SBVC Academic Senate
Meeting Minutes
February 5, 2020
AD/SS 207 3:00 – 4:30 P.M.

Topic	Discussion	Action
1. Roll Call (sign-in)	• Meeting called to order at 3:02 p.m. by C. Huston [President] • Roll call via sign-in sheet [Academic Senate Documents, Sign-In Sheet]	
2. Public Comments on Agenda Items	• None.	

3. Reports	**Senate President** [C. Huston]
	• [Academic Senate Documents, President's Report]
	• You may have noticed that the agenda is a little different. We're going to try something different today. The Exec team will also take us through a mock presentation. Let me know if you like the new format.
	• R. Carlos asked if faculty would be interested in moving. If you have feedback let him or C. Huston know.
	   o A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: It would be difficult for the vision of the faculty.
	   o C. Huston: Yes, you would be facing the crowd.
	   o M. Copeland: I wouldn't mind doing it one year to see what we think. We can always go back to the old way.
	   o M. Worsley: Is there a possibility of a tent to shade everyone?
	   o C. Huston: I'm not sure about the expense for that.
	   o L. Gregory: The audience wouldn't all be able to see.
	   o A. Avelar: Why isn't the stage what's facing the sun since they have a cover?
	   o D. Rodriguez: I think it's because of the seating up in the bleachers. They get really full.
	   o V. Alvarez: You could do it horizontally and use the length of the field.
	   o C. Huston: You can also talk to the Commencement Committee; L. Gregory is on it.
	   o A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: There's something to be said about how we affect each other in unity. Our role as faculty is to support the students, and the Board of Trustees is there to put a stamp on what they accomplished. There's something to be said about the way we present that.
	• There's an email from R. Hamdy about the Stanford Community College Scholarship. It covers $500 in travel expenses and dormitories at Stanford.
	• Who got to go to Leading at the Speed of Trust? We'll talk about it more at Exec. It was an interesting training.
	
	Student Services [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr]
	• As I mentioned previously, certain committees are looking into how we standardize the implementation of academic	

Topic	Discussion	Action

3. Reports, continued	renewal without course repetition. This can one time at each college, not the district. A student can have a petition for academic renewal at SBVC as well as CHC.
	• There's a word in our AP/BP which is "subsequent to" meaning if a student petitions you have to take the next two semesters into account. For example, if a student has Fs in Anthropology & Biology, and after that there were two semesters following with a GPA of 2.0 and at least 24 units, then the academic renewal without course repetition will be applied.
	• There was some wordsmithing on our forms, we have to say "substandard grades" instead of just "grades" because we're not doing academic renewal for everyone. There will be another meeting we'll conduct to make sure we have all the wording lining up and standardization of the implementation process.
	
	CTE [J. Milligan]
	• The biggest thing is new applied tech building that affects a majority of our CTE programs. The Welding and Machine Inspection faculty chairs submitted a proposal to the President and Vice Presidents on December 11, that would take care of most of the concerns for the Welding program. We are waiting to hear a response back as to whether they accept/reject our proposal or have a counterproposal. It doesn't address the AERO concerns because they're not in the new building. We will likely be following up in the next couple weeks.
	• **Discussion/Questions:**
	  o A. Avelar: I heard about the term "sticky spaces" being used quite a bit. Is there clarification on what that means?
	  o J. Milligan: None that we've been given. There haven't been additional user group meetings. As far as I know, nothing else has been done this semester for the facility planning, unless they're doing it outside of consultation with the faculty. As far as "sticky "spaces," the first I heard of that was during S. Stark's presentation on Opening Day.
	  o D. Rodriguez: "Sticky space" was probably a term that I first used, and it probably stuck. My definition is places where students can gather, talk, hang out, do homework, consult with each other, or form study groups. It's been my observation that students don't have a lot of space to do that. I thought it would be nice to incorporate that into our new buildings, ones that will be renovated, so students will have room indoors. Hopefully we have funding and all that. In a previous building I designed, we included "sticky space" and put in half white boards.
	  o A. Avelar: We also want to make sure the programs have appropriate space.
	  o D. Rodriguez: It's not in lieu of program space. It's more about comfortable seating, like coves that would be too small for a classroom.
	  o M. Copeland: J. Milligan, did you say you submitted that proposal on December 11th? So, it's been almost 2 months? And you've had no response at all?
	  o D. Rodriguez: I'll take some responsibility for that. Perhaps there wasn't a direct response, but at our last Senate meeting we talked about safety and the ability to grow the program. We have and are in the process of addressing the safety concerns that was a part of the conversation with the proposal. That was part of the response I guess to the proposal, sorry if it wasn't more direct.
	  o J. Milligan: It addresses the safety, but not facilities.
	  o D. Burns-Peters: If we really want more sticky spaces, we need USB ports and plug-ins.
	
