our Psych Tech students, another presentation from 4 - 5 in HLS 145</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A. Avelar: I have two comments.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The budget calendar is on the board agenda on p. 114 and 116. I am not sure if the body got to see it before it was on the agenda or not. I think the body should know.</li> <li>○ Also, what happened on Friday. I think all of us got the all clear, none of us got the notification of what was happening. I think we need to evaluate our processes. I'm happy it wasn't a bad situation. We need to evaluate what happened and make sure it doesn't happen again. We had not just faculty and staff on campus, we also had kids here for our STEM-a-palooza event and nobody knew what happened unless you were personally told by someone who was already on campus. The other issue that happened on Friday was the power outage. Speaking as Chemistry faculty, when we have a power outage that means our units go down. Our ventilation goes down and air quality in that building suffers. We've requested our ventilation system to be updated over and over again through needs assessment has not been updated. Everything is connected, so if air quality goes down in that building everyone will suffer. We are exposing ourselves to chemicals. We may have certain thresholds in terms of exposure. We need to analyze what needs to be evacuated and which rooms are okay I guess, to teach in the dark. I'm being sarcastic, but I think we need a process. I'm hoping the safety committee is involved with this.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• D. Rodriguez: I'm going to need more than 4 minutes to address A. Avelar's concerns.</li> </ul>	
<b>3. Senate President's Report</b> [R. Hamdy, VP]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I'm sure you all saw the email come out, but I get to announce that our new Senate President-elect is A. Avelar! Congrats! [applause]</li> <li>• I see some non-senators in the room. I'm so excited to have you all here. Can you introduce yourselves?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Casey Thomas: I'm a Chemistry lab technician. I also the co-chair of the Safety Committee. I'm also working with the chair of the district-wide Safety Committee on the issues that came up on Friday.</li> <li>○ Ali Hassanzadah: I teach math. This is my first year, but I wanted to come and see how Academic Senate works.                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ T. Allen: A. Hassanzadah was my new best friend from Great Teachers!</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<b>3. Senate President's Report, continued</b> [R. Hamdy, VP]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Samuel Valle: I'm one of the Applied Technology instructors.</li> <li>○ Bryce Cacho: I'm a Welding instructor.</li> <li>○ Joanna Oxendine: Interim director of Grants Development and Administration.</li> <li>○ Phuong Nguyen: I'm an Applied Technology instructor.</li> <li>○ Jody Fehr: I'm from the Tutoring Center and the Math and Science Success Center.</li> <li>● R. Hamdy: Great! Glad to see all these new faces!</li> </ul>	
<b>4. Committee Reports</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. Ed. Policy</b> [J. Bjerke] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We were charged with looking at the Scholarship Committee and establishing what we thought its minimum or maximum representation should be. Right now there are only 11 faculty on the committee, so we aren't too concerned with the numbers. We'll continue to gather data. If you feel strongly email me: Jennifer Bjerke, Geography instructor.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>b. Personnel Policy</b> [J. Notarangelo] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We'll meet next week at 3:00 p.m. I'll contact members.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>c. Student Services</b> [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No report. We are still working on some things.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>d. CTE</b> [vacant] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● I was nominated to be chair and I accepted. I'm not officially chair yet.</li> <li>● We looked at toolkit for equivalency and we are asking it move forward. We asked C. Huston to vote "yes". It was written well and thorough with very good examples.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>e. EEO</b> [R. Hamdy] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We have not met recently. We should meet next month. I'll have a report then.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>f. Professional Development</b> [R. Hamdy] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Great Teachers happened last Friday. We will make sure it doesn't conflict with other events like STEM-a-palooza or Guided Pathways next time. It was fantastic.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>g. Elections</b> [D. Burns-Peters] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Just a quick thank you for everyone who heeded the call to get your votes in because we needed majority.</li> <li>● I think we are good until spring semester.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>h. Curriculum</b> [M. Copeland] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No report.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>i. Program Review</b> [P. Ferri-Milligan] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No report.