

## SBVC Academic Senate

### Meeting Minutes

September 2, 2020

[Zoom link](#), 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 3:02 p.m. by A. Avelar [President]</li> <li>• Roll call by B. Tasaka [Secretary] [view the <a href="#">Attendance and Voting Record</a>]               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Quorum reached</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>2. Consent calendar</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Motion 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Discussion</b></li> <li>○ A. Avelar: The 8.12.20 minutes weren't loading. The site kept showing the minutes .</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Motion 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Discussion</b></li> <li>○ A. Avelar: Add reports for Distance Education and Financial Policy.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Motion 3</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 1: Motion to pull the consent agenda.</b>            1<sup>st</sup>: R. Hamdy            2<sup>nd</sup>: D. Smith            27 Votes            Aye: 92.6% [25 votes]            Nay: 0% [0 votes]            Abstain: 7.4% [2 votes]  <b>Motion passes</b>  <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p> <p><b>Motion 2: Motion to wait to vote on 8.12.20 minutes.</b>            1<sup>st</sup>: C. Jones            2<sup>nd</sup>: D. Burns-Peters            27 Votes            Aye: 92.3% [24 votes]            Nay: 3.7% [1 vote]            Abstain: 7.7% [2 votes]  <b>Motion passes</b>  <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
2. Consent calendar, continued		<p><b>Motion 3: Move to approve the 8.19.20 minutes.</b>  1<sup>st</sup>: D. Burns-Peters  2<sup>nd</sup>: A. Ababat  27 Votes  Aye: 88.9% [24 votes]  Nay: 0% [0 votes]  Abstain: 11.1% [3 votes]  <b>Motion passes</b>  <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p>
3. Public Comments on Agenda Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	
4. Senate President's Report A. Avelar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [view the <a href="#">Academic Senate President's Report</a>]</li> <li>• Anti-Racism/No-Hate resolution work</li> <li>• Accreditation</li> <li>• Guided Pathways</li> <li>• Distance Education/Format of Instruction</li> <li>• Professional Development Themes</li> <li>• Student career exploration and networking</li> <li>• [A. Avelar's] personal goal – follow through</li> </ul>	
5. Committee Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Ed. Policy</b> [L. Cuny] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. <b>Personnel Policy</b> [D. Smith] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report.</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. <b>Student Services</b> [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr &amp; M. Tinoco] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. <b>CTE</b> [J. Milligan] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> </li> <li>e. <b>EEO</b> [H. Johnson] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> </li> <li>f. <b>Professional Development</b> [R. Hamdy] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> </li> <li>g. <b>Elections</b> [A. Pave] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We had a large interest in the adjunct senator position. We had 8 nominees for 2 positions. I'll read their names on</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>5. Committee Reports, continued</b></p>	<p>the action part later. We have 8 different departments represented.</p> <p>h. <b>Curriculum</b> [M. Copeland]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> <p>i. <b>Program Review</b> [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> <p>j. <b>Accreditation and Outcomes</b> [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report.</li> </ul> <p>k. <b>Distance Education</b> [M. Worsley &amp; D. Burns-Peters]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters: M. Worsley and I have been fielding quite a few inquiries about work on academic holidays. We sent an email to the deans as a reminder. We do have holidays this semester and we should not have work due that day, including synchronous teaching. Those holidays should be treated the same as if we're in a face-to-face environment.</li> <li>• Upcoming holidays: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Monday, September 7</li> <li>○ Wednesday, November 11</li> <li>○ Fall break: November 23 – November 28</li> </ul> </li> <li>• We want to recommend that there be no live sessions on those days. We also ask that you consider due dates and workload.</li> </ul> <p>l. <b>Legislative</b> [T. Heibel]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [view the <a href="#">Legislative Subcommittee Update</a>]</li> <li>• The California Legislative Session ended on Monday, so there are some updates that I'll bring back next time.</li> <li>• There are some bills of interest [view update].</li> <li>• The next thing is a potential collaboration with the office of Student Life. R. Carlos is here with us. This pertains to AB 963; it requires community colleges offices of student life to do programming related to voter engagement. Student Life is planning some events: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 9/17 – Constitution Day</li> <li>○ 9/22 – National Voter Registration Day</li> <li>○ 10/19 – last day to register online</li> </ul> </li> <li>• They're also considering virtual watch parties for the upcoming presidential and vice presidential debates as well.