

SBVC Academic Senate

Meeting Minutes

March 4, 2020

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 3:03 p.m. by C. Huston [President] Roll call via sign-in sheet [see Academic Senate Documents, Sign-in Sheet]. 	
2. Public Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None. 	
3. Senate President's Report C. Huston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [see Academic Senate Documents, AS President's Report] Area D meeting: March 28. Please consider attending. We'll talk about resolutions and things going on at the state level. Committee list: Will be coming out soon. Some may be switched from their committee of choice due to too many sign ups in certain committees and not enough in others. Committee attendance has been low for some of our major committees. As you interact with faculty you represent in your division, encourage them to attend their meetings. It's a contractual obligation, but it's also a good opportunity to have our voices heard. If faculty don't want to participate in committees, they should work through the union. We've had two opportunities to change that and reshape it and make it something more that we've passed on. Now it's set for the next two years. Next time it comes up for review, let's make changes. Flex Day: April 8, from 9 – 11 a.m. in B-100. We have an Accreditation forum planned; it's going to be a working meeting. We'd like to get a commitment from one faculty member from each division to attend. We also want to make sure we have representation from student services, committees, students, and classified. Encourage maybe just one person to commit to the event to read one standard and work with the work group. We didn't have the attendance we hoped for at our forums, so we are trying to get feedback. We're about six months out from our visit. [see Academic Senate Documents, Analysis of AB 705 Compliance, Implementation, Student Success, and Student Retention] I received some district-wide data for the Free College Promise and AB 705. This will be going to the Board of Trustees at our next meeting. The Chancellor's search is beginning. If you didn't have a chance to go to the forum today there will be another tomorrow. I've also been assured that there will be candidate forums. Also, both open dean positions for CTE and Humanities have flown. Check out the CC registry or the District's website. We'll be sending out a call for letters of interest for the Study Abroad Faculty Lead once we hear back from CTA. It'll be 20%. 	
4. Committee Reports	a. Ed. Policy [B. Tasaka] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> J. Bjerke and I switched because I already attend District Assembly. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>4. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yesterday we pulled three APs, including the one we talked about last time regarding accessibility. <p>b. Personnel Policy [J. Notarangelo]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AP 7210 section on Advancement in Rank passed at CHC's Academic Senate. C. Huston: That was one that was pulled yesterday at District Assembly. • I just resent the email about Advancement in Rank. If you have questions, please use "Reply" (not "Reply All") and I'll answer your questions. • We have an upcoming Advancement in Rank; we have to honor the current process until the new one is approved. I have the committee all but complete now. Thanks to those who helped. I'll send out information requesting schedules after March 27th. <p>c. Student Services [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>d. CTE [J. Milligan]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>e. EEO [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>f. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>g. Elections [D. Burns-Peters]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like you already said, the intent is to have the committee list finalized soon. We're having to move people to fill spots. There are a couple of divisions with a couple of serious gaps. We tried to go through and look at time commitments to make committee changes. It will go out campus-wide. • Then we'll move to outstanding professor. We want to make sure we have enough nominees. Don't forget we're also doing adjuncts this year. <p>h. Curriculum [M. Copeland]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see Academic Senate Documents, San Bernardino Valley College 2019 – 2020 Catalog] I made a copy on page 41 of the catalog. We had an interesting situation come up and we wanted to run it by the Senate. We're going to make a change to the requirements; you can see #1 is complete ACAD 001. That class no longer exists. It came up in counseling because a student had to do a grad check, but they hadn't taken it. The department decided to remove it from Area 1. LST will still be under category B so a student has the option to take it, but it's not a requirement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Huston: This is on the action agenda for later. We can vote on it now. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Motion 1 <p>i. Program Review [C. Jones]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had 26 programs up for full efficacy, 1 for peer review, and 17 that are on probational or conditional. • Everything is due Friday the 13th at noon. 	<p>Motion 1: Move to accept these changes. 