SBVC Academic Senate
Meeting Minutes
October 7, 2020
[Zoom link](), 3:00 – 4:30 P.M.

Topic	Discussion	Action
1. Call to Order and Roll Call	• Meeting called to order at 3:02 p.m. by A. Avelar [President] • Roll call via sign-in sheet [view the Attendance and Voting Record] ○ Quorum reached	

2. Consent calendar	• Approval of the 10.7.20 agenda and the minutes from 9.30.20.
	    ○ **Motion 1**
	        ▪ **Discussion:** None
	    ○ **Motion 2**
	        ▪ **Discussion:** None
		Motion 1: **Move Item 7. after Item 3. and swap Items 8a. and 9b.**
		 1st: D. Burns-Peters
		 2nd: M. Lawler
		 33 Votes
		 Aye: 100% [33 votes]
		 Nay: 0% [0 votes]
		 Abstain: 0% [0 votes]
		 Motion passes
		 [Voting Record]
		
		 Motion 2: **Move to approve the minutes.**
		 1st: C. Jones
		 2nd: T. Vasquez
		 33 Votes
		 Aye: 97% [32 votes]
		 Nay: 0% [0 votes]
		 Abstain: 3% [1 vote]
		 Motion passes
		 [Voting Record]

3. Public Comments on Agenda Items	• None	

Topic	Discussion	Action

4. Senate President Report, A. Avelar	• [view the Academic Senate President's Report]
	  ○ Elijah McClain: Elijah McClain deserves justice.
	  ○ ASCCC Resolutions Fall 2020
	  ○ Area D meting
	  ○ Fall Plenary – Thank you to D. Humble for helping us send 10 faculty this year, in addition to myself and J. Stanskas.
	  ○ Accreditation	

5. Committee Reports	**a.Ed. Policy** [L. Cuny] – No report
	b.Personnel Policy [D. Smith] – No report
	c.Student Services [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr & M. Tinoco] – No report
	d.CTE [J. Milligan] – No report
	e.EEO [H. Johnson] – No report
	f. Professional Development [R. Hamdy] – No report
	g. Elections [A. Pave] – No report
	h. Curriculum [M. Copeland] – No report
	i. Program Review [C. Huston] – No report
	j. Accreditation and Outcomes [C. Huston]
	  • We have been receiving evidence requests and meeting requests from the visiting team. We already responded to many of the requests from Standards I and II. Thank you to everyone who sent me evidence; you were all really quick and that made such a difference. I appreciate your quick responses. K. Yarborough is working on scheduling.
	  • Now we received round two of evidence and interview requests earlier this week. It's primarily for HR. We expect one more at the end of this week for Standard IV. Everything is going very smoothly.
	  • Please make sure your cameras are on. There will be a big launch on Tuesday. There's forums on Tuesday night and Wednesday afternoon that anyone can attend. The exit meeting will be on Thursday just before lunch.
	  • D. Humble: We'll have a general schedule for everyone this Friday that will go out with the campus newsletter. Thanks to everyone for your participation.
	  • A. Avelar: When do we expect to hear back from ACCJC?
	  • C. Huston: They have their big meeting on January. They'll make a formal recommendation that we'll receive shortly after. We'll also get a preliminary copy of the visiting team's report that we can correct for fact. We'll get a pretty good feel from the exit report. Nothing will be official until late January, early February.
	k. Distance Education [M. Worsley & D. Burns-Peters] – No report
	l. Legislative [T. Heibel] – No report
	m. Financial Policy [A. Castro]
	  • [view 2020-21 Financial Budget Strategy Session]	