</li> <li>• Follow-up questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Does the Senate support the SBVC Student Life voter engagement project?</li> <li>○ If the Senate supports it, how is this support manifest?</li> <li>○ Could we incorporate voter engagement into larger campus-wide anti-racism, social justice, cultural inclusivity, and Census initiatives?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• One more item to consider is the Legislative Policy Subcommittee charge.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<b>5. Committee Reports</b> , continued	<p>m. <b>Financial Policy</b> [A. Castro]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [view <a href="#">Financial Policy Subcommittee Update</a>]</li> <li>• The Financial Policy Subcommittee met and we came up with some small changes to the by-laws.</li> <li>• The first change is under #4, marked in red. We want to include parts c and d. We want to “[u]se campus qualitative and quantitative data to support decision making on budgetary needs,” and “advocate for equity-minded decisions.”</li> <li>• The second change is under #5, again marked in red, under part c. We want to include part vii: “identify inequities in current and proposed budget models.”</li> </ul> <p>n. <b>Guided Pathways</b> [T. Simpson, M. Robles, J. Stanskas]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report.</li> </ul> <p>o. <b>Honors</b> [A. Blacksher]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report.</li> </ul>	
<b>6. Additional Reports</b>	<p>a. <b>SBCCD-CTA</b> [S. Lillard]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Just a reminder that there will be an election for treasurer for the Union. That should come out in the next week or two.</li> <li>• Our luncheons are by Zoom. We had a good turnout. J. Herrera sent out that invitation. I believe it’s an ongoing invitation.</li> <li>• For negotiations, we finalized two MOUs. They’ll be posted on our website early next week. The first is for adjunct faculty. We negotiated an additional 4 hours professional development to help support their DE training.</li> <li>• [Lost connection]</li> </ul> <p>b. <b>District Assembly</b> [B. Tasaka]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We met yesterday. We have a new District Assembly President. C. Thomas. As a membership update, your faculty representatives are m, D. Burns-Peters, and C. Luke. A. Avelar is also there as your Senate President. We’re also going to work closely with L. Cuny because he chairs the Ed Policy subcommittee.</li> <li>• I encourage everyone to download the Board BookIt app. I don’t know if you get the emails from S. Nikac. All of the meeting information can be easily accessed through that app.</li> <li>• We got a budget update from J. Torres. His whole presentation is on that app as well as in an email sent out by S. Nikac yesterday. He talked about a best, middle, and worst-case scenario, then said we’re going to operate on the middle-case scenario.</li> <li>• He mentioned that the plan is there will be no furloughs or layoffs. He said we’re looking to be at a fund balance in deficit until the 24-25 academic year. He said we’re working with about a 9% lower enrollment across the District.</li> <li>• He updated us on the District’s mission. Instead of several different goals, they’re working on goals that are shared across the District and down to the campuses.</li> <li>• One of the last things he mentioned was an update on the Promise Program. He said we are not planning to continue it to a third year. That will have some repercussions and we want to look into that.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>5. Committee Reports</b>, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We did decide to revisit the APs and BPs next month. If you have any comments on those, you can see them on the screen now, S. Nikac’s email, or on the Board BookIt app, let one of your faculty representatives or L. Cuny know.</li> <li>● <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: Is it worth mentioning the AP that Crafton wants to pull?</li> <li>○ B. Tasaka: Sure. It’s AP 4235: Credit by Examination. We’ll have our Ed Policy committee look at it. I encourage all of you to look through these and give us feedback. Your voices are important as we talk about equity.</li> <li>○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Quickly, about the Promise Program. There are 2 cohorts now. What happens to them?</li> <li>○ B. Tasaka: My understanding was the first two would finish, and the third would not start at all. President Rodriguez is typing in the chat that she will address it as well.</li> <li>○ T. Vasquez: What kind of feedback are you looking for?</li> <li>○ B. Tasaka: I think any feedback at all is helpful. Sometimes something really small helps, like a change in grammar. I personally think that it’s important that our policies and procedures are grammatically correct and consistent. It could be an inconsistency or a red flag – you might think we shouldn’t be doing something or we aren’t following what’s written. We want to bring any of that to light. Anything that stands out to you is important.