1st: H. Johnson 2nd: J. Notarangelo</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M. Copeland: This was a decision by the entire department. • D. Burns-Peters: For clarification, ACAD is what class? • M. Copeland: It's LST now. • H. Johnson: It's Learning Skills and Tutoring. If they go to tutoring it counts as a class. <p>Approved: Unanimously</p> <p>Abstentions: None</p> <p>Motion passes [see Academic Senate Documents, Voting Record]</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>4. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The last workshop is Friday, March 6, from 9:30 – 11:00 a.m. in B-204. <p>j. Accreditation and Outcomes [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I already talked about the Flex Day activity. • We talked about the QFE. • I was unable to attend the Accreditation Institute after all. I'll let B. Tasaka, A. Avelar, and D. Humble share. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Avelar: One thing I noticed was that schools sent teams including management and classified professionals. I think in the future we can plan ahead like that so we are all on the same page. The committee asked us to go to different breakout sessions so it was good we went in teams. One that stuck out in my head was how to get students to attend our committees. I know Guided Pathways talked about a compensation piece. We are all paid to be here, but the ones who we need feedback from have limited resources. One school actually paid their students to attend as student workers. They had to go through some hurdles and they all got training. It was like a stipend or an hourly rate. One thing I thought about was our requirement for the Promise Program for students to have community service hours. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ H. Johnson: That would be great because we're trying to have them look at service learning projects as opposed to individual service. Talk to O. Rodriguez. 	
<p>5. Additional Reports</p>	<p>a. SBCCD-CTA [K. Lawler]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elections are coming up. Announcements will come out next Monday. <p>b. District Assembly [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have two faculty vacancies coming up. I'm pleased to say B. Tasaka already applied to be one of them. • A lot of our discussion was going over the numbers I presented in my report. • We pulled three APs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3725 ○ 3750 ○ 3715 <p>c. Guided Pathways [T. Simpson]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. 	
<p>6. SBVC President's Report D. Rodriguez</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. 	
<p>7. Consent Agenda</p>	<p>a. Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2/20/20 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Motion 2 	<p>Motion 2: Move to approve the consent agenda. 1st: M. Copeland 2nd: J. Notarangelo Discussion: None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
7. Consent Agenda, continued		Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None Motion passes [see Academic Senate Documents , Voting Record]
8. Action Agenda	<p>a. SOAA Report: 2nd Read and Approval [D. Humble]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see Academic Senate Documents, Preview] Expanded version of what was done previously with feedback we received included. • The Guided Pathways steering committee and standing committee worked on this document. We have to submit this to the state. It's divided into the work and the reporting of the work is divided into the four pillars. • I have good info from the Accreditation Institute about how the ACCJC is exploring how the Standards fit into the four pillars of Guided Pathways. The theme for the QFE session included Guided Pathways as our action project #1. The theme for the QFE session was #beingbold and #beingclear. They want us to be innovative and bold. • The majority of the comments that were received and revisions made are on Pillar 3, which is ensuring learning (p. 13). We updated the name of the Accreditation and Outcomes Committee. • For example, on p.18, at the bottom there's some rewording. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: We're looking at B. Tasaka. Did she read it? ○ B. Tasaka: I looked earlier and gave feedback. I didn't look at this version yet. • This will still go to College Council and BOT. It will also go to some other committees. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Motion 3 <p>b. Draft Resource Allocation Model with Student Center Funding Formula [L. Strong]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see Academic Senate Documents, Resource Allocation Model (RAM)] This is what was presented at the District Budget Committee meeting last week. • My objective today is to share the draft with you to answer any questions you have, then after if any of you have questions to please share them with C. Huston because she's on the committee. • This is the model for how budget and resources are allocated to the colleges and the District office. We now have the Student Centered Funding Formula; it's different from the model we used before that was 100% on FTES, so we need to update our method so when accreditation comes we have something that matches the current method we're using. Later there will be an opportunity to continue to look at it and collegially decide how we want to do things. This is a transitionary time in our District. We have new leadership. There's certainly opportunities to grow and improve. • The 9 pages are broken down into 3 handouts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The first one is the Resource Allocation Model (RAM). ○ The next two pages is a model prepared by J. Gilbert and his colleagues, also at the campus researchers. ○ Pages 4 - 9 are a multi-year forecast of our expenses, etc. for about six years. This is what was submitted to the Board of Trustees in September when they approved the 2019 – 2020 budget. 	Motion 3: Move to approve. 1 st : M. Copeland 2 nd : M. Lawler Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None Motion passes [see Academic Senate Documents , Voting Record]

