

Commonly known as the "Ten Plus One," (as articulated in [Title 5 of the Administrative Code of California, Sections 53200](#)) the following define "Academic and Professional matters."

1. Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and places courses within disciplines
2. Degree and certificate requirements
3. Grading policies
4. Educational program development
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success
6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
9. Processes for program review
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development
11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the senate

	Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
1.	Call to Order and Roll Call (Sign- In)	3:00 p.m. Sign-In Sheet and Voting Record	
2.	Public Comments on Agenda Items (max. 15 minutes)	None	
3.	Senate President's Report (max. 5 minutes)	Read the Senate President's Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Alteria Woods ● We have more work to do. Let us move forward with Hope, Unity and Love. ● BOT recognition of new curriculum, specifically PolSci 150 and Mandarin 101 ● Applause Cards – a way of recognizing good work being done ● Spring Plenary is April 15 – 17 ● Please know that the faculty voices from both the Senate retreat and the all faculty meeting are going to be presented to the Exec team and then shared out to the Senate body as a whole. 	
4.	Committee Reports (max. 20 min.) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ed. Policy – No report b. Personnel Policy – No report c. Student Services – No report d. CTE – No report 	f. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]: We are still wrapping up the remnants of convocation week. We will get recordings out to everyone. I'll be sending out a clarifying email about flex hours that are due. There are 12 hours of professional development for everyone this year and moving forward. Flex tracker is down, but it	

<p>e. EEO – No report</p> <p>f. Professional Development – Report</p> <p>g. Elections – No report</p> <p>h. Curriculum – Report</p> <p>i. Program Review – No report</p> <p>j. Accreditation & Outcomes – Report</p> <p>k. Distance Education – Report</p> <p>l. Legislative – No report</p> <p>m. Financial Policy – No report</p> <p>n. Guided Pathways – Report</p>	<p>will come back. We are working hard to implement a new system through the Vision Resource Center.</p> <p>h. Curriculum [M. Copeland]: I attended the cultural curriculum audit over the break with Long Beach City College. It was fabulous. I hope to be giving a lot more information to members of the committee and the campus at large.</p> <p>j. Accreditation and Outcomes [C. Huston]: Sadly we do not have the ACCJC action letter yet. ACCJC is launching its 10-year review of the accreditation standards. They're putting a call out for people who are willing to be writers for the accreditation standards. They'll start taking applications in February. I'll send it out when the actual application is available. It would be great to get faculty voices into the accreditation standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o D. Humble: I want to follow up with C. Huston's announcement. This is a great opportunity to get involved and learn about accreditation and ACCJC, also if you've never served on a visiting team before and it's something you're interested in doing in the future. I know there's a bunch of good writers here now; if you're interested I would suggest applying. You have nothing to lose except time. It will be a good experience. <p>k. Distance Education [D. Burns-Peters]: Our committee has yet to meet, but there was an email that went out, we will send them out on a regular basis, in terms of equivalency. We're really trying to get faculty to submit their equivalency information. This way we have a hard number of faculty who are trained versus not. Please submit them and we'll do a formal report after meeting with the committee.</p> <p>n. Guided Pathways [J. Stankas]: We are working on the scale of adoption, that's due back to the state every year. It's a written document the state asks us to update how we're doing implementing what we said we were going to do. There are the three teams continuing to work. One of them is about mapping for our students at your direction in September; we are attempting to look at how that guidance for students can be clarified. We're looking not at the traditional full-time student, we are looking more at students who come to us and meeting their needs where they are. The second group is the communications group. We appreciate everyone who filled out the survey at the end of last year about how to communicate Guided Pathways out to the campus. Our third group is the diversity, equity, and inclusion piece of Guided Pathways. One idea that came up is finding ways to get our students' voices, experiences, and how they interface with our institution so we can listen to the students. This is part of the long term culture change that aligns with Guided Pathways and aligns with the anti-racist resolution of the Senate. It's not to correct</p>	
---	---	--