</li> <li>○ L. Cuny: Anything is helpful to me as well. I’m trying to wrap my brain around it.</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: It’s also a good opportunity to look at those APs/BPs with the lens of student impact and equity as well. I remember when a policy that seemed small about smoking on campus came through and we ended up looking at the student perspective. It changed a lot of minds.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: I also want to point out the Roadmap for Student Success. It’s part of that agenda. You can also find it on the District Assembly website.</li> <li>○ B. Tasaka: I can add a link on SharePoint as well.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: It is a lot, but it’s important.</li> <li>○ B. Tasaka: I think it’s worth it to ask. If you’re reading and you think something sounds weird, say something and we’ll look at it. I’m by no means an expert, I’m just at the meetings. So if you have a question, reach out and ask about it.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: There was also an update on accreditation. You can look at the presentation in S. Nikac’s email.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>7. SBVC President’s Report</b> D. Rodriguez</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● I want to mention enrollment. You heard the update that enrollment is down across the District. For SBVC alone, not talking FTES, we are below where we were at this time by just over 2800 students. That’s about 15% of our students. I’m hopeful as we move into our late-start classes and into next semester that we will recapture those students as they realize that they can do online work. I’m still virtually in the community and you all are getting so many kudos for going above and beyond for students. Again I’m hopeful and optimistic.</li> <li>● You all talked about the elections and polling. SBVC sent over to our league of registered voters that we would be happy to be a polling site. We’re still waiting on confirmation, but it looks like it’s going to happen. We do have the facilities. We’ll work with them on the social distancing aspect of it. The site we’re looking at, so you all are aware, are</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>7. SBVC President's Report, continued</b></p>	<p>the Sunroom and cafeteria, mostly the cafeteria. Originally we were thinking about B-100, but we think the cafeteria will be better in terms of cleaning and sanitizing. Restrooms are right there. There's a convenient flow of entrance and exit. And the parking lot is right there. We think we have a pretty good strategy about how we can shepherd the public in and out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I'm extremely happy to see the work being done on microaggressions. It's a topic I'm very passionate about. It's also a topic that's often overlooked when we talk about our underrepresented students and students of color.</li> <li>• Just to repeat what J. Torres and B. Tasaka said, we are not talking about furloughs or layoffs. I know there can be some anxiousness, especially now. If we can spread that, it would be helpful.</li> <li>• Going to the strategic plan, if you recall I talked about that a little in my last presentation. Our strategic plan should work in concert with the District's and Crafton's. We'll also talk about it in College Council. We'll also have a lot of collaboration and discussion about pulling it together. Probably over the next two years there will be a lot of conversation.</li> <li>• The Promise Program – we talked about this with the Board and Chancellor's Cabinet. We talked about, not cancelling the Promise, but I'm going to say putting it on pause right now. This is for a couple reasons. First, it will give us a chance to do an in-depth analysis on the success of the program. We know it's successful. We know students who participate in it tend to do better. Right now that's anecdotal. We need to dive in and see if we're moving the needle. We're right at the halfway point with the first cohort. They're finished with their first year, hopefully they're getting ready to graduate. We want to see where they are and to see if we can do better. Chancellor's Cabinet has asked each of the colleges to identify some of the people to participate in doing this evaluation. The committee will be co-chaired by the two VPSS's. There will be 5 people from each site. I've also asked S. Thayer and C. Rodriguez to put together a resource committee because we need everyone's input- from those that are teaching those students to those who are providing wraparound support services for those students as well. It will be quite a process. I am positive we are going to see successful results that will give us all the reasons we need to continue such a program.</li> <li>• Another challenge is budget. It's an expensive program. We all know the budget situation this year, next year will probably be a little tighter. We need to think how we are going to run the program should we continue. You know early on we talked about revenues coming from buildings we purchased; the rental income would help support the Promise. Well as you know, we got thrust into COVID and we are losing some of our renters in those buildings. There are some folks, if I understand correctly, talking about downsizing or not continuing their lease because they're running into economic challenges as well.