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>j. Accreditation &amp; SLOs</b> [A. Avelar] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We were able to narrow down our topic for our Quality Focus Essay which will be around Guided Pathways and look at it as a holistic application for our campus. That was the majority of our focus.</li> <li>● Our draft of the ISER is nearly complete. We are planning on sending out I believe the first standard, but we are trying to work with R. Hamdy on getting some forums.</li> <li>● R. Hamdy: C. Huston and I decided we'll hold it on a first Tuesday, when the committee normally meets. It will be at 1:00 p.m., which is a little early, but hopefully people can come in and out of it. We'll see how that works before we set up future forums.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>5. Additional Reports</b></p>	<p><b>a. SBCCD-CTA</b> [K. Lawler]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report.</li> </ul> <p><b>b. District Assembly</b> [B. Tasaka]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yesterday went pretty smoothly. I think everything was approved pretty quickly.</li> <li>• There was also discussion on Friday's events and the need for updated processes. C. Thomas was the one talking about it; do you want to add anything?</li> <li>• C. Thomas: Yes. I just want to add that we're working on drafting some sort of a procedure to address when lights go out. I let District Assembly know that CSU San Bernardino has a procedure as well. We'll take that to the next Safety Committee on November 22.</li> <li>• B. Tasaka: That's it. If any of you have thoughts or comments on upcoming agendas, please feel free to let either me or C. Huston know because we're on that committee.</li> </ul> <p><b>c. Guided Pathways</b> [T. Simpson]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We had several events around course mapping. Our last one was [October] 25<sup>th</sup>, about two weeks ago. We had well over 30 faculty submit their mapping.</li> <li>• On the 1st of November we took a team to a ASCCC Guided Pathways Regional Conference. We had 4 students, 2 classified attend and 7 faculty went between student services and instruction. We went over pillar 2: Insured learning, shared governance, collegial consultation and entering the path.</li> <li>• We had a career focus group yesterday in the cafeteria with students. We are still working on the numbers because some students didn't sign in. The students did like the career fields we worked on as faculty. We'll have definite numbers once that's done.</li> <li>• Yesterday we also met. We worked on the website and scheduling. We broke into two groups. We'll have some follow-up there.</li> <li>• The Academic Senate's plenary is tomorrow. I'll be presenting there on learning and entering the path. I do have a resolution that's up for voting in terms of collegial consultation and ensuring that Guided Pathways has support from Professional Development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ R. Hamdy: Can you elaborate on the website? I was at the Technology Committee meeting earlier and there were rumors that our website is changing. They just wanted more details and I didn't have any.</li> <li>○ T. Simpson: Everything is still kind of in the works. Crafton and us are in agreeance to work together. Exactly how that will work, I guess you'll need to come to the next meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• T. Simpson: Today was confirmed we are going to host a Guided Pathways Retreat in January 16, 2020 with the Chancellor's office.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6. Consent Agenda</b></p>	<p><b>a. Minutes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10/2/19</li> <li>• 10/16/19</li> <li>• 10/30/19 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Motion 1</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 1: Move to approve the consent agenda. Motion passes</b>  1<sup>st</sup>: D. Smith  2<sup>nd</sup>: V. Alvarez  <b>Discussion: None</b>  [see attachments:]</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
6. Consent Agenda, continued		Voting Record]
7. Old Business	<p><b>a. Campus Committees</b> [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A. Avelar: In light of what happened on October 30, all of our standing committees are under the Brown Act because they're under an AP and they're tied to a legislative body. Any of our standing committees need to be presenting an agenda 72 hours in advance. It will help for those of us who cannot make every committee because we teach so we are able to see what happened in each committee.</li> <li>• R. Hamdy: All of our committees are in AP and they fall under the umbrella of Senate or College Council. That may not be the best way to proceed. We need to have conversation about that. It doesn't make it the best practice.</li> <li>• B. Tasaka: But for now, it's still under the Brown Act.</li> <li>• R. Hamdy: For now, yes it is.</li> </ul>	