		<p>students or to argue about their experiences. It's really to honor their experiences and reflect as employees of the institution, whether that is the experience we intended them to have. If it is, how can we do more of that? If it's not, how do we improve?</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Additional Reports (max. 5 min) a. SBCCDTA – No report b. District Assembly- Report</p>	<p>b. District Assembly [B. Tasaka]: Last semester we announced that there would be a vacancy on District Assembly. D. Burns-Peters was a faculty representative, but now she will be moving to the Academic Senate President position on District Assembly. We heard from one interested party, L. Cuny. So the three faculty District Assembly representatives are me, L. Cuny, and C. Luke, and you can also contact D. Burns-Peters as your Senate President. You are welcome to reach out to any of us at any time. L. Cuny also looks at APs and BPs as part of Ed Policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o D. Burns-Peters: Big round of applause for L. Cuny for stepping into that position. 	
<p>6.</p>	<p>SBVC President's Report (max 5 min.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It's probably no surprise to you that our enrollment is light, about 2800 students fewer than we did at this time last year. I'm encouraged because at one point we were about 3000 students fewer. Our current number of students is just over 10,000, which is good. We are doing some special programming for adult education students to see if we can get some of those students interested in our programs. I know our VPI and deans and faculty chairs are talking about late start classes. We are hopeful that we'll be able to make up some ground. I want to thank all of you who are going above and beyond reaching out to students. We are also seeing the gap close in the number of seats we have available. We have approximately 960 FTES fewer than last year, so that's about 20.5% fewer than last year. We still have a long way to go, but we're hoping to close the gap. ● I know that some folks have questions about the return to campus plans. As a district will be making decision about whether we will return face-to-face or continue as we are now by mid-March (12th or 19th). The folks at the state level are telling us to plan to be remote. The rollout of vaccine has some challenges and challenges, and we see those challenges in San Bernardino county with the rollout as well. We are all eligible for vaccines in the next rollout, but there are questions about there being enough for first and second rounds as well as the timeliness of those rounds. Whatever decision we make will hold for that term, so however we start will be how we finish the term. We might have late start classes or allow study groups to meet on campus, depending on what we get the green light to do. A lot of folks are wondering if their specific class can be held on campus. The Office of Instruction has 	

		<p>put together some kind of template for developing a plan in order to make that happen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Quick shoutout to the Chemistry Department whose plan we are using as the gold standard for our template for the college.● We are fortunate that with all of the folks testing positive that none of the contact tracing comes back to the college. I like to be optimistic and say we're doing all the right things and our plans are working.● Commencement will be virtual again. The commencement team is already started their planning by reaching out to the same organization that helped us last year. I thought that was an excellent video they put together. The turnaround time was really about two, three weeks. So imagine what they're going to be able to do for us having four or five months of planning.● Questions/Comments:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ M. Tinoco: With the vaccine, how are they going to be doing that? I know we are in the next phase to get vaccinated. How are they going to do that with us? Do we need to present something to them?○ D. Rodriguez: I know you can register online through the county. I also volunteered the college to be a site for vaccinations. I hope it's the case, our community could use additional sites right now. Some sites have been identified as county-designated sites. I know some grocery stores are offering it: Vons, CVS, and I think Rite Aid.○ K. Lawler: Did you mention summer is remote or was that fall that's going to be remote?○ D. Rodriguez: As of now we are leaning towards summer being remote unless we get more folks within our areas vaccinated and if the county and state allow us. Right now we're planning for remote.○ K. Lawler: And the determination for fall hasn't arrived yet, that's soon to come? I think you gave a date?○ D. Rodriguez: That's correct, mid-March.○ T. Vasquez: I want to acknowledge the work we are doing in terms of the vaccination education campaign within the district. We met today to plan forums for learning about the virus and vaccine more in depth. We want to bring students into the conversation, and obviously the staff and faculty as well, so we can all learn more about the processes. Information is power.	
--	--	--	--