</li> <li>• If we decide not to move forward with the Promise, what I talked about, not widely, so this is the start of it, is I think we should continue with SBVC's version of a promise program. Now whether we move back to Valley Bound, a phenomenally successful program, one of the original promise programs in California and widely recognized for its contributions. We'll take a look and consider if that's something we want to bring back.</li> <li>• <b>Questions/Comments:</b></li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>7. SBVC President's Report, continued</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [from the chat] R. Pires: What happened to the funds from the KVCR airwaves in relation to the Promise Program?</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: I believe those funds were to be used for the startup. They were allocated as such for cohorts 1 and 2. I also have an answer to A. Aguilar-Kitibutr's comments. We will continue with cohorts 1 and 2.</li> <li>○ [from the chat] K. Lawler: I know the Promise Program lost funding, but our district was federally funded with CARES Act funds which can be used for student success programs. Could you address?</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: We're currently using some of the CARES Act program for a number of initiatives across campus to help out. However the CARES Act money is one-time so we cannot use it to sustain the Promise Program and I think it would be a false promise, if you will, if we went down that road. In terms of California funding, there's still the California Promise, which is a repackaging of the BOG. We'll do a campaign to make sure our students know that.</li> <li>○ [in the chat]: If we need a stop-gap to get us through COVID will that help us keep the promise? Referring to the CARES fund.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: My instincts say no. It's one-time funding and we have to spend it by a certain time. I'm trying to remember those deadlines and I'm not sure we can get the third cohort through with that money.</li> <li>○ K. Lawler: Is it your belief that if we weren't in this COVID environment, would we continue sustaining the program?</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: We would probably be in the same situation given the budget scenario. It's hard to say if COVID-19 is the sole reason for the slowing down of the economy. If the economy was thriving, according to trends, fewer students would come to campus and that would reduce our allocation. It's unusual that the economy is poor and we still don't have the students we should have. It's not an unfair question, I just don't know how to answer it.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>8. Action Agenda</b></p>	<p><b>a. Election of Adjunct Senators [A. Pave]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We have a How to Access SharePoint [shared at an earlier meeting].</li> <li>● Again, we have 8 adjunct nominees and 2 positions. It's open now and it will close at noon on Friday.</li> <li>● Once you're on SharePoint, all senators should have that access, click on the Adjunct Senator Elections. I want to thank B. Tasaka for designing it.</li> <li>● I want to read the candidate's names and give you their departments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Joanna Camba Colón, Biology</li> <li>○ Dion Cuevas, Art</li> <li>○ Jaime Garcia, Communication Studies</li> <li>○ Elena Kellogg, English</li> <li>○ Mary Lawler, Kinesiology</li> <li>○ Yasmine Shereen, Anthropology</li> <li>○ Shelley Smith, Geology</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>6. Additional Reports,</b> continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Donna-Maria Trehwella, Film, TV, and Media</li> <li>● You can see we have a really nice selection to choose from.</li> <li>● I want to make sure you click these names. That will take you to their letters of interest. Every candidate offered us a letter of interest to tell us why they're interested, what they can do for SBVC, and why they belong on the Senate, which I think is great. We have a responsibility to read those letters.</li> <li>● Then, we have to Rock the Vote. We need your email address to make sure everyone votes once for two potential senators. What's nice is that link randomizes the names. They won't automatically be in alphabetical order.</li> <li>● Voting closes at noon on Friday, September 4. Make sure you get that in. I look forward to letting our winners know on Friday. If you have questions, let me know. You can also email me.</li> <li>● A. Avelar: Our voting for adjunct is done by senators. It's a one-year term.</li> <li><b>b. DE recommendations for Spring 2021</b> [D. Burns-Peters and M. Worsley] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● [view the <a href="#">DE Recommendations for Spring 2021</a>]</li> <li>● D. Burns-Peters: The DE Committee met to discuss and come up with recommendations from the committee to the Senate in case we go online in Spring 2021. As you know, that decision hasn't come yet, but we're trying to be proactive. If that decision leans in the way of going online, we can be prepared and a bit more proactive. After a very lengthy and thorough discussion, we came up with the decision to make a recommendation for Spring 2021 only. There are further discussions on what online learning looks like. We recommend that if we remain online, that we remain mostly asynchronous. We speak of this as a default to synchronous, but there is a need for synchronous components. If the synchronous components are requested, then that should be outlined in the schedule and all courses should heed to the Course Outline of Record. If there are any synchronous components, they must be approved by the dean.