8. New Business	<p><b>a. CTE Building</b> [S. Stark]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C. Huston told me there were some concerns about the CTE building. I put some notes down on a piece of paper.</li> <li>• I want to paint you a picture about where we started a couple of years ago. I was the facilities guy at the District office back then. Safety concerns were raised about the Applied Tech building. J. Hanson was the VP Admin at the time. I initiated a safety assessment; we had an engineering firm come out at the time. There was quite a few safety concerns to consider at the time: we segregated them from critical to something we should consider. We immediately put together a plan to address the safety concerns, but we also wanted to assess the entire building. It was built in 1962 or 1965. It had outlived its useful life. What were the costs to modernize it? The results that came back from that were that it would cost 70% to modernize it of what it cost to build a new building. Spending that kind of money to modernize it isn't a good use of public money. We knew we needed to build a new building.</li> <li>• Four years ago in August 2015 we completed the safety aspects that we needed. A lot of it was ventilation issues and some egress lighting that we had to take care of. Welding was a big one. A number of things were taken care of in that building kind of as a Band-Aid to get us by so we could continue teaching and learning until we could reconstruct it. There was no plan for a bond, but we knew we wanted to apply for state building money.</li> <li>• Welding was the star of that at the time. We wanted to expand Welding and continue to use that front lab until the building was demolished. Upon completion we started the programming panning for that building, not knowing where the money was going to come from. I think it was from January through May of 2017. We had our architect come in and start programming the building- what's your current use, what are the needs in the future, and develop a plan to submit to the state. We had user group meetings like we are now. Now when we use state money, the state is very particular on what they are going to fund or what it's not going to fund.</li> <li>• So we submitted an Initial Program Proposal (IPP) and qualified, then by July 2016, we submitted a Facilities Program Proposal (FPP) to the state: Here's the dollars, will you fund this? That was over 3 years ago. The state doesn't just let you do what you want. If we were constructing this with our own bond money, not using any state money, we could do what we want. But when the state gets in the sandbox and plays with you to the tune of \$34 million, the state has pretty rigid rules. It uses something called a cap load ratio. Some of you may have heard of that, some of you may not have heard of that. There's formulas for each type of top code whether it's a type of lab or lecture space or auditorium. It's a formula that compares your existing capacity of a building against what your projected enrollment growth is and what</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>8. New Business,</b> continued</p>	<p>your use is- how often is it full and what percentage is it full throughout the week or month? They also helped us with a facilities long range master plan that some of you were involved with. They put together a plan based on the information we gathered from the user groups to submit to the state that fit their guidelines that would help us build that building. That allowed us to grow by about 6,000 square feet, not a lot, but 6,000 square feet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key things to keep in mind: I hear there was an issue with AERO. In order to allow all programs, with their needs, to exist and grow in the way we teach and learn today in applied technology, AERO would move out to an offsite facility. San Bernardino International Airport at that time was the hot topic. We initially reviewed that and it kind of came to a stall, but there wasn't urgency because we had no money for a new building, we had just proposed. That was the plan that AERO would move offsite, and Heavy Truck would move in to the new facility and other programs would be able to expand. That's what we submitted and that's where we are today, except state said they would play ball. They said they would give us \$34 million on the project, which by the way the total cost of that project is estimated at about \$94 million. We are in what's called the schematics stage right now where we're working with the people in that building from the instructors, classified staff, custodians, maintenance and operations, what we need to make this work?</li> <li>• Let's talk about Welding. J. Milligan, I saw some statistics you put together, some measurements, and what you have now, maybe the user groups said what you were losing. The plan for Welding is that it would expand into your existing building. You have Auto Restoration moving into the new building as a unit. Welding, the plan, is going to expand into that entire space. <i>That</i> not being part of the building is not programmed yet. So the programming, the needs, how we are going to use it, how we are going to design it, is yet to come. Welding will be involved in that heavily. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J. Milligan: So what square footage is that compared to what we have now?</li> <li>○ S. Stark: It would add about 2700 square feet to what you have right now. You've got to remember that corner space you're using in the corner building will go away. You'll occupy the entire east wing of the building which will be the Welding Program. That's actually not part of the CTE state-funded building.</li> <li>○ J. Milligan: In that building is there a plan to renovate it to allow us to actually use it? There's not enough power in the building where Auto Collision is right now for us to use it.</li> <li>○ S. Stark: That was a \$4 million modernization that we did. That's why we stipulated when we invested in the program at the time, we aren't going to demo this, it's staying. We installed new infrastructure.</li> <li>○ J. Milligan: Where Auto Collision is there is almost no electrical systems.