7.	<p>Consent Agenda</p> <p>a. Approval of the minutes for 11/18/20 & 12/2/20</p>	<p>Motion 1</p> <p>●Discussion: None</p>	<p>Motion 1: Move to approve the minutes for 11.18.20 and 12.2.20. 1st: D. Smith 2nd: R. Hamdy 25 responses Aye: 100% (25 votes) Nay: 0% (0 votes) Abstain: 0% (0 votes) Motion passes</p>
8.	<p>Action Agenda (max. 15 min.)</p> <p>a. Credit for Prior Learning by Dina Humble</p>	<p>a. Credit for Prior Learning [D. Humble]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●View 4235 Credit for Prior Learning ●D. Humble: Thank you for letting me present this. I had the opportunity to present the information a couple meetings ago. Since then, we've been working with K. Wurtz at CHC. Their Academic Senate is approving it as well. We received numerous comments and feedback from faculty that we incorporated into the policy language. ●This is BP 4235: Credit for Prior Learning. This is a mandate from the State Chancellor's Office that requires all districts to approve a credit for prior learning (CPL) policy. The main reason for the review of CPL is really around this whole equity initiative from the Vision for Success at the Chancellor's Office. As we look at equity and inclusion and getting students to finish faster by giving them credit for their experience coming in. You can see here the language regarding authorized assessments. That may include the evaluation of approved external standardized examinations, joint services, transcripts, student-created portfolios, and then of course credit for prior learning or credit by examination, which are established. ●This is the revised document. There haven't been many other changes and faculty feedback has been incorporated. Again, you have this document on your Academic Senate website. Next steps for this will be to go to District Assembly on February 2, and then the Board of Trustees, and then we can submit to the Chancellor's Office. ●Motion 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussion: ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Can I see the comment on CSU and UC breadth requirements, to verify my own understanding of it? Thank you, no questions. 	<p>Motion 1: Move for Credit for Prior Learning to go to the next step to District Assembly on February 2, 2021 1st: M. Lawler 2nd: C. Huston 25 responses Aye: 96% (24 votes) Nay: 0% (0 votes) Abstain: 4% (1 vote) Motion passes</p>

		<p>○ J. Stankas: I thought it was important to recognize that this is part of a larger package of reforms we are trying to implement at the state level that really helps us to be number one, ore supportive of students, but also helps us communicate to students a little more effectively in the ways that for-profit colleges have. It doesn't mean that we're going to be for-profit colleges, we don't want to do that, but if you interview students who attended for-profit colleges and ask them why some of the things that they have said are they recognize that my life experiences and work experiences were valuable and gave me credit for them. And number two, they had a clear pathway and courses outlined for me about exactly how I was going to finish and how I was going to finish in a timely way while still working at my job. These are the kinds of things along with looking at the culture of institutions and serving their community, it's really important we can take what we have learned from those student experiences and as we watch them pay out \$100,000 in student debt and communicate that to our students; that is not the only way to go, that this is how you can be successful, and we are here for you just as well or better to help you reach those goals. It's really important that this kind of work continues to move forward.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Information Items (max. 20 min.) a. SLO Pilot Update (5 min.) b. Guided Pathways-hiring processes (15 min.)</p>	<p>a. SLO Pilot Update [B. Tasaka]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● So we ran into some technical issues getting the system up and running the way it was presented to the Senate. If you remember, in November I believe, J. Brady from the district came and presented on what the new process would look like with individual student level reporting as opposed to entire-class reporting. He'd said a lot of technology works differently when he's not at the office. So we weren't really able to get this off the ground the way we wanted to. So what I'd like to propose, and I don't know if this needs a new formal motion or not, is that we postpone and try again this term. All of the participants in the pilot, or a majority of them at least, seemed pretty willing to try again at the end of this semester. I also believe CHC is suspending theirs as well. ● R. Hamdy: That sounds like an update; it isn't that you're not moving forward it's just that you're refining it still. So I think the original support from the Senate still stands. ● M. Copeland: Are there any thoughts, like are those problems going to persist as long as we aren't on campus because this is really important work? ● B. Tasaka: I agree. I don't think they'll persist. I haven't had a chance to talk to J. Brady since we've been back from the break, but I will reach out to him. I did speak 	