</li> <li>● We want to make sure we share, that once we have that decision, if it's an online approach for Spring 2021, the DE Committee will work closely with R. Hamdy as we have over the last 6 months. We will jump into action and provide support, training, and webinars to support faculty. Looking at how to better implement and improve our asynchronous components and how to improve engagement with students.</li> <li>● <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M. Copeland: The thinking about having a dean approve synchronous components is about scheduling, right?</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: It's primarily about scheduling. It's about making sure we don't fall into a remote education format; making sure we're still falling under online education format. We also want students to be able to pick and choose what format works for them. I'll use my department as an example. If we only offer required, synchronous formats, then students don't have a whole lot of option as if we had fully online and a couple courses with synchronous components. It's really making sure students still have choice in the classes they take given what they're dealing with. We also want to service our traditionally online students.</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: I like this, I just get concerned with unintended consequences. I'm a little concerned that the last sentence could be used in other ways. I'm not sure how the language could be clarified.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. Action Agenda, continued</p>	<p>You said something about being remote?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: We're operating under the definition of online instruction, which is really about the format in which we provide instruction. I should say the platform. It falls under all the other requirements like regular and substantive interaction. Making sure there's a course structure. Remote is you're teaching at a specified time, I don't want to be misunderstood. Some people interpret remote as only using Zoom to teach and there's no online component.</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: Do we feel that's been addressed in our DE Addendums? My concern is it speaks to curriculum rather than scheduling. I'm not sure we want a dean approving curriculum. That's my only concern.</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: We have addressed, at least in documentation, the use of Zoom as the sole support for students. We want to make sure in practice we're actually providing what we said in the DE addendums.</li> <li>○ T. Vasquez: I have a question regarding surveying our students.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: Research and Planning did send out a survey relating to DE. That did happen. The DE Committee would not survey students, that's not their responsibility. Research did do it before we left for summer.</li> <li>○ [in the chat] V. Alvarez: How reliable is that data?</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: I don't know I can ask Dr. Smith to pass that along to faculty.</li> <li>○ C. Jones: I heard them say that moving to DE would give people a lot of choice, but I only hear one choice: online. I get a lot of complaints from students, especially in Organic Chem. I keep hearing the same thing from students: Why can't we be put in one of the big lecture halls so we can socially distance and be in the same room. They can go up to the board and draw something and I can go up to it later and finish it off.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: This is only the recommendation if the District says we have to go online. We're still waiting on that decision.</li> <li>○ C. Jones: I don't understand why the District is pushing 100% online. That's not equitable. I mean there are students that need it face-to-face. They already have to be on campus because the classes have the hybrid components with the labs. I don't see why we aren't moving a certain percentage face-to-face, assuming faculty are willing to do it.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: That's what the District might decide. We don't know until September 18. They have to look at the state level, the county level, and follow the CDC.</li> <li>○ C. Jones: I don't think we should be fully back face-to-face. There's clearly going to be faculty who are scared over the next few years. So we should probably always offer more online classes. To have 0 is unbelievable. I have students complain because of the difficulty and they basically have to drop because of the issues.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: It is a lot, but if you look at the data for schools who went face-to-face, they had to go back online.