Topic	Discussion	Action

5. Committee Reports, continued	• This is what S. Stark presented at the last District Budget Strategy meeting. This was the plan for the 2020-21 academic year. I want to thank the committee: A. Blacksher, T. Vasquez, and M. Lawler. We all put a lot of work into this.
	 • The state is in a deficit. How does that affect us and the District Budget Committee's (DBC) strategy? We have a $54.3 billion deficit. That's $1.5 billion in deferrals starting in February, and there will be five months of deferrals.
	 • We have an action plan, depending on what the federal government does by October 15. They will decide about a stimulus package. The District has a best, middle, and worst case scenarios. I've been learning this on my own – it's like taking a class with no professor and no textbook. I want to understand and break all this down.
	 • The Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) is money we get from the Department of Education for the state. Depending on the cost of living increase, we could have a COLA of zero, meaning we don't get additional funding because we're already in deficit. The deficit is due to COVID and the wildfires. We're also including hiring freezes in our action plan.
	 • One thing I'm still working on is the deficit factor. It's 0.35%. It's supposed to be a revenue shortfall amount. I'm looking into exactly where that is.
	 • The fund balance is we go to our expenses. We have yearly expenses for us, the District, and CHC. We also have the reserve. It's going to be the percentage of our expenditures. We take our amount divided by the expenditures and that gives the fund balance reserve.
	 • Scenarios presented: The District is going with the middle case scenario, assuming we get funding from the federal government on October 15. Right now we're currently at about $23 million for our fund balance. Middle case scenario drops that down to $21 million. Best case scenario is if we get the COLA, which is not likely. The worst case scenario is where we take a hit if the federal government decides not to fund us. Our fund balance will take a hit. If that happens, the funds that are being currently designated to the Promise Program, assuming the revenue from the buildings is going to be delegated to help in this response and maintain our recommended fund balance of 5%. Our District usually goes for about 10% - 15%.
	 • The main topic was where are we going to be borrowing money from because we have five months of deferrals which we're starting to be paid back in July of next year. The main thing is we're going to be borrowing internally for a total of approximately $32.8 million. Why is it we're going for so much? Going back to the DBC's website, we're spending about $10 million/month to keep ourselves running. We're going to have five months of deferrals, the objective is to have $50 million to get us through it. We're going to have $32 we'll borrow and about $23 in our fund balance reserve. That will allow us to pay our bills and meet the 5% reserve.
	 • Questions/Comments:
	   o R. Hamdy: Do you want to mention our potential PD opportunity and the guide you're working on as well?
	   o A. Castro: Yes, so yesterday at our subcommittee meeting, A. Blacksher had a great idea. It's difficult to learn how to read this budget and there's no manual. He said we should offer training. I've been writing my own manual as I learn this, but I could adjust it to make it available to others.	

Topic	Discussion	Action
5. Committee Reports, continued	○ R. Hamdy: I think the goal is if A. Castro does a pre-recording, everyone can watch it and read his manual. Then we can do a live Q&A so everyone comes in with some knowledge. It will help everyone understand more of this. ○ J. Garcia: Thank you for breaking this down. You mentioned three scenarios. When we're talking about worst case, especially as an adjunct, could you talk a bit more about that? ○ A. Castro: It says we're okay this year. No furloughs this year, depending on how things go. It depends on money we get in July because then we might have a cash flow problem. That's all the info I have at the moment. ○ J. Garcia: Thank you. I appreciate it. ○ M. Worsley: Will we essentially know by October 15 what our plan will be? ○ A. Castro: We'll have another meeting this month, I think it's after that. Once we have that information we should be able to act accordingly. ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: So we are okay this year, what do you sense about next year? I know you said it depends on deferrals and the October 15 decision. ○ A. Castro: I had a lot of your same questions when I went to our campus committee. Basically they said we have to wait and see what happens. This year we're okay. We don't know how we are going to pay those deferrals back. I will keep asking questions and keep brining information back here. **n. Guided Pathways** [M. Robles, T. Simpson, J. Stanskas] **o. Honors** [A. Blacksher] – No report	
6. Additional Reports	**a. SBCCD-CTA** [S. Lillard] – No report **b. District Assembly** [B. Tasaka] • [view the District Assembly agenda from 10.6.2020] • There was an update on KVCR, you can read about that in President Rodriguez's report [she presented earlier in the meeting, her report is below]. • Interim Chancellor Torres also provided us with an update on aligning our strategic plans across the District so we can have a unified voice. • There was quite a bit of conversation around APs/BPs. The list is somewhat lengthy. Most of those that were on a second read were pulled. We only voted on BP/AP 7240: Confidential Employees. L. Cuny was there, so this should go to Ed Policy, but I really encourage everyone to look these over, especially if they relate to your area. We will be looking at all other APs/BPs on this second read list as well as on the first read list at our next meeting on November 3. Most of them are in the 4000s and in our last Senate meeting we voted that anything in the 4000s and 5000s is under our direct purview. Many others still apply to us though; there's one on evaluations and one on a commitment to diversity. • A. Avelar: The environmental scan is needed before our Educational Master Plan is written. We commonly use an outside consultant. I had requested extending our deadline because we're online, but it was voted to move	