	Elections [D. Burns-Peters]
	• Next week there will be an announcement to start submitting for Outstanding Professor, and don't forget we're doing it	

Topic	Discussion	Action
3. Reports, continued **Other Reports**	for adjuncts too. • Thanks to everyone who turned in and did the hard work for Committees. Hopefully that was sent directly to me. If you Reach out to me if you have questions. The goal to have committee assignments done is no later than the 19th, but hopefully sooner. • Peer evaluations just got turned over to the committee, hopefully those will be done soon. **Professional Development** [R. Hamdy] • C. Huston mentioned the Leading at the Speed of Trust training we had at District. We weren't able to invite everyone because of limited seating. The goal is to get everyone through this training so we all have a common language and then we can restore trust throughout the district. Look out for announcements. • April 8th is the next Flex Day. We're always open to new workshop ideas. Please send them my way • Flex- We're hard at work closing out those reports. Please be patient if it isn't approved right away because it takes a moment. Please continue to submit. **Program Review** [C. Jones] • Twenty-six programs are in full efficacy this cycle, there's one in a two-year cycle, and 17 programs that had conditional or probational that we also have to review. • If you want to go to the SLO Disaggregation workshop, it's on Tuesday February 11th, from 12:00 – 1:30 p.m. in LA-208. o R. Hamdy: We don't have enough for another yet. • Efficacy workshops: February 21st and March 6th from 9:30 – 11 a.m. in B-204. Look for an email from me or J. Lamore. • Everything is due, even if you're probational or conditional, on March 13th, at noon. **Accreditation and SLO Committee** [C. Huston and B. Tasaka] • We met yesterday. We're also on the agenda later for ILOs and the name change. We also talked about SAOs and trying to streamline that process. We also talked about the disaggregation workshop. • We also talked about sending out a survey across the campus, but that is in very early stages. • There are also Accreditation Forums coming up. D. Peters sent out an email of the upcoming schedule along with the related Standards that they'll be covering. **CTA** [A. Avelar] • [Academic Senate Documents, SBCCDTA Negotiations Highlights] • Article 16: Evaluations, Article 13: Lecture/Lab/Clinical Parity, Preparation for Online Instructors, and Honors Courses are what's highlighted. **District Assembly** [B. Tasaka] • We met yesterday. J. Torres mentioned the hiring process for the new chancellor. He said their goal is to be done by June 30th. • He also mentioned some goals for the District including student success applying to AB 705 and Guided Pathways, equity and diversity, making sure that students can afford college, and student housing.	

Topic	Discussion	Action

3. Reports, continued **Other Reports**	• He also mentioned realigning the reporting structure and succession planning. K. Hannon is now a Vice Chancellor of HR. He handed out a Human Resources organization sheet. They're eliminating an HR Supervisor position and creating a HR analyst, then using that funding in different areas. P. Walker was accidentally left off the chart.
	• They also talked about the organization of District Assembly. If you aren't regularly attending and if you miss three consecutive meetings, then you will be taken off the list and they'll ask for a replacement.
	• There was a flowchart of District consultation committees. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee at the district level doesn't want to duplicate what District Assembly does. For example, the Chancellor doesn't need to be on both, so they were removed from the Institutional Effectiveness Committee.
	• They also pulled AP 7210. There was talk of pulling another one, but they walked back on that.
	
	Guided Pathways [T. Simpson]
	• We are working on mapping still. There are some updates that need to be done. We're stepping back and cleaning things up. In the works of cleaning up maps.
	• Our Guided Pathways team has collaborated with K-12 and CSUSB to work on pathway for educators of color.
	• The committee will be working with adjunct and full-time faculty in Child Development to try to help with their lines because they're struggling with it.
	