		<p>to G. Sosa, who is in J. Smith's position over at CHC, and he said they're looking to make some improvements because they have an entire semester to work it all out. So I can touch base with them again. I agree it's important and the general feeling is we will get it done.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• M. Copeland: And make sure we get it done right.• B. Tasaka: As much as possible. I'll be looking for volunteers again towards the end of the spring. <p>b. Guided Pathways-hiring process [J. Stankas]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• View Equity in Hiring at SBCCD Jan 2021 and AP 7210 Proposed Edits• This is an update about AP 7210. A brief introduction, just to reframe us because it's the beginning of the semester and it seems like a whole lot has happened since the last time we talked about this. The reason Guided Pathways is doing this is because this is what you approved at your last September meeting and number five says that Guided Pathways will evaluate proposed changes to the hiring process with a lens towards racial justice and equity. The Guided Pathways team partnered with professional development and human resources to create a four-part webinar series. We specifically invited the Senate. I know you all received an email encouraging you to attend. Campus emails went out and specific emails went to Latino Faculty, Staff, and Administrators Association and the Black Faculty and Staff Association to encourage membership and dialogue here. Those four webinars were each an hour and half long and were dominated by discussion about different parts of the hiring process. We are not in a post-racial society. The statewide Academic Senate asked us to do this. I wrote the call to action and our district adopted goals, particularly around reducing equity gaps and affirming as a district our commitment to racial justice and equity and we have a resolution that the Academic Senate adopted.• In terms of statewide data, this is an aggregate of what our system looks like in terms of students, tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, classified staff, and administration. When we look at our data, we will report to the state and compare that to San Bernardino City. You can look at this similar data. What all of this data tells us is as open an transparent and inclusive of a processes we have tried to have in the past, we haven't quite met the goal. So there are probably ways to improve that. So a summary of what we learned at each of our meetings, I kept notes on these and we were sure to disseminate these at each of the subsequent webinars.	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In order, advertising is important as well as timing. Restructuring job descriptions to highlight the values of the institution regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion could go a long way in recruiting a diverse pool of applicants. Multiple other recommendations around how we can expand the pool and diversity of the pool of applicants. We talked about the first level of committee and our recommendations were we needed regular and ongoing unconscious bias training for all, not just committee members. That the diversity component and announcements and initial screening needs to be revised. We need to create better opportunities for the ad for expanding the diversity of the adjunct pools and improve our relationships that offer masters and PhDs, but also with the industry in the area that hires associate degrees. Employees may have six years of experience in the field for certain CTE disciplines. I think some of the major ones here were that the committee composition needs to value both the discipline expertise as well as the ability to serve the diverse needs of our students. I know we've reported this multiple times that there are two minimum qualifications for faculty and our current process values discipline expertise over the ability to serve the diverse needs of our students. So we need to reframe that because they are both equally important it is not possible to do the job of faculty without meeting both of the minimum qualifications in that area. Include students in the hiring process for faculty or student forces and divides mechanisms that demands hiring committees consider the implications of paper screen criteria related to both minimum qualifications for faculty and potential impact on the diversity of the pool of applicants. One question I think most people kind of smile and nod when they have been on a hiring committee and there's the "Oh yea, we have the diversity question." One question to do all the work of an equal minimum qualification. There are potentially ways to structure the creation of the interview questions in such a way that we can evaluate both content expertise and the ability to serve the diverse needs of our students in every question. If we allow the candidates to know in advance that that was the criteria that the committee would use to screen, they may be able to structure their answers in a way that I thought was an entertaining idea that came out of the dialogue.• The last one was about the process of the second level interview and the Board of Trustees role. One question was that it seems the first level committee feels obligated to send three people forward. The goal is to send three candidates forward, not necessarily send qualified candidates forward. So restructuring that in a way that it's expected that every committee will end with sending zero to five	
--	--	--	--