Topic	Discussion	Action
6. Additional Reports, continued	forward. There was also a question of the cost and whether certain parts could be written by people on campus. • I also want to reflect on the one AP/BP we did pass yesterday. Much of the language was stricken and it refers to the handbook. But that means they can make changes without it coming through District Assembly. I did talk to J. Torres about this. I want to make sure that's on record. They need to make sure changes come through District Assembly even though it's not directly in the AP/BP. There needs to be transparency in those changes. • B. Tasaka: They also talked about the campus safety plan that President Rodriguez spoke to [she presented earlier in the meeting, her report is below]. • Towards the bottom, K. Hannon talked about our District and campus efforts to address systemic racism. There were five focus groups over the summer with a total of 271 participants, but it's duplicated. That's just over 10% of our district population, according to K. Hannon. A. Avelar read my mind because she said that needs to continue through the year so everyone has a chance to participate and get involved. It also creates a continuing effort. K. Hannon did give us a shoutout for our resolution.	
7. SBVC President's Report D. Rodriguez	• Thank you for accommodating my schedule. I appreciate it. [given • We talked last time about the possible opportunity for KVCR's facilities and equipment to come over to SBVC and for all of KVCR to take on a new life. It's on the agenda for this week's board meeting to take action. I'm hopeful that the BOT will approve our proposal. In all transparency, some folks have expressed opposition. I don't believe any opposition has come from anyone at our college. Some community folks expressed concern. We're hopeful. Thanks to all of you who expressed support in moving the facilities and equipment to our campus. Keep the ideas coming; it really is pretty exciting. • Our return to work safety plan that the District has put out. I want to remind everyone that it's a fluid, living document. As things change, the document will change to reflect that. One thing I wanted to remind you of, especially those who have students on campus, is please practice social distancing. I know faculty are doing the best they can and you can't keep your eye on students the whole time they're there. It can be difficult for me to advocate and justify why we need labs for certain disciplines when there's postings on social media about students not practicing social distancing. Please remind your students and colleagues. It doesn't hurt to get a reminder. The managers in each area will be reaching out to faculty and classified professionals as they help develop plans for your specific areas. The folks who are closes to students and interacting with them can give the best guidance on how to execute those plans. • Lastly, some of you may have seen an article about the discontinuance of diversity. A. Avelar shared something as well. I want you to know, I and Valley College have no plans to discontinue our work around diversity, around no-hate education, and becoming an anti-racist campus. I want to be very clear about that. Even until we get a stern directive will probably be questioned. I have no intentions of discontinuing our work. • **Questions/Comments:** o M. Lawler: Are they keeping up on the numbers? I know when we're going to the website for the COVID it's still showing that people are still getting sick. It said four has passed in this last week, I probably think it might have been a family. Are we still keeping up on that. We had updates on the numbers and it seems like it's quieted, even	

Topic	Discussion	Action
7. SBVC President's Report, continued D. Rodriguez	though it's not quiet, you know what I'm saying? o D. Rodriguez: Are you talking about the numbers for the county? o M. Lawler: Yes. o D. Rodriguez: We are monitoring that on a daily basis, so is the District. M. Nguyen is looking at that to see how it might impact the district. o R. Hamdy: You can go to the San Bernardino County website, you can sign up for email updates that will go straight to your inbox. You can also do that for Riverside County. o M. Lawler: Thank you. o K. Lawler: You talked about the return to campus plan as fluid, does that mean it's fluid in terms of us returning face-to-face in the spring? o D. Rodriguez: No, sir. We are committed to being remote in the spring. We found it to be incredibly disruptive if we changed our mind back and forth for the faculty and for our classified professionals to do their work in that way. We are committed to remain remote in the spring. o K. Lalwer: Thank you. o D. Rodriguez: I guess I should clarify on the fluidness. That has to do more with the protocols – for example, the number of individuals who can gather in a room, elevator, and so on. The levels of sanitation we have to mandate, if you will, wearing a mask on campus and so on. That's what I mean by fluid, more amongst protocols. o A. Avelar: The plan was presented to District Assembly, it is on page 110/199. Someone said in the chat that the CDC finally published something that was know for some time now that COVID is airborne. So my personal recommendation is to wear face shields if you're going to be in proximity to other people and you're not sure of your own status as positive or negative or others around you. T. Vasquez is the faculty co-chair for the Facilities and Safety Committee, so you can let her know if there's anything additional. We were asked to bring this back to our constituents for feedback. I also put out a call for a representative for the Districtwide Safety Committee and I did get a response. o As always, reach out to me, D. Burns-Peters, A. Avelar, C. Luke, or L. Cuny if you have feedback.	