	SBVC College President [D. Rodriguez]
	• **Promise Program**: The applications for the next cohort closed this past Friday. We closed with just over 2400 students applying for the program. Many of these students still need to do the CCCApply application, apply for financial aid, and so on. If history repeats itself, we should have upwards of 90%-95% of them with us. Crafton has about 1100, so we're talking about 3500 across the District. It's a huge success. This is how you turn around a community for education, but it only works if our students are successful.
	• For our first semester, the numbers look really promising. I do wish the GPA was a little higher, but the Promise Program is working compared to other first-time students.
	    ○ GPA was 2.85 (Promise), compared to other first-year students, 1.35
	        ▪ We need to do some digging and wrap our arms around those other students
	    ○ Overall success rate: 60.89% (Promise) vs. 41%
	    ○ Transfer-level courses: 60% success rate (Promise) vs. 42%
	    ○ Non-transfer level courses: 62.5% (Promise) vs 50%
	    ○ Transfer-level Math: 36.5% (Promise) vs 21.5%
	    ○ Transfer-level English: 55.3% (Promise) vs 27.4%
	• When you compare our Promise students against other first-time students, the Promise Program is working. Nice job. There are still some hiccups that we're working on, but it's very very encouraging. I'll share more as we have more information on those students.
	• **Board Goals:** I had the opportunity to attend the Board Retreat, which I think was a move in a positive direction for our Board to invite the presidents to their retreat and to have input on their goals. That way all three district entities can be aligned and we don't start chasing things that aren't aligned with our goals. We had a lot of input about how our goals should be. The goals:
	    ○ To continue the implementation of AB 705 and the support we need at the district level, and Guided Pathways	

Topic	Discussion	Action
3. Reports, continued **Other Reports**	○ Equity and diversity in our hirings ○ Student affordability, one being the Promise Program ○ Student homelessness and food insecurity • Those are the four big goals. I think they align well with the colleges' goals, plus half of them are law. • I'm glad to see Accreditation on the agenda. There are a number of us on teams this semester: C. Huston, D. Humble, and myself were at a training yesterday. J. Smith is at one today. I'm leading a team, so I think that will give good insight about what to expect when they come here. I'm excited. • We're still in negotiations about the swap meet property. Many across the district believe it would be a good purchase for us and it opens a lot of opportunity. It's approximately 22 acres. • **CTE:** J. Milligan already covered. • A. Avelar asked about the Vice Chancellor of Fiscal. When J. Torres has finished his interim role, and he will go back to Executive Vice Chancellor, and one of his positions is fiscal. ○ A. Avelar: In the past they couldn't hire a Vice Chancellor of HR so they combined the two positions. Are they going to change the flowchart or keep it the same? ○ D. Rodriguez: Based on what B. Tasaka just said, it sounds like there's going to be a separation. ○ B. Tasaka: That was my understanding. ○ D. Rodriguez: I don't know it for a fact but based on what she said. ○ B. Tasaka: That's what it sounded like to me.	
4. Presentations	**4.1 New Academic Senate Meeting Procedures p.2** [C. Huston] • My intent is to bring more clarity and structure. We want to allow for rich, organic dialogue like we often have. We want to bring in more voices and viewpoints. • The cover sheet for each agenda item has a recommendation in it. We often get presentations in senate and we don't know what we're asked to do with them. Also, it provides better records keeping. • Our current practices are good. We have wonderful organic conversations like we did not, but we can sometimes get way off topics and have long discussions where only a few get to speak. • So, the Senate agenda today is modeled after the Board Book. All the documentation is included. There will be deadlines to submit that documentation. We can also adopt a pro/con format. If we all feel the same way, why do we spend 10 minutes agreeing with each other? • Mock agenda presentation ○ We aren't adopting anything today. This is just a sample. If we like this, we can adopt it next time. ○ [Academic Senate Documents, Mock Agenda Presentation] **4.2 Quality Focus Essay** [D. Humble] • [Quality Focus Essay Draft January 2020, linked on February 5th meeting] • You all know there are four standards as part of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER). There's also the Quality Focus Essay. While it's included in the ISER, it's really its own document with separate outcomes and subject areas. I'll give some background on the QFE and what it's supposed to cover. The Accreditation and Outcomes Committee narrowed down some topics. • The QFE must be linked and related to student achievement. We'll write about these areas in our Midterm Report and be held accountable for them. It's important to collect college-wide feedback because we'll all be held accountable. • There are action projects. We have to talk about the desired goals and outcomes, action steps, a timeline, who are the responsible parties, what resources we will require, and an assessment plan for how we'll evaluate ourselves.	