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. Action Agenda, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first page is the RAM. It starts, in sections a) - d) is really the Student Centered Funding Formula. We're a multi-college district. Valley has greater than 10,000 FTES, so they get a higher base allocation than CHC because they're smaller; that's a). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part b) is calculated how it always was - FTES. 70% FTES. c) is 20% of the formula is based on that. d) based on outcomes (associate degrees/credit certificates, etc.). In # 2, 3, 4, it explains how we'll handle other revenues that happen. The cost of the districtwide support operations are split based on the % for each college. • Pages 2 - 3 are both J. Gilbert's model. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Top of p. 2: Component 1: The left side is total FTES for District; to the right you see CHC's portion, then SBVC's. Component 2: Supplemental Allocation. Component 3: Student Success Allocation. That's all the outcomes. ○ Component 1 (p. 2) is tied in with p. 5. You'll also see the totals for Component 2 with CHC & SBVC's parts; row 6 on p. 5 is the same thing. ○ Multi-year forecast p. 5: line 8 - apportion for colleges are 69.47% SBVC, 30.53% CHC. That's how strong workforce, lottery, etc. are split up. District Support services: \$21,887,631, also split according to the RAM. District %: 19.26%, SBVC: 53.55%, 27.19% • If you have questions or feedback, please send it to C. Huston. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Worsley: I know we lost \$2 million from the funding formula, did we just absorb that? ○ L. Strong: If you look on page 4, line 11, I'll explain what that is. Our district was really ahead of this. Our region was shorted \$2,075,938. J. Torres really was the one who noticed it and took it to the state. At the time it seemed like we were going to be out \$2 million. By the time you get funding the year is already out. To be conservative we put it in the model. In future years we accounted for about \$1 million because we didn't feel at the time we were going to get shorted all that. A lot of times the state says they're going to cut money, we get a lot of it back. It's still a 15% haircut but we'll get 8% back. ○ M. Worsley: Promise students, I know we don't have a cap. Have we anticipated over-enrollment like we had the last year? ○ L. Strong: I wish S. Stark was here because he has the numbers for that. We've had a lot and that's a good thing, but it's a challenge. How do we pay for that? I know A. Avelar was talking about scheduling. ○ H. Johnson: We're looking at 2400 coming in, plus our current is 1089, so we're looking at 3,000 students total. ○ L. Strong: One thing I like about J. Torres is he's a visionary and he's always working to improve things. He's been working to tackle big challenges, and this is one of them. It's on his mind. ○ A. Avelar: I think what you're showing us on p. 2 - 3 is the DSO district services operations? ○ L. Strong: The Board wants to call us districtwide support operations (DSO). ○ A. Avelar: So these pages don't show what the DSO is going to be getting. I know on pages 4 - 5, we do actually see the assessment for DSO to do its operations. We had this conversation at the DBC about how the District is prioritizing. Is there discussions to look at that number and making sure a campus is not in the red? ○ L. Strong: Yeah, so to answer your first question, the model that J. Gilbert made only gets down to state-based revenue. The campuses work together and put all their expenses here. It's concerning. When you start looking at percentages, we hear that. One thing we talked about at DBC was we also shared the DSO budget with details and a 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. Action Agenda, continued</p>	<p>lot of lines. We try to get it down. It's a very transparent process. It shows what everything was last year with details of individual lies. DBC has been looking at that. Your question was also about how do you keep a college from being negative? K. Horan asked about negative as well. He doesn't see how CHC can overcome that and it seems broken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Avelar: What about restricted funds? Doesn't some of our salaries get covered by that? Shouldn't we see that too? ○ L. Strong: You're right in that this is unrestricted general funds. Anything you see here is not paid by the restricted side – the grants mainly. I could show you an income statement with revenues coming in and statements going out, would that help? ○ C. Huston: Maybe have it at the next DBC. ○ A. Avelar: I know there are discrepancies. I know there were a lot of faculty being counted as 12-month employees, but most of us are 10 month. I want the budget to be actual and correct. ○ L. Strong: I want it