8. Action Agenda	a. **Accreditation and Outcomes** [C. Huston and B. Tasaka]
	  • [moved from item 9b. in the first motion]
	  • [view Outcomes Update and SLO Pilot]
	  • C. Huston: B. Tasaka is going to present information on a pilot project we're working on for SLOs. Right now we report aggregate data on our SLOs so we tally up how many students passed and we're only really able to look at our SLOs or PLOs in terms of courses. If you do a lot of legwork you can break them down and look at them as day classes vs night classes. This pilot would give us a whole new way to look at information. It would allow us to disaggregate by categories. It would allow us to look at our SLOs through an equity and anti-racism viewpoint. Also we're looking at curriculum that way. I'm going to let Bethany tell you all about the pilot.
	  • B. Tasaka: I want to present you with some updates on where we are on SLO submissions. When we run our	

Topic	Discussion	Action

8. Action Agenda, continued	report there are 44 classes without submissions from fall 2017 – summer 2020. However, some weren't offered, so we are able to cut that list down. It's the way the Cloud was set up, but I can cross them off our list. The actual count is 8. Our current number is 98.98% reported. I'm expecting that to get closer to 100%.
	• The other thing I want to remind you about is the PLO maps. K. Yarborough send them out at the beginning of the year. They're 92% completed. We are going to set this up so that your SLO submissions connect to the PLOs behind the scenes. You don't have to do anything differently, but those maps will give us more data when reports are run.
	• C. Huston mentioned a pilot that we're trying to get off the ground. Yesterday J. Brady came to the Accreditation and Outcomes Committee to give us a demonstration of what the pilot would look like. Normally we go into the SLO Cloud you pick your semester, department, class, section, etc. When you go to enter your SLOs you say this many students were assessed, and this many met the SLO. It's still good information, but it's very broad information. In the conversations we're having around equity and diversity, we talk about supporting our communities who are often overlooked or who are less successful. This actually allows us to do that. What J. Brady created is a way to bring that data in at the student level.
	• This is optional. It's essentially a box that would be checked. Your department can opt out. I do ask that you have conversations around that before saying no.
	• You'll still go the SLO Cloud. You'll click a box called Student Level Reporting. This happens after you submit grades so it populates with students who finished your class. Instead of giving a number, you'll be able to put a check box next to each person's name saying that they were assessed and whether or not they met the SLO. I'm asking the Senate for a motion to support this pilot so I can do a call for interested faculty. I want to remind everyone that we've suspended Program Review, so it really is an experiment for our campus. I'll also pair with R. Hamdy to get some Professional Development on how to use the data.
	• Questions/Comments:
	  o M. King: May I ask if gender and ethnicity are self-reported? Where do the terms options come from?
	  o B. Tasaka: Those four things were some of the ideas that the committee came up with yesterday. He said he needs faculty to participate and categories we want to examine. I'm looking for others and we can cross things off this list. That's what we want to develop in this pilot.
	  o D. Burns-Peters: I think the clarification is where does the data come from? Is it self-reported at some point.
	  o B. Tasaka: My understanding is it would come from their data from when they applied to the college. It's all tied to WebAdvisor information.
	  o A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: That's correct. I share A. Pave's idea that students need to authorize the release of their information. That's just good research, even though it's in the system already. They have the right to know where the information would go.
	  o C. Huston: We do success and retention data and we disaggregate by age, gender, etc. already. How is doing the same thing with SLOs any different than looking at overall success rates and retention rates?	