</li> <li>○ S. Stark: The TI, the interior electrical, we need to tap into what we installed. There's lots of capacity.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: You'll definitely be involved in the redesigning of that. Hopeful we'll know well in advance of your needs so you have a fully functional program.</li> <li>○ B. Cacho: We are concerned about removing those bathrooms and classrooms, and the tool room will be a conference room as well.</li> <li>○ S. Stark: We can incorporate that into the overall design. We have flexibility with that. Let's take a look at restrooms and tools and storage space.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: It would be helpful if you have a running list. Then every so often, send it over to S. Stark so we can plan what we need.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: I think it should be really clear we can't engineer out the bathrooms. I think that's against the law. I think we should make sure there are always bathrooms near our facilities. I think it's illegal to not have bathrooms.</li> <li>○ S. Stark: That's absolutely correct. We'll have plenty of restrooms in the new facilities and we'll make sure we take</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>8. New Business,</b> continued</p>	<p>care of that. We have time and Measure CC money to do what we need there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ B. Cacho: So we'll build more structures to do that, is what you're saying?</li> <li>○ S. Stark: I can't say we are going to build more structures. I can say we'll definitely fill out the structure that's there and we can reconfigure it in a way we want.</li> <li>○ J. Milligan: What about the portables?</li> <li>○ S. Stark: I don't know yet.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: So what's a more timeline for all this to actually happen? I'm hearing a lot of, "in the future....," "down the road..."</li> <li>○ S. Stark: For the main CTE building, I believe we have to fit a timeline for the state. They aren't letting us slip and lag. So it's on a very specific timeline now. I believe we have another year to get through Division State Architect (DSA) we bid it and it's a little over a 2-year construction plan. We are looking at a little over 3 plus years before it's actually constructed. The phasing of the build out, until it's constructed AUTO won't move to the new building of course. The other thing I forgot to mention is the state is very specific also on lab space, office space, lecture space, general space. We have very little wiggle room. We can't change our mind. The state says this is what you submitted 3-years ago based on the information we knew. You've grown Welding significantly, right? In the last 3 years? It's almost a different program with all the degrees and certificates. So things change and we'll have a building build 6 years after we submitted it. But we've changed now. Sorry. That's the state. I can tell you this also: We're going to build some flexible spaces into this building. Put infrastructure into it so as we do move and change and maybe develop new programs in the future, some of these spaces are already set up so they're easier and less costly to reconfigure them.</li> <li>○ P. Nguyen: So what are we doing with Aeronautics?</li> <li>○ S. Stark: So now that we know we're actually going to build this thing, and we know that's 3 years out and we know we're going to keep it there. We were going to demo it. We're going to keep it there for what we call swing space. When we build the Student Services Center over here where LA's at, we need places for people to go. That building is going to stay. AERO has a home here for at least another 5 years. Now that we know we're building the building and we know it's gonna happen, now we're gonna get out there and find an appropriate home, most likely in an airport, for AERO to operate.</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: Do you know if EDCT is scheduled to have any space in the new building?</li> <li>○ S. Stark: No, EDCT does not have any space in our new building. Now, will EDCT be able to use a building when we aren't using it? That's for us to decide. They have done that. EDCT has used some of our space when we're not instructing in the past. But there is no dedicated space for EDCT.</li> </ul> <p><b>b. ASCCC Resolutions [R. Hamdy]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The packet of resolutions was emailed to you on Sunday with the agenda. Please email C. Huston if you have any particular way you want her to vote.</li> <li>● M. Copeland: I think we should urge a no-go on 9.02, which is a curriculum issue to encourage putting the CID number in the catalog and schedule. There might be great reasons for it, I don't know. Right now it seems like additional minutia.</li> <li>● T. Simpson: We need that. The reason that push is there is they want our CIDs to match other colleges and they want it visible. So it makes it easier for students.</li> <li>● R. Hamdy: Both of those compelling arguments need to be emailed to the person who is voting.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>8. New Business,</b> continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M. Copeland: I know one issue with CID, is it seems ineffective right now. Sometimes when we submit it, we don't hear back. We should talk more about it.</li> <li>• R. Hamdy: A. Avelar will be going to plenary. She can take your notes to C. Huston. Please read through those resolutions.