</li> <li>○ C. Jones: Everyone is talking about 0% or 100%, we should look at middle percentages. We have to offer options.</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: You make good points, but that's not for the DE Committee to decide. Our intent here is to be proactive in advance and state if there are going to be synchronous components they're stated in the schedule. We didn't do that in the fall.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>8. Action Agenda,</b> continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ D. Humble: I want to thank the DE Committee. I appreciate the discussion here today. We know there are some courses that will need to be mostly synchronous. There's always an online component, especially now. That's where the synchronous component comes in. There's a pedagogical need for some courses to be synchronous. I want to thank the Committee for providing this option for us in the spring. This is only if the District makes the decision to go online. I want to address another question in the chat – do we have time to make changes. Yes; priority registration starts November 2. The Office of Instruction and chairs, staff, deans, have time, but it will be fast. There is time to make an accurate schedule when it goes live so students understand.</li> <li>○ L. Cuny: I'm hearing C. Jones on some of these concerns. I'm in a similar circumstance. I'm wondering too if say we're 100% virtual on spring, but we look at our results and say we had no outbreaks, so we make some adjustments. Is there room for that in their decisions later in the spring?</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: We are the discipline experts. Chemistry made recommendations and they were followed. I think this is a different discussion we're having here. If you look at your addendums and you have labs that must be face-to-face, you need to work with your deans to make sure you get cleaning taken care of.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: This discussion is not related to the DE Committee's recommendation. I would like to suggest that A. Avelar direct us to the person we should direct questions and concerns to.</li> <li>○ K. Hannon: Yes, both D. Rodriguez and I will take feedback to the Chancellor's Cabinet. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Motion 4</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>c. Student Voter Engagement and Census</b> [T. Heibel]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [view <a href="#">Students Vote Project</a>]</li> <li>• [view <a href="#">Ballot Bowl</a>]</li> <li>• [view <a href="#">Ballot Bowl codes</a>]</li> <li>• This is a follow-up to what I mentioned earlier. I am looking for a motion of support for what the Office of Student Life would like to engage in. I did receive several comments that we will make sure this is a nonpartisan effort. We merely want to make sure our students are engaged. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Motion 5</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>d. Program Review Efficacy</b> [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [view <a href="#">Program Review Efficacy</a>]</li> <li>• We got the results of the Program Review survey. Thanks to all who participated. There were 116 respondents. Here are some of the themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns about Needs Assessment</li> <li>○ The data received</li> <li>○ Program Efficacy and forms</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Fall is normally the semester we do Needs Assessment. There's no time to fix it because it has to go out next week, or should we postpone it to spring? That led to a motion to suspend program efficacy. I'm looking for a</li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 4: Move to support the DE Committee's recommendation.</b> 1<sup>st</sup>: T. Heibel 2<sup>nd</sup>: A. Ababat <b>Discussion:</b> None 26 Responses Aye: 73.1% [19 votes] Nay: 15.4% [4 votes] Abstain: 11.5% [3 votes] <b>Motion passes</b> <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p> <p><b>Motion 5: Move to support Student Voter Engagement and Census.</b> 1<sup>st</sup>: M. Worsley 2<sup>nd</sup>: V. Alvarez <b>Discussion:</b> None 22 Responses Aye: 95.5% [21 votes] Nay: 0% [0 votes] Abstain: 4.5% [1 vote] <b>Motion passes</b> <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>8. Action Agenda,</b> continued</p>	<p>motion of support to suspend program efficacy so we can fully evaluate process and revise the forms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Motion 6</b></li> <li>● C. Huston: The committee is going to revisit Needs Assessment. We need to make a decision on Friday if we're going to suspend it and work on it in Spring or if we're going to run the same thing. Would the Senate be supportive of running Needs assessment in spring and working on it this semester?</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: Can we find out if we go through Needs Assessment, will there be money to fund items? It doesn't make sense to suspend and reevaluate if there's no money.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: I think that's why the committee didn't arrive at a conclusion. I was looking for a straw poll, would the Senate support it if we brought it back here?</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: If not, we won't have another Senate meeting before the document is sent out.