Topic	Discussion	Action
8. Action Agenda, continued	o R. Hamdy: Is there a disclosure when they fill out the application that their information will be used for internal research data purposes to evaluate programs and so forth? If there isn't' already there should be. o A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: I thought this is really looking at the student. That's why I thought A. Pave's comment was appropriate. It's different when they're looked at as a group. The release in their application has had some changes. I would defer to the VPSS. Maybe we have to do research on this. o M. Tinoco: You're correct, I just don't know the details. o M. Worsley: I just want to bring up A. Pave's point in the chat about FERPA protections. I think this data can be extremely helpful. My concern is about pulling future reports, can anyone pull that? Can any faculty pull that data? o B. Tasaka: These reports would not be available to everyone. They won't be the same as a regular SLO report. o C. Huston: We would not get that information at the student level. It would be used for EMP sheets, Program Review, looking at it as a department, etc. o B. Tasaka: I know it's something J. Brady is very aware of and we will build those protections in. o T. Simpson: It was in reference to having the questionnaire done. There has to be disclosure on how students' information will be used. o A. Pave: As a former registrar I get crazy about this. I'm really concerned about this. This has a potential of being an absolute major major concern. If one single student's ethnicity, age, gender is disclosed to a faculty member and the students didn't want that it opens the campus to not only a FERPA violation, multiple lawsuits, accreditation problems, and federal funding issues. This is not something to take lightly. I worked as a registrar for eight years and I worked with campuses who broke this. No campus has ever lost funding, but if you have federal agents on campus for 3 – 5 years it's not something you want to mess with. I've been on it from both sides. Trust me, it's not something you want to mess with. If one student, one single student, someone says this student is a female or male or their ethnicity, I cannot tell a student's ethnicity nor should I. I have no right to their ethnicity. I have no right to their age. If they want to share it with me that's their choice. I do not need it to do my job. I see an overreach in the name of diversity from the chat and perhaps that's the most simple way to do it. I'm going to stop now because I could go on for a very long time. o T. Allen: I agree with A. Pave. I really believe it could do more harm than good for the very reasons he's outlined. o B. Tasaka: Other colleges do this successfully. Data is sent to Institutional Research and Effectiveness. I've seen presentations on this. There has to be a way to make sure FERPA isn't violated. o T. Allen: Is there a way for them to opt out? I think it's a slippery slope. o C. Jones: I'm not understanding why we wouldn't just enter it per student and have it linked to college data that would have the age and gender information. o J. Smith: I was at the meeting yesterday too and that's how it would work. The data is there is the background and we would generate summary data. It's not going to be printed on the input documents. o A. Avelar: Faculty wouldn't know individual student data.	

Topic	Discussion	Action
8. Action Agenda, continued	○ J. Smith: Correct. It goes into a data set in Colleague where other data can be linked. Your assessments of SLOs will go the same way grades go. We always pull out grades and link them to reports using ethnicity, gender, 1st generation, and other groups. It's not going to be listed on that document. It will be available in the database. ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: The way I understand it from you is there is a distance in how you look at it, as a group. From the way it was explained as I understood it, it will have a name and you will check did or did not meet the SLO, PLO, or ILO, whatever. So is there really a link of the information to me. It will say I'm bicultural, my age, and so on and so forth. It's not really like Group A, of all students who are taking sociology or anthropology 1 and 2, it's not like that, that's the way I understood it. Am I wrong? ○ B. Tasaka: It would be entered that way. If we want it at the individual level it has to be entered per student. ○ J. Smith: When it's input, it will be done in the same way that grades are done. You don't see ethnicity, gender, etc. on your roster to submit to Admissions. When Institutional Research goes in and summarizes to look for gaps in performance, we're able to link that to student's gaps in their profile to write a report. SLO Student Reporting will work the same way. Did others who were in the meeting yesterday hear it the same way? ○ C. Huston: Yes, it will work the same as grades. ○ A. Avelar: Yes, me too. ○ D. Burns-Peters: It sounds like there are a lot of unanswered questions still. This is under an action item. I am wondering if we are open to a motion to hold this and ask the Accreditation and Outcomes team to go back and see what other campuses do. ○ J. Smith: I think maybe it would be good for you to see an example of the demonstration we saw yesterday. That might answer some of your questions. When I asked about the demographic data would be, J. Brady assured me it would look like a grade roster. It's linked the same way. In terms of FERPA protections, the same way grades are being protected would apply to SLOs at the individual students scores. We can see what other schools do, but it seems like the model is pretty clear. We may not be explaining it in a way that gives you a complete view of how it works. The litany of the questions you have can be answered by a demonstration. ○ **Motion 3** ▪ **Discussion** ▪ C. Jones: Is that going to delay us too much? ▪ R. Hamdy: It's just a pilot. ▪ C. Jones: It seems like we've been out of compliance for a long time. ▪ R. Hamdy: We aren't out of compliance, it's just another way we can do it. ▪ T. Vasquez: When I presented data last week, I as faculty didn't get any specific information about individuals. I couldn't get that data even if I wanted to. ▪ A. Blacksher: Our community, and by our community I mean the Black community, ahs been calling for disaggregated data. Our community has been coming to BOT meetings calling for disaggregated data. With respect to everyone's concerns, I certainly share them, so it should be a matter of *how* we get this done, what	**Motion 3**: **Move that J. Brady come to the Senate to do the same presentation with us to ensure that FERPA isn't violated.** 1st: R. Hamdy 2nd: D. Burns-Peters 34 Responses Aye: 82.4% [28 votes] Nay: 5.8% [2 votes] Abstain: 11.8% [4 votes] **Motion passes** [Voting Record]