</li> </ul> <p><b>c. Finals Week [D. Humble]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I know at your last meeting you had a chance to see our new scheduling tool that's being drafted. I want to thank Dean Kalantarov for showing that to you; he's been working hard on that scheduling tool. We've been kind of taking our tool on a road show. The faculty chairs have seen it, you saw it. We also took it to the state CIO Conference to get some feedback from the CIOs across the state. So far everyone is really excited about it. We are hoping it helps deans and department chairs on scheduling. The other benefits are it increases our efficiency and helps move students get through classes more quickly and through their pathways. Keep sending your feedback.</li> <li>• One thing we discovered when doing calculations was we are using a 17.5-term week multiplier. We'll eventually bring that down, but that multiplier will continue through next year. If we take a look at some of our scheduling times, what we want to propose, is if we eliminate finals week, we aren't eliminating finals, we are just saying that the final for this class will occur on the last day of classes or the last 2 class meetings.</li> <li>• We heard concerns about lengthy finals and a decrease of instructional time. It's actually more instructional time. I'll spare you on some of the calculations. I wanted to get some initial feedback from the Senate. At some point soon, we want a yes or no from you so we can incorporate this into our schedule for spring. The other benefit is equity. When we look at our evening students or our weekend students, they no longer have to adjust their schedules for finals, so it's less impact on the student as well. It works better for students across the board. I just wanted some initial feedback and bring this to you as an initial discussion.</li> <li>• D. Kalantarov: Crafton doesn't have that. They just do a final It's actually less than 30% of classes that fall into that finals week. There's more classes being scheduled so there's going to be a lot more conflict. It won't reduce the amount of time. One of the bigger issue that came up was lab classes, but that lab time can be used for the examination. So you won't lose the time you have. It will be equity for all, whether the student has a day or evening class. Right now I see students come in and there's conflict. Whether a class meets twice a week you can use it for part 1 and part 2 of the exam. It will optimize the amount of time you spend.</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters: I want to clarify that for student equity, for the students who have a morning class and suddenly they have a final at 10:30 a.m. It may seem really small to us, but it can mean the difference of showing up to a final or not for them. I think we need to keep our students in mind.</li> <li>• T. Allen: Same here.</li> <li>• J. Notarangelo: I'm in English department, and correct me if I'm wrong, but we were for the elimination of finals.</li> <li>• A. Avelar: Being part of a lab science as long as we can give our finals during a lab we are okay. That was our concern.</li> <li>• R. Hamdy: If someone wants to make a motion of support, we can start that process.</li> <li>• D. Humble: Or if you need more time, that's fine too. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Motion 2</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>d. Grants – Intent to Apply Form [J. Oxendine]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Back in May, I'm going to share an electronic version of the intent to apply. Years ago, there was a form that if you were</li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 2: Move to support the new scheduling tool. Motion passes</b>  1<sup>st</sup>: D. Fozouni  2<sup>nd</sup>: T. Allen  <b>Discussion:</b> None  [see attachments: Voting Record]</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>thinking of seeking for grant funding you had to fill out the form, and there was a process, and that kind of went away. N. Nazarian, who is the interim executive director of the Foundation, and I, we tried to work together to streamline the grants processes. One of those is what we hope is a worksheet to help you think of your ideas for grants. I've worked with quite a few of you on campus before, and some you've tested this form for us and given us the green light. We aren't asking for anything absurd in the initial processes of grants. We want all of you to be able to take advantage of as many grant opportunities as possible. I shared this in May, and didn't ask for a formal motion of support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R. Hamdy: There are a lot of grants floating around and there are a lot that you probably get emailed about directly. Sometimes that urge to apply is really deep and you may do that, but that can start a process that isn't good for the college. There are a lot of reporting, and budgeting, and things that the grants office needs to be a part of. If that doesn't happen, the college could get in trouble, and you become responsible for that grant. The grant office can help manage all of that. That's the intent of this form. We'd like to call for a motion of support for the form. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Motion 3</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>e. Curriculum Process</b> [M. Copeland]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Curriculum Committee talked about the timelines for curriculum. We have a deadline of October 1 now. We are doing our schedule now a year in advance. It would be beneficial for our processes to move our deadline up to the spring. Think about this: October 1 is the deadline now. That means you get back to school and it's only a month or so, you're busy and you have a lot on your mind. Faculty tend to think in terms of the academic year. If we can get curriculum submitted, it will need to go through to board process and be Board approved by the last curriculum meeting in May so it can go to the Board in June or July. It also has to do with articulation issues. The deadline would be for spring, say for a transferrable course, that would not be in our catalog for the following fall, it will be the fall after that.</li> <li>• The local processes aren't as lengthy, it's the articulation process that takes much longer. That's not something we have a lot of control over. The committee is in favor of it.</li> <li>• <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ T. Heibel: Would that be an early March deadline?</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: Yeah, the thought behind it is more you have to get curriculum through the process and approved by the end of May. You will probably be going through the local processes by February or early March so it goes through the appropriate groups.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: Your committee already had this discussion, right?</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: Yes, and they're in favor of it. We voted that I would bring it to the Senate. We also talked about one of the great things with the new schedule that's going to be coming out is we'll have more inservice days. Hopefully we can have an inservice day where all faculty are there working on curriculum and people are well-informed of curriculum because we'll have that time on campus.</li> <li>○ J. Notarangelo: Would that have an effect on the implementation of new courses being approved? Would this be a one-time postponement, then everything kind of resettles? How would it affect actually being able to teach courses?</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: If it's an articulated class then you're looking at about 1.5 years, which it already is anyway. If it's a 0-level class, it's up to the office of instruction if they want to make an addendum to the course catalog. I know there's laws on that, like it has to be in there for 30 days. If it's a non-transferrable course, that can go pretty quickly if they do an addendum.</li> <li>○</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 3: Move to support the new form from the Grants Office.</b></p> <p><b>Motion passes</b></p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>: J. Bjerke 2<sup>nd</sup>: M. Lawler</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A. Avelar: I think this needs to go beyond the Senate. Make the rounds to other committees like chairs, etc. We get faculty who want to apply, but may not understand the work behind it. I recommend making the rounds.</li> <li>• R. Hamdy: J. Oxendine can email it out to the campus if it gets support.</li> <li>• J. Oxendine: We also talked about professional development for this. I want to be proactive in helping you on your grant-seeking adventures.</li> </ul> <p>[see attachments: Voting Record]</p>



Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>8. New Business, continued</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ D. Humble: Can I say something quick about the catalog? We are at the final stages of going live with a final catalog with Courseleaf. I would say it's weeks away at this point, by the end of the term you won't see a PDF you'll be able to click and go to different sections on it. It looks great. K. Yarborough is working closely with TESS and Courseleaf to get this implemented. Now we'll start our Curriculum development with Courseleaf this month. It will help facilitate any addendums we may do. It'll help get CTE courses going faster as well.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: That's really exciting. It's the perfect culmination of the new calendar, going to Courseleaf, and now this.</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: I want to add that I know faculty are always complaining about the lengthy curriculum process and I just want to say it doesn't have to be. It's about following up and following up the steps.</li> <li>○ S. Valle: Just to clarify, you're pushing back initial October first deadline?</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: Correct, now we would push that deadline. So if you have courses you want for fall 2021, they would need to be finally approved to May. That means you need to think backwards and get it into the system by maybe March?</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: A few suggestions with backwards calendar? Would it be a good idea to have that on the Curriculum website? You can say if you want your course approved by, say fall 2021, you have to be approved by this date?</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: We can definitely put that up.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: I've also heard about the addendums- it's not automatic for our non-transferrable courses. Do we have to request that? What's the process for that?</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: All our committee does is approve the curriculum. Scheduling is the Office of Instruction.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: For what is offered?</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: Yeah. That's a technical issue, but there are loopholes. If there's an addendum it depends on when it's done and how often there is an addendum.