Topic	Discussion	Action

4. Presentations, continued	1. Scale academic and student support services in support of Guided Pathways and AB705.
	   ○ This can sound massive, but there are some really distinct goals we can accomplish with this task. We also have to list what standards they attach to. This one is Standard I.B, II.A, II.B, II.C, III.A, III.B, III.C.
	2. Evaluate program review processes to ensure integration in planning and prioritization across the college.
	   ○ That's related to Standard I.B.
	• Again, this is in draft form. If through discussion and debate, the Academic Senate wants to propose another topic, you can certainly do that. We'll take it to the committee and continue vetting it until we have something we want.
	• **Discussion/Questions**
	  ○ J. Bjerke: I've had fruitful conversations with others about the SI model. One thing that stands out to me is that SI isn't a sustainable model if you pair one SI with one course. We need to serve a lot of courses where you have a lot of sections. We need to pair an SI with one instructor but invite others in from other sections. We're trying that with MESA right now.
	  ○ D. Humble: That would be great documentation to include in this project should we adopt this project.
	  ○ R. Hamdy: When will the committee adopt it? When would the campus know which project is chosen?
	    D. Humble: Our goal is to narrow down in the next month to narrow down to a final draft.
	  ○ R. Hamdy: Has the committee weighted these against each other and considered pros/cons?
	  ○ D. Humble: No, the committee hasn't seen these yet. They will at the next meeting. These are drafts, they'll get refined and revised. We also want to ask if it's possible for us to complete our goals in a multi-year amount of time?
	  ○ A. Avelar: With AP2, when we look at the Program Review processes, what's glaringly missing is what happens with budget development and what's happening with the budget committee. We could do an in-depth evaluation of the program review process, but if it doesn't align with the timelines of the budget committee, then there's still going to be a disconnect. I'm not even sure if they've met yet, but budgets are being developed now, so if whoever creates the budget doesn't communicate with the different programs to see if their decisions still make sense.
	  ○ C. Huston: I see budget under Goal 4.
	  ○ A. Avelar: But it's not explicit.
	  ○ C. Huston: We can make it explicit.
	  ○ R. Hamdy: I think also a realization by the college. We go through the Program Review process and we put a lot of work into the document hoping that something is funded. Then year after year these lists are created and nothing gets funded. I think we've created a discouraging process. I don't know how to remedy that.
	  ○ A. Avelar: Or even when programs do have funds. That communication isn't in place.
	  ○ R. Hamdy: Maybe communication is another goal entirely.
	  ○ D. Humble: That will all come out in this project. I think to conduct an in-depth evaluation, these topics will come up. Then we'll address in action project itself.
	  ○ C. Huston: This will go back to the committee. A. Avelar and B. Tasaka are on the committee. Someone from every division is on every committee.
	4.3 Guided Pathways SSOA [T. Simpson]
	• The Guided Pathways is working on the scale of adoption report that's due on March 1st to the Chancellor's office. We plan to bring a draft at the next Academic Senate meeting. We've already scheduled time for feedback to make sure it gets to the Board on time.
	• **Discussion/Questions:**	

Topic	Discussion	Action
4. Presentations, continued	o C. Huston: We only have 1 other meeting before. We can't present and take action at the same meeting. o D. Humble: It doesn't really take action. o C. Huston: Does it require a signature? o D. Humble: Yes, there's a line for that. o C. Huston: We'll have to work on that process for the next meeting.	
5. Consent Agenda	**5.1 Recommendation to approve the minutes for 12.4.19 and 1.15.20 Academic Senate Meetings p.10** **5.2 Recommendation from the Education Policy Committee to support BP/AP 3505 Emergency Preparedness Plan p.26** **5.3 Accreditation Committee Name Change p. 48** **Motion 1**	**Motion 1** Move to approve the Consent Agenda 1st: R. Hamdy 2nd: J. Notarangelo Approved: Unanimously Opposed: None Abstentions: None [Academic Senate Documents, Voting Record]
6. Action Agenda	**6.1 Advancement in Rank** [J. Notarangelo] [Academic Senate Documents, Recommended Substantive Changes to AP 7210] - I would like a motion and feedback. The full document is p. 49 - 52 in the agenda. - We've brought this to the Senate several times before. Our committee brought this here. We also worked with CHC. We would like to clean up Professor Emeritus. - All proposed changes and when they would be conferred: o Assistant Professor: Upon hire o Associate Professor: Upon tenure o Full Professor: Applied rank after three full years served after tenure, applied through the Advancement in Rank Committee via letter. Note your contributions to your department, college, and community. o Professor Emeritus: Applied rank by a letter with two signatures in your department once someone achieved Professor rank. There is still discussion here with CHC. They wanted Emeritus to be applied to anyone at any rank. Right now there is no timeline attached to this. The idea is you would retire at the last level you attained. **Discussion/Questions:** o C. Huston: I'm wondering if we need multiple motions on this. o J. Notarangelo: You can also recommend that we just work it out with CHC. There are some other stop gaps because you need two other professors to sign off on it, so it's not just a rubber stamp. o R. Hamdy: I think we can trust the workgroup. If we motion, we can trust the committee to work the final piece out and then report back to us whatever you decided. o A. Avelar: Is this only for full or part-time?	**Motion 2** Move to approve these recommendations with the stipulations that the Advancement in Rank Committee will work out the Adjunct Professor Emeritus piece and report back to us. 1st: D. Burns-Peters 2nd: T. Allen Approved: Unanimously Opposed: None Abstentions: None [Academic Senate Documents, Voting Record]