		<p>candidates forward. It's okay to say none of these candidates are what our students need. That's not a failure of the committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There's also a recommendation that the Board of Trustees should ask for aggregated hiring data once per year at a public meeting, not on the consent agenda. So what that means is to talk all of the pools for faculty for example. Then how many were interviewed at first level, how many were interviewed at second level, and how many were hired. And then look at those in terms of racial and ethnic diversity of the applicants to see if there is a place structurally that we may need to come revisit this in the future if we see that there's always this one place where we are significantly losing a great deal of diversity, then this is an area that as an institution we should examine and consider how is that appropriate or not. If it's not appropriate, how do we reform that in such a way so a summary of the changes that are actually in the AP.• Just because we talked about all these things doesn't mean every single one of them should be written into an AP. I know the AP revision using track changes is available on the Senate website. You will have a chance to look at it or distribute it to your constituents or really examine how that might look.• First is a change to the minimum qualifications and it is actually utilizing the language that was adopted at the fall 2020 plenary session at the statewide academic senate and this is the suggested revision that they wish to have written into Title 5. The minimum qualification seems to be much more explicit. The second one is empowering. There's a slight change to explicitly empower Human Resources to evaluate the diversity of the pool of applicants to determine if further outreach is required before proceeding and human resources across the state. It would be useful if it were written into an AP.• Inclusion of students on hiring committees and it's really interesting that conversations that are happening statewide are coming up locally. There's a recommendation from the Student Senate for California Community Colleges to the Chancellor's Office to explicitly include students in hiring of faculty and that was one of the discussion items that came out of ours as well. There are lots of ways to do that and the AP doesn't need to clarify that locally. That is something we could discuss in how to include students in the hiring process. There's also a revision that would allow the possibility of a guest lecturer as part of the interview process that may be one way to include students. Right now, that's not explicitly allowable in the AP. Here's a list of things that are not in the revision to the AP, but	
--	--	---	--

		<p>are recommended as an outcome from this dialogue. A holistic revision to job announcements and the advertising beyond the usual places simply putting something on the registry is really not going to reach those not familiar with our system and it should not be a prerequisite that you have to be familiar with our system to apply. Revise the current EEO mandatory training to be more appropriately professional development in terms of diversity, equity, and inclusion. A professional development lens to EEO training really allows for some self-examination of implicit bias that all of us hold and how that manifests itself. It's a different approach to training. Screening criteria, using the recommendation from earlier encouraging the Board of Trustees to evaluate the aggregate data. Empowering Human Resources to ask questions of the first level committee regarding the impact of their choices on the diversity of the candidates in the pool. These recommendations would not be part of the AP, but the AP would allow us to explore how to put it in practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Guided Pathways wanted to make sure you all had a chance to look at this and evaluate it, think about it, and talk to your constituents as appropriate before you're asked to make a decision about it. Next week, this will go to the Guided Pathways Committee as a whole package. The timing of the meetings did not work out to bring this in December.• Then we're asking the Academic Senate to approve changes to AP 7210 at the first meeting in February, so in two weeks. An additional step to consider is creating a separate policy to address part time faculty hiring. We don't have any recommendation beyond that. That's often difficult to follow when we're attempting to fill up an immediate need and that perhaps is a future action in this area.• Questions/Comments:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ R. Hamdy: I was in a meeting with some HR folks. They're waiting for CHC's recommended changes to come back so they will look at both changes. I think their changes will be similar to ours. HR is really looking forward to moving forward with a lot of the trainings that were recommended and partnering with both Professional Development and Guided Pathways. I think a lot of good will come out of this. Then they do want to tackle adjunct hiring to create additional consistency with the way that we evaluate adjuncts. It really does vary by department and faculty chairs.○ J. Stankas: The next meeting is on February 3, and I am hoping this will be scheduled for action and adoption. It might not look like much when you look at	
--	--	--	--