</li> <li>○ D. Humble: We don't want to do addendums if at all possible. We did some because of AB 705. We want to minimize the addendums. Keep in mind that any courses that come through are also part of a program, and that program also has to be approved. We'll take it year by year and semester by semester.</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: Technically speaking it has to go in the catalog, so if we don't go with the thought process that we don't make addendums whenever, we're saying spring for fall 2021 whatever your course is, transferrable or not. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Motion 4</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 4: Move to support the Curriculum Committee's request to move up the deadline for curriculum submission. Motion passes</b>  1<sup>st</sup>: V. Alvarez  2<sup>nd</sup>: D. Burns-Peters  <b>Discussion: None</b>  [see attachments: Voting Record]</p>
<p><b>9. SBVC President's Report</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● I want to congratulate the group on enrollment. We are doing exceptionally well. It's not all Promise students, it's all folks coming to the campus. We have over 375 more students from this time last year, which gives us over 237 FTES. Kudos to all of you.</li> <li>● I think S. Stark did a great job talking about the CTE timeline. We also know that others have questions. We have scheduled a meeting on the morning of Monday, November 18, to go into more detail on the timeline. The presentation is designed for those in the division, but all are welcome. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ R. Hamdy: Can we get that out to the entire campus? Because there are CTE programs across campus.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: We can, but I'll say the room we have won't host the entire campus.</li> <li>○ B. Cacho: The invitation that came out is for Tuesday the 19th at 8am.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: Is it the 19<sup>th</sup>?</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: What if you're teaching?</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: Contact us. Let us know.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>9. SBVC President's Report, continued</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A. Avelar: What can we do to get the presentation or information for those who can't</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: I don't think it'll quite be a presentation, but if there is a lot of information or if there are a lot who can't attend we'll do another one.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: Would you like us to email you if we can't go?</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: I think we did check with the division offices to find a time the majority can attend.</li> <li>● One thing we'll hear about more in a little bit is #realcollege and #realcollegeCalifornia. #realcollege is a national organization that we're associated with and they do a lot of work around food and housing insecurities. I sit on the CEO state board for that. I've also been doing a lot of work for the national organization. Myself and a CEO from the central valley are developing #realcollegeCalifornia. California has some real needs around food and housing insecurities. You'll be hearing about that. My mantra is students don't learn when they're hungry and faculty can't teach when students are hungry. We know we have housing insecurities for a lot of students. We've unofficially identified over 300 just on this campus. My stance is the state needs to give us some money to help us out, especially if they want us to perform at the levels they do with the new funding formula based on success.</li> <li>● On Tuesday we had a campus-wide debrief about what happened, what didn't happen, and why it didn't happen. I won't go over everything, but there are a couple things I want to mention. At no time did anybody in any official capacity state that there was an active shooter. There weren't any shots fired, there wasn't even a weapon drawn; there was a man identified with a gun on campus. Kudos to George one of the grounds people who saw something and said something- that was the right thing to do. There was a question of why information didn't go out via text or something like that. Once information got to campus police, based on the description they were given, the chief and officers immediately thought that the person sounded like an officer. They still did their due diligence and investigated. When it happened, Paul Walker, the emergency manager, began drafting the message. He was not to send that message until given instructions to do so. As a campus we depend on the officers' training and expertise to make that decision. So it was just a quick period of time when the officers made contact with the individual. He identified himself, there was a few more minutes because we had to confirm that identity. As soon as they had identification, they informed the Chief that they were here for an event on campus. The decision was made not to send the message. In the future, a notification from Campus Police will be sent out immediately. Then they will make contact with dispatcher at CSU San Bernardino, then it will be sent out. The question is, why does it need to be a dispatcher who calls? If Campus Police calls a dispatcher, they know the codes and information needed. For many of us civilians it will take time.</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: So to be clear, it sounds like there was never an official lockdown. There was identification made prior to that happening?