to be accurate. We use that Qestica budget software and it has each of us in there. If there's extra money, I want to use it where it's needed. ○ A. Ababat: Any plans if the corona virus comes to the community college? ○ L. Strong: Well there's no line item for that here. The Board wants to be conservative. They appreciate our jobs. I've been at the district since 2013, and many of you who were here before that know it was a dark time in the economy. Some districts had job losses because of the conservative level of job loss. You think, I could use this to hire new faculty, but it's always a balance. The Board has always wanted us to have a fund balance of 10-15%. The state only has a requirement, and I think it's dangerous, of 5%. That represents less than a month's worth of expenses. If there was a catastrophe like that we would work to draw on that piece of that. Hopefully it wouldn't be prolonged. ○ A. Avelar: Line item 1 (p.4), I know S. Stark mentioned it at DBC quite a bit falls under a) line 1, on p. 4. That should not be included for the calculation for #5, it should be a separate one. It would be detrimental to CHC and I want to look out for each other. So it shouldn't be counted on that section. ○ L. Strong: S. Stark didn't feel like that line should be from here, it should be pulled somewhere else. K. Horan worried it would be detrimental to CHC. It's in the minutes and it's something that can be considered. ○ D. Burns-Peters: How's that divided? It doesn't look like 70%-30%. ○ L. Strong: No, it's not. If you go on the state's website to exhibit c, it says if you're a multi-college district and depending on size you get each amount based on the college's FTES. It's right off the schedule statewide. <p>c. Remove Graduation Requirement for ACAD 001/LST 001 [M. Copeland]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed during Curriculum Committee update [item 4h]. <p>d. ACCJC Annual Report & Institution Set-Standards [J. Smith]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold for the next meeting. <p>e. AP 7211 – Equivalency [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7211 – This is draft language we'd like to move forward for equivalency. Last year we developed a joint equivalency policy so that CHC and Valley were both on committees that granted equivalency because if you get equivalency at one campus, you get it at the other. • We put this in practice, and we found some things that we want to modify. • We want faculty representation from each campus, and at least one administrator, and more faculty in the room than 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. Action Agenda, continued</p>	<p>administrators. That's been our practice, so we wanted to get it into the AP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We rearranged some language that was below. Requirements for ESL and coursework to come from an accredited institution. It was listed under degrees that don't require a Master's, but we want that for all our faculty. We moved it up so there's no question it applies to everyone, not just those seeking a degree for an area that doesn't have a Master's. • We found that A and B were very restrictive, but AP 7210 with our original equivalency policy was still active. We found ourselves using C and D (and sometimes F) from 7210. We want to move it to 7211 so it's all in one policy. It's possible to ultimately delete the equivalency portion of 7210. • This would go from us to CHC's Academic Senate, then to District Assembly. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Jones: On A it says "Master's Degree," there are people with a PhD but no Master's degree. ○ C. Huston: If we only had A and B it would be a problem, but we're covered because it says 30+ units. We want to move that back in and perfect the AP so we can ultimately operate under one. ○ D. Burns-Peters: When the new policy was in place, the goal was to get both campuses unified instead of us making equivalency decisions for CHC and vice versa. In the process, some language was lost and it limited us. This is not new language, it's just recognizing that there was a gap and attempting to fix it. ○ Motion 4 	<p>Motion 4: Move to approve changes. 1st: D. Smith 2nd: A. Ababat</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Pave: Under minimum qualifications I understand degrees, but I only see one sentence about diversity. Does this apply? • C. Huston: There's a separate qualification. This one is only for academic qualifications. We would only delete equivalency from 7210, everything else would stay the same. • J. Lamore: So if someone has a Ph.D., instead of saying they're good, they have to go to D and get the runaround? • C. Huston: What if the Ph.D. is in a different discipline? • D. Burns-Peters: Ph.D.'s aren't in the minimum qualifications handbook, so it gets kicked to us. We

Topic	Discussion	Action
8. Action Agenda, continued		couldn't make those decisions. Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None Motion passes [see Academic Senate Documents , Voting Record]
9. Information Items	a. Approved 2019 Program Review Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Took almost \$6000 interest from invested KVCR money and put it in Program Review. Program Review worked really hard on this list [applause]. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Jones: Did everyone see the email I sent out? ○ D. Burns- Peters: ○ C. Huston: I think S. Stark sent out an email. 	
10. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J. Notarangelo: Comments on Community College survey on student engagement. I speak for several peers in Arts & Humanities who note the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) is currently taking place in clear violation of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations on Academic and Professional Matters. Implementing this survey significantly interrupts already scheduled curriculum in courses across a number of disciplines, and that should never happen without Academic Senate approval. <p><i>Two Memoranda sent campuswide (2/13 and 2/27) generally announced this survey's existence. I am not aware of any more information regarding the process shared with the general faculty. No formal discussion has taken place in the Academic Senate on whether it belongs in the curriculum. Nor was there general discussion about the rollout which is now causing problems for some of the affected professors. These issues would have been alleviated had consultation with the Academic Senate occurred.</i></p> <p><i>One peer reports they initially had to go to the CCSSE website to discover it would take 50 minutes to complete. Given that amount of time taken away from classes campuswide, it is critical that appropriate notice is given to professors selected for the survey. The CCSSE website notes that the initial Memorandum should have been sent before the end of January, not February 13, and that the faculty would then receive at least a two-week notice to make appropriate cuts to their curriculum. That would have been a rather tight timeline as it was. However, one peer of mine has only recently received their notice that they were participating and several of the suggested survey dates were during Spring Recess. Had that the letter gone out on time and been discussed in Academic Senate, this rollout would be running more smoothly.</i></p> <p><i>But again, and most importantly, this survey is replacing already scheduled, existing curriculum without faculty approval, and it's doing so during a time when we are preparing for Accreditation. In terms of the Academic Senate's 10+1 criteria, this falls directly under responsibility No. 1 and likely a few others as well. The survey itself may not be a bad idea. But ignoring</i></p>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
10. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items	<p><i>Title 5 while implementing it, is. Title 5's direction on Academic and Professional Matters is pretty clear: if anyone wants to do anything that changes curriculum policy, they work with the Academic Senate to make that happen. Please, let's apply that from now on.</i></p> <p>—Joe Notarangelo, Senator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M. Nguyen- I'm with district environmental health & safety. I didn't have an agenda item I'm open to a future agenda item to discuss the corona virus. I just came from CHC, we had a communicable disease strike team. That's a stipulation for our district communicable disease plan. It's basically a strike team that forms in times like this. We want faculty input as we look at disseminating newsletters at a time like this. We already sent two. You can email me. • A. Avelar: Class caps were not on the agenda but will they be on the next one? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Copeland: I talked about it at the last meeting. We're meeting with faculty who haven't given us class caps still. I haven't heard from the union. 	
11. Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Jones: MESA announcements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Veterinarian: Images are very graphic. Friday at noon in HLS 134. ○ We partnered with UCR; a representative will be in library walkway March 25th from 1 – 4 p.m. 	
12. Adjournment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m. • Next meeting: April 1, 2020, at 3:00 p.m. via Zoom (link will be shared on our webpage). 	