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: I am uncomfortable going through Needs Assessment and moving forward with given the uncertain budget and reevaluation of Program Review. I don't see it's the right direction to go for this particular academic year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Motion 7</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Discussion:</b></li> <li>▪ C. Huston: For discussion, and in response to the chat, we are not permanently suspending it. Only postponing it in the fall so in the spring we can run it with the new process. We have several committee members here either as senators or as guests who can speak. I'd like to get their thoughts.</li> <li>▪ D. Rodriguez: For clarification, the Needs Assessment process, does it only deal with issues of budget? Is that the only reason to go through it or are there other important factors that come out of that?</li> <li>▪ C. Huston: It creates growth positions for faculty and classified, it does facilities requests, technology requests, equipment requests, and budget augmentation.</li> <li>▪ D. Rodriguez: From a management perspective, I would be okay with postponing it as the committee sees fit. I don't know if I'm in favor of just not doing it. As new monies come in or other pots of money are identified, there might be opportunities to hunt for things on these lists. I'd hate for us to not be prepared. I certainly understand postponing it to align with the other motion.</li> <li>▪ R. Hamdy: That's my original motion. Let's run it in Spring along with other stuff that the Program Review committee does in Spring. There's no point in running an old process while we redo it.</li> <li>▪ A. Avelar: It will still take place. If we have the process in place early enough in spring there will be funds I think.</li> <li>▪ C. Jones: We were talking about suspending efficacies for one year, right?</li> <li>▪ C. Huston: Yes, the law requires us to do it once every 6 years and we are on a 4 year cycle, so we're good.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 6: Move to suspend program efficacy reports in Spring 21 in order to fully evaluate the program efficacy process and revise the program efficacy forms.</b></p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>: R. Hamdy 2<sup>nd</sup>: K. Lawler</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> None</p> <p>24 Responses Aye: 95.8% [23 votes] Nay: 0% [0 votes] Abstain: 4.2% [1 vote]</p> <p><b>Motion passes</b> <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p> <p><b>Motion 6: Move to suspend Needs Assessment for fall 2020 and do a pilot of Needs Assessment in spring 2021 based on the Program Review Committee's findings.</b></p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>: R. Hamdy 2<sup>nd</sup>: D. Burns-Peters</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> On the left</p> <p>22 Responses Aye: 77.3% [17 votes] Nay: 0% [0 votes] Abstain: 22.7% [5 votes]</p> <p><b>Motion passes</b> <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
8. Action Agenda, continued	<p><b>e. Anti-Racism – Beginning to address at the institutional level – Review policies we have input on, does that produce/keep institutional biases, for example: APs/BPs.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I'm requesting that we start reviewing policies we have input on to look for biases that are in place. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Motion 7</b></li> <li>○ <b>Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ D. Burns-Peters: Just a point of clarification, I am 100% in support of that. We are beginning to have these discussions about looking at things through an equity lens. Are we looking at what methodology will do that? What are our guidelines going to be like? How do we know that we're actually looking through the equity lens? In DE we're looking at a research-based rubric in terms of DE information to look at things through an equity lens. How do we as a body look at those things and know that's what we're doing? Are there tools? A process? Resources? Guidelines? I don't want it to be red-tape, but I want to keep that in mind.</li> <li>▪ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: I think it's an ongoing process for us. We just continue with the work. Now D. Burns-Peters is mentioning the rubrics. Maybe that's the next step.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 7:</b> Move that we begin to address anti-racism at the institutional level - review processes we have input on, does that produce/keep institutional biases, for example: AP/BPs.</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>: M. Copeland 2<sup>nd</sup>: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> None</p> <p>20 Responses Aye: 100% [20 votes] Nay: 0% [0 votes] Abstain: 0% [0 votes]</p> <p><b>Motion passes</b> <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p>
9. Discussion Items	<p><b>a. Anti-Racism – Reflections on what can we do now from All Faculty Meeting, email your stories! Share what you are doing! Example: inclusivity statement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [view <a href="#">inclusivity statement</a>]</li> <li>• We also have the notes from the All Faculty Meeting.</li> <li>• If you have stories, please share them with us.</li> </ul>	