</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: There was an official lockdown. Official lockdown was called.</li> <li>○ S. Stark: It came from me.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: It came out at 7:50 in the morning.</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: How did that go out?</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: Via the radios that are in the different areas around campus.</li> <li>○ T. Allen: The text we received, we were at Crafton for Great Teachers, the only text I saw was that the lockdown was lifted. We all thought, what lockdown? We had no way to preface that.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: What happened was the lockdown went out initially via the radios. So we gave the all clear via radios. Shortly thereafter, about a minute or so, S. Stark also sent it out via live Informcast on the campus. That's the message</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
	<p>that many of us got.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ S. Stark: It doesn't go out to the broader group via text. It's just on campus.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: Less than an hour later, we sent an email with more information. That morning, there were 7 instances almost back-to-back that required emergency or medical attention. Once things were settled then Campus Police was able to send out information. The 7 or 8 emergency situations happened before noon.</li> <li>○ T. Allen: Then the power went out.</li> <li>○ J. Oxendine: If we were able to be notified that it was lifted via text. Why not be able to be notified via text? At 7:50 we're coming on to campus. If it had been an active shooter situation, we would have walked right into it.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: When the information was reported at about 7:45 a.m. we were connecting with Campus Police, we asked what was the level of threat. It's determined by Campus Police when that notification comes out. When they heard it was an off-duty officer, they didn't feel given their judgement, it was time. And we have to trust their professional judgement that's what we pay them for. Everything happened in a short amount of time, probably less than 15 minutes.</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: It sounds like a disconnect. S. Stark had the ability to make the call, but the police department sends the alert. It sounds like a disconnect- if we have an on-campus entity that can make that judgement call, but can't sent out the alert it's an issue. Do we have a plan?</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: Moving forward, as soon as possible, a text will be sent out.</li> <li>○ S. Stark: Also have an off-site group to do that because we found everyone was engaged. Trying to do that takes us off the focus. That's why Campus Police is going to have a dispatch. Someone offsite can do that while we focus on what's at hand.</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: Who will do the on-campus radio call? If there's a time lag, it can be nerve-wracking.</li> <li>○ S. Massad: What are we trained to do if that was real?</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: All the information is on the District's websites. We have access to the website. We need more training. We know what to do if there's an earthquake because it's been ingrained. We are scheduling that training for some time in April.</li> <li>○ M. Lawler: We were on the football field, we had practice, how will info get to us? We were playing music. One of the groundskeepers came to us and said we're on lockdown, then someone else said it was lifted. We were confused about what happened. If there was an active shooter who knows what would happen?</li> <li>○ S. Stark: I apologize, I have to leave, I have something to get to, but we learned a lot from this soft exercise. We'll make adjustments as we go.</li> <li>○ M. Valdez: I had 50 students with me moving from HLS to NH. I didn't have my cell phone and I have my students keep their phones away. One told me we're on lockdown. I locked both doors and continued with class. When it was cleared I heard it. I was concerned because I had that many students in a classroom.</li> <li>○ T. Allen: We went through something similar back when the San Bernardino shooting happened. They just said clear the campus, everybody leave. They went right past the school. My students were in the lab watching it on the TV and that's how we got our information. Unless you had access to email you weren't getting that information right away.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: I want to bring this back. All of us view this through different lenses. I know some folks were very fearful. The administrative team apologizes for that because that wasn't our intent. Our intent was to identify this person as soon as possible. We debriefed Friday night and again on Monday because sometimes a clearer head helps. They are updating the emergency material we have. The districtwide Safety Committee is also reviewing it and they will have input.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<b>9. SBVC President's Report</b> , continued	We want folks to know what to do. We are talking about having this as part of our onboarding process. We want us to be able to act just like if it was an earthquake and we know exactly what to do.	
<b>10. Announcements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	
<b>11. Adjournment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.</li> <li>• Next meeting: November 20, 2019, at 3:00 p.m. in AD/SS 207.</li> </ul>	