Topic	Discussion	Action
8. Action Agenda, continued	o can we do to get this done? Mind you, the definition of institutional racism is a concern for the system and protecting the system, which has adverse effects. So not getting this done, not meeting the request of our community, our Black community, is in fact the reproduction of institutional racism. Let's keep that in mind so we can focus on how to better serve students.	
9. Discussion Items	**a. Distance Education** [D. Burns-Peters] • [view DE Addendum] • I have two brief things. We want Academic Senate know that the DE Committee has had a conversation about what regular and effective contact looks like. I'm sharing our website. We decided to adopt what's already in place by Title 5. You'll see definitions there. The Committee has committed to reviewing those every year to make sure they still make sense for us. So we have officially adopted language from Title 5 regarding regular and substantive interaction. We didn't really feel like we could add anything to that, but we can make sure we provide examples and ongoing training and partnership with PD on what that might look like in the classroom. • The second item has been talked about in other presentations, but I want to share to make sure you have access to it. Over the summer we did updates to the DE Addendum. That's currently being used in the Curriculum process. Two quick changes I want to share with you are some expanded verbiage on Title 5 section 55002. That's what guides everything we do in terms of DE and this addendum; it guided the questions. We also added the definition of fully or partially online and proctored assessments. It's the language that's being used in the DE community. We also added question #10; as a committee we are looking at what we can do to support the anti-hate resolution we have with the Senate. One thing we're looking at is language and wording. While Curriculum is building that into the process, we added the question to ask how you'll ensure disproportionately impacted students are reflected in your course content and what communication methods do you plan to employ to ensure they remain engaged and succeed in your course with full access to all course materials and tools. It's a big question, but it really hits, I think, all the points we're looking for you to have representation in the course: resources, images, accessibility, textbooks, etc. • **Questions/Comments:** o M. Copeland: We already have that integrated into CurricUNET. Courses that move forward will have access to that addendum information in CurricUNET and it will be part of the process. **b. Anti-Racism** [M. Worsley] • [view Ideas for Anti-Racism] • Full disclosure, this isn't something I teach. It's not something I'm used to talking about. • I'm going to talk generally about an approach and a few general ideas you can incorporate if you want to generate discussions with your colleagues, then I'll talk about how we did it in the Music Department. • This is not solution oriented. It's important to get vulnerable. It's required a lot of soul-searching. Now is the time to research what and who is not included in the literature. My entire goal was to make H. Zinn proud. Every discipline and every class can be approached with an anti-racist lens.	