10. Information Items	<p><b>a. Degree Planner [Y. Carter]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [view <a href="#">Degree Planner</a>]</li> <li>• For fall 2020, the general counseling department along with the programs rolled out our new degree planner tool for ed-plan building for students.</li> <li>• I'll just log in and give you a quick run-through of what counselors are doing.</li> <li>• Crafton has been using Degree Planner and Up and Away for about a year now. There's still some fine-tuning for us along the way, but as of now counselors are using this. It's housed in Starfish. It's build specifically off the catalog. We do have plans to roll it out to students as well this semester. We have open labs and training videos so students can learn how to use it. It will also go through their Student Development courses.</li> <li>• I'm going to run through a sample student exactly as a counselor would see it. We'll build a program. It's a shared system, just like WebAdvisor. The dropdown will show both Crafton and Valley.</li> <li>• We hired professional experts. They extracted ed plans from WebAdvisor to Degree Planner, about 12,000 ed</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>10. Information Items, continued</p>	<p>plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It doesn't default to summer, students have to identify if they want summer classes.</li> <li>• Students can select preferences for online, time of day, days of the week. Then I click "build plan" and it gives their ed plan. There's the classes they already completed and everything they have planned. I can modify it along the way. There's a drag and drop feature. I can move them to whatever semester I see fit.</li> <li>• Counselors and students get alerts if there are unmet requirements that need to be resolved or planned for.</li> <li>• I can see courses that are still open for Fall 2020. If I put in Spring 2021, it will say the schedule isn't out yet. If it was I could add that to their plan.</li> <li>• It will alert me if a course was already taken or if there's a prerequisite.</li> <li>• Students can have more than one plan.</li> <li>• This will recognize that courses weren't offered, say in the summer. So it won't let that be selected. There are some things that need to be worked out. Nursing was an example. We had to build them in the system.</li> <li>• A. Avealr: Can instructional faculty use this to plan for future classes based on demand?</li> <li>• Y. Carter: Yes. That's part of the point. We'll share this information with the office of instruction and it can be used for schedule planning. Our ultimate goal is to have students register directly from the ed plan. We have a demo coming on September 9 on how to register from the ed plan. We'll make a decision as a district on how to move forward. I'm crossing my fingers, but we'll roll it out at the same time as Crafton.</li> <li>• The only caveat we're running into is we're building ed plans in Degree Planner, students still have to go to WebAdvisor to register for courses. It's not as seamless for now. It takes some getting used to. Counselors have had some mixed reviews.</li> <li>• We're trying to stop having counselors build ed plans in WebAdvisor. Starting Spring 2021 they should be using this.</li> <li>• R. Hamdy: Can you just promote your Starfish open labs as well? I just sent out an email.</li> <li>• Y. Carter: We do have those open and available. Click on the links on the flyers and it will get you right to our Zoom meetings. We're working to troubleshoot and build progress surveys. We had a ton of feedback last semester where the faculty could set up thresholds for tutoring or counseling if they dropped below a certain percentage.</li> <li>• A. Avelar: When the course comes up, will it show if it's a zero cost textbook?</li> <li>• Y. Carter: No, but I'll put that in my notes. Is that in the catalog?</li> <li>• A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: It's in the schedule of classes, but not always in the catalog.</li> <li>• A. Avelar: We can look into it.</li> <li>• R. Hamdy: Can we refer any other questions to Y. Carter's open lab tomorrow?</li> </ul> <p><b>b. Sustainability Committee [A. Avelar]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is not going away – it will be brought back. I believe College Council is also looking at this as an ad hoc. It will have a minimum of one manager, one faculty, one classified, and one student. If you're interested let D. Rodriguez</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
10. Information Items	<p>know.</p> <p><b>c. Bylaws revisions</b> [A. Avelar]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to send me your subcommittee recommendations or any language corrections. I'm compiling it and we'll make edits as well. Hopefully we can bring an actual draft for first-read soon.</li> </ul>	
11. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Avelar: The Latino Faculty, Staff and Administrators is doing a membership drive.</li> </ul>	
12. Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None.</li> </ul>	
13. Adjournment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting adjourned at 5:11 p.m.</li> <li>Next meeting: September 16, 2020, at 3:00 p.m. via <a href="#">Zoom</a> (link will also be shared on our webpage).</li> </ul>	