Topic	Discussion	Action
6. Action Agenda, continued	o J. Notarangelo: The adjunct professor is absolutely included in AP 7210, there's names for every type of instructor. It comes up in terms of adjunct professor emeritus. T. Allen: What's the harm in it? It's not hurting anyone. o C. Huston: Does anyone dissent? o R. Hamdy: Motions we approve these recommendations with the stipulation that the AIR people work out, then forward to DA. o **Motion 2** **6.2 Study Abroad Faculty Lead** [R. Hamdy] •R. Hamdy: I've been working with the VPI to get some release time to create an actual faculty lead position for this with 20% release time. If you've been here for a while you know the position jumps from person to person. I've been working hard to grow the program. It really needs to be a position that people apply for. We're still working out the details of the job description. •I'm looking for a motion of support. •**Motion 3** **6.3 ILO to Campus Climate Survey Mapping** [B. Tasaka] • [Quality Focus Essay Draft January 2020, linked on February 5th meeting] • Earlier today C. Huston sent out a copy of the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) mapping. • The Accreditation Committee put together this mapping at a previous meeting. The idea was to take the ILOs and map them to two parts of Campus Climate Surveys for faculty and students. We are trying to align how the ILOs relate to those surveys. • The committee developed an Excel sheet and just put "x"s where we felt the ILO relates to a particular question on those Climate Surveys. • We wanted the Senate to see it and ask for a stamp of approval. • Right now, Dr. Smith is working to align the results of those surveys with the ILOs. • C. Huston: It gives the campus a way to assess our ILOs which we need to do. • **Questions/Comments:** o J. Lamore: I'm sitting here thinking I don't understand ILOs. Aren't they aligned with the SLOs? o C. Huston: We started a project last year to get everyone to map. Everyone didn't, so the project died. We're going to use this other way. o B. Tasaka: If you look across the top, we have all the ILOs listed. Below that are some subcategories for each ILO. On the left, you'll see questions from the Campus Climate Surveys. o J. Lamore: Are we going to get two sets of ILO data, one that's based in a survey which is about how we feel about things. Is there still going to be one that's attached to the actual SLO data? o C. Huston: Yes, that's still the plan. o B. Tasaka: Some of it was the availability of what's already out there. o C. Huston: We have these going back a decade. o A. Avelar: So SAOs and SLOs should be mapped to the PLOs and ILOs? o C. Huston: Yes, right now they are not. They're just mapped to PLOs. We rolled that out. I gave you all sheets last Spring. We got about a third of the data back. o M. Copeland: This is an action item. o C. Huston: It is. The action is to endorse the mapping so we can pull the statistics and have some data on our ILOs for us to assess.	**Motion 3** Move to support to formalize the Study Abroad Faculty Lead position in the way that all of our other faculty lead positions are formalized. 1st: J. Notarangelo 2nd: M. Worsley Approved: Unanimously Opposed: None Abstentions: None [Academic Senate Documents, Voting Record] **Motion 4** Move to support to formalize the Study Abroad Faculty Lead position in the way that all of our other faculty lead positions are formalized. 1st: J. Milligan 2nd: J. Notarangelo Discussion: • J. Lamore: I just want to make sure that the survey doesn't replace the SLO one. • C. Huston: We can make a friendly amendment that we support the mapping, but we also wish to continue mapping our SLOs to our ILOs as well so we have quantitative data. • A. Avelar: Should we also say our SAOs and PLOs?

Topic	Discussion	Action
6. Action Agenda, continued	o R. Hamdy: That sounds non-controversial. o C. Huston: I would hope. ▪ **Motion 4**	Approved: Unanimously Opposed: None Abstentions: J. Buchanan [Academic Senate Documents, Voting Record]
7. Information Items	**7.1 ISER Draft Standard I & IV p. 55**	
8. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items Announcements	• C. Jones: MESA has a UCR field trip to STEM labs on February 28th. We need people to RSVP by Feb 10. If you have engineering majors we have two speakers on February 12th and 25th. We have a live feed from DreamWorks.	
11.Adjournment	• Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. • Next meeting: February 19, 2019, at 3:00 p.m. in AD/SS 207.	

8