Topic	Discussion	Action
9. Discussion Items, continued	• After some surface-level digging, I found that Heinrich Shankar is a huge racist and that this racism absolutely affected his theoretical approach to music. It's the Sankaran analysis that's more or less the foundation of music theory that's taught in the US. Most scholars are saying you don't have to not teach these people or topics, but you must make it clear what his perspective is. One suggestion made by J. Bowen is to have students read even a single paragraph of a famous or under-famed person in your field before taking an exam. I believe it's called cognitive wrapping; it's used in metacognition. You can introduce someone in an exam who was successful in their field, and it increases exam scores. • I'm not a sociologist, but I am keenly aware that money speaks, that voting speaks, that speaking speaks. • I'm the co-chair of music, theatre, and dance, because I've honed this in on music because I believe these conversations are nuanced and will differ depending on the discipline. I would encourage you to be mindful of that as well. • Sharing literature was an important first-step as well. I knew my sources needed to be scholarly. Nobody would want to talk to me unless the research was done. We started with Music Theory. Next I'd like to go to Music Appreciation because of it's effect on the general population. Some people will get defensive and that's okay. It's important to start the dialogue. Everyone has perspectives and opinions and you want to include that. Despite the vitriol of recent and not-recent events, none of this can go unacknowledged. • I'd like to develop a department statement on anti-racism. I'd also like to revisit our SLOs with anti-racist components. I also want to establish department standards for each class that could be discussed. That could take many many forms. It could be a piece of literature or the discussion of a person whose life should be talked about or a societal movement within the field. We are at an advantage with some courses, obviously History of Rock, American Popular Music, History of Hip Hop, but some are hard to look at. • R. Hamdy: The hope is that all departments step up and follow this lead.	
10. Information Items	None	
11. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items	• D. Burns-Peters: I was hoping a CTA representative would be here to share. I want to remind people that there was a MOU signed for reimbursement of the cost of teaching from home. ○ A. Avelar: It's in the Board Book: COVID Reimbursement MOU – signed 8.28.20 ○ D. Burns-Peters: I just want to get the word out. ○ R. Hamdy: I was under the impression that R. Hrdlicka and D. Humble were going to work together to put something out to faculty. It seemed more complicated than just that piece. • C. Jones: I wanted to plug MESA real quick. We had a presentation on Black Mathematicians. A. Castro is presenting on car loans. We have several events coming up. • B. Tasaka: T. Heibel was plugging our debate watch party tonight. The VP debate is tonight. A. Blacksher is going to get us started at 5:45 p.m. We'll watch together and have some discussion. ○ A. Blacksher: You're all experts. We're not interested in who won. We aren't interested in who is right or wrong. In the first presidential debate they talked about climate change. Students will have questions.	

Topic	Discussion	Action
12.Announcements	• E. Akers: [view Care Solace Summary] We've heard consistently from faculty that we have a lot of students who are struggling with emotions and mental health issues, especially since we've entered this virtual environment. We had an opportunity to bring on a service that would provide services to students 24/7, in addition to what we're doing and student health. Diana and her team supported us along with the grants in making it happen. So you will be seeing an announcement probably come up soon. Maybe even as early as next week. This is alive and available for your students. And it's a service called Care Solace and they want to help our students access the care that they need in a comfortable supported way. They're very sensitive to the college environment, they're able to provide services and multiple languages. They're also very sensitive to cultural needs that students might have. And so what you will have is a phone number or an email link that you can provide to any of your students who may be struggling and may need services. Sometimes they're just not able to reach out and access them. Because they're anxious and they kind of freeze and the connection never happens. So this group will help them make those connections. They will be contacting the student or the student will contact them, it's up to the student how they want to do that and just find out what the need is for the student. Then they will help the students find the appropriate service and give them options and help them make contact get an appointment made. They will also follow up after the appointment that they were happy with the service they got and there's also a website that you can go to look for services independently. If they don't want help from someone so I think it's just going to be an additional resource that will be really helpful for our students. Another way of making sure they connect they will be helping students connect with services, both inside the campus and outside the campus and they have a very huge directory of vetted services that they check every year to make sure they're still current and that they don't have any complaints against them and that they use licensed providers and all those things. So they're high quality services so just wanted you to be aware of that. When you see that announcement come out you know that's available to students. Faculty and staff can use this service as well. It would be a support for the whole community because it's not just students that are struggling right now. One of the other nice things about this is that they will help students find services for their children or family members, because I know often, it may not be the students themselves, who's struggling. You know when you're in school and you're working and you might be a single parent trying to find these services and make connections is very difficult. This will be a service that will help them do that. We will send out information on social media, via email, and so on.	
13. Adjournment	• Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m. • Next meeting: October 21, 2020, at 3:00 p.m. via Zoom (link will also be shared on our webpage).	