		<p>the track changes, but it represents a tremendous amount of work by the Guided Pathways Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: There was a time when there was a move to include students in the hiring process. Some departments perhaps did that. There were always barriers because of time commitments. Students go to work and then participation in the hiring process might be a way to encourage this participation from students consistently across the disciplines. Would this be included in your discussion?○ J. Stankas: If it is in fact good practice to include that student voice, then it is incumbent upon the institution to figure out how to do so. If this is adopted, then it's also foolish to recommend something that's not implementable. I think that's where your question is coming from. The Statewide Student Senate has been pushing us. I don't think we need legislative action for this, but a memo did go out from the Chancellor's office to HR representatives explicitly allowing students to do this. There has been dialogue about an ASG representative or paying the student a small stipend. Another idea is to have a guest lecture where each applicant would deliver a lecture in front of live students, then the students would submit feedback via paper or a poll. Their assessment of how the lecture went for them. The first level could use that information in determining how that person would be as a faculty member.○ T. Allen: I've always had a bit of an issue with the teaching demo being in front of faculty pretending to be students instead of actual students. We are viewing the candidates through an educator's eyes. I'm thinking I would have done it a different way and we all have our own cachet of what we feel are best practices. If it doesn't align with our pedagogy, then we're somehow discounting that candidate.○ J. Stankas: It's really much more like a four-year institution model. A candidate is invited to spend the day on campus to provide some sort of interaction with live students. Their feedback is solicited.○ L. Cuny: Thanks for the work you're heading up. If it's not three candidates and you change it from zero to five and it doesn't mean it's a failed search, I'm wondering at that point could we re-review applications. Is that something that's going to be considered here?○ J. Stankas: It could be one of the things that happens. We do this in particular disciplines that are difficult to fill like Nursing. We don't say this is the closing date for the application, we say it's open until filled with a first review date. If	
--	--	---	--

		<p>other applicants come in, you can continue to review them as that happens. If your committee had two really strong candidates they thought met both minimum qualifications they would not go through to find a third one. I don't want them to find the third one they may have missed, why would they have missed it in the first place? There's nothing that would prevent the president of the college from saying I need at least three choices and that's okay. But it doesn't mean the first level committee didn't do their job. It means the first level committee said these are the only ones we found, is that enough for you to make a decision at the administrative level of the president or designee. There's an interplay of trying to review this process in terms of everyone performing those roles to the best of their ability and it should be totally okay for the president of the college to say, thank you for sending me the two and we'll leave it open until filled. We want to make sure we are investing, I mean the hiring of a tenure track faculty is a multimillion dollar investment over a potentially long period of time. We see lots of turnover in administrative positions and some classified positions. I don't think that is potentially our issue, faculty stay for the most part a very long time. So it's really important to get those decisions right.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ T. Vasquez: I have one question. We sometimes have written rules of what we're going to do. Then practices are different when we do them. I'm concerned from the perspective of saying we won't hire and then the position gets taken away. I think there is some fear, so we hire because we otherwise we lose the position and that's problematic because we end up with a mismatch between what we need and what our students need. It's a question we need to tackle in terms of our practices. ○ J. Stankas: I agree. I think that is separate. The action being requested at the next Senate meeting is to approve this recommendation for changes to the AP, which is a finite defined set of recommendations. What you're bringing up is a recommendation from the Senate to the administration of our college about what happens with those positions. Hiring someone because we're afraid we're going to lose a position or might have to cancel a few classes in the next year, in my opinion, is not worth a multimillion dollar investment, long term, for our students. So our staff and students in the long term are not well-served by making a short-sighted decision. 	
10.	Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items		

11.	Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •C. Jones: I just wanted to let people know about some of the upcoming MESA events. There's a study skills workshop on January 28, at 3:00 p.m. Anyone interested in medical school can attend one as well. We have a speaker who's in charge of the COVID-19 testing center. If anyone wants to learn more about how they do the COVID-19 testing you can listen to her. A. Castro will also be scheduled soon with another personal finance workshop. The first one was very successful. 	
12.	Adjournment Next Meeting: Wednesday, February 3, 2021	Meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.	

Upcoming Events:

- [SLO Symposium, 1/29 - 1/30](#)
- [ASCCC 2021 Part Time Faculty Institute, 2/18 - 2/19](#)
- [ASCCC 2020 Fall Plenary](#)
- [Additional upcoming ASCCC events](#)

Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-25-20 on March 12, 2020, and Executive Order N-29-20 on March 17, 2020. Portions of these orders relax parts of the Brown Act. In part, the orders allow elected officials to "attend" a meeting via teleconference WITHOUT having to admit members of the public into the location from which they are participating (N-25-20) and orders that "such a body need not make available any physical location from which members of the public may observe the meeting and offer public comment" (N-29-20).