

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."

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting called to order at 3:03 p.m. • Sign-In Sheet and Voting Record 	
2.	Public Comments on Agenda Items (2 minutes/per person for a max. of 15 minutes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R. Pires: My public comments relates to an agenda item from May of 2018 when the Senate entered into forming our acceptance into the OEI exchange. At that time, the Senate voted to have all online faculty model the OEI rubric. When I was completing the Level 1 training, as well as Level 2, it didn't seem like that class was modeled specifically to the rubric. In fact, towards the end of one of the last modules it specifically said that for faculty who want to learn more about online learning, @ONE has classes for the OEI rubric. So given that we got an excellent report, as far as I saw, in the accreditation report we did get dinged on online learning and online teaching. I think, in my opinion, the Senate should take this topic up again and reaffirm their vote that faculty follow the rubric and maybe modify the Level 1 training to be more aligned with the OEI rubric. I know through my online committee representatives for the division, I've been hearing that there's some movement to combine Level 1 and Level 2 training. I would like to remind the Senate of what they voted on and that you know, this is in the purview of the Senate to have those discussions and move forward with our progress with the online exchange. Also the OEI rubric, it's interesting you know, going back to the Budget Committee meeting today, we might be asked to increase 	

		our online offerings from the year 2018-2019, to increase our online offerings by 10%. In my opinion, that's important.	
3.	Senate President's Report (max. 5 minutes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Say their name: Casey Goodson Jr. • Board of Trustees report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I recognized us for our accreditation efforts. I specifically recognized the work done by the faculty and the accreditation team. ○ I also shared out the work the BFSA and the Arts, Lectures, and Diversity Committee are doing to celebrate Black History Month. I invited the Board to attend sessions, and a direct invitation has since been sent. • TESS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I attended the TESS Exec Committee. We're looking at the role of the DAWG Committee and decisions that are made with or without faculty input and representation. ○ Another round of COVID relief funds are incoming and they're looking at how to support students and faculty in technology as part of that. ○ They're also updating faculty work stations to laptops and dual screen setups. • COVID-19 • Applause cards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeff Klug ○ Mary Lawler • Spring Plenary invitation to come. 	
4.	Committee Reports (max. 20 min.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Student Services</i> b. <i>CTE</i> c. <i>EEO</i> d. <i>Professional Development</i> e. <i>Elections</i> f. <i>Curriculum</i> g. <i>Program Review</i> h. <i>Accreditation & Outcomes</i> i. <i>Financial Policy</i> j. Distance Education – Report k. <i>Personnel Policy – Report</i> l. <i>Legislative – Report</i> m. <i>Ed. Policy – Report</i> n. Guided Pathways – Report 	j. Distance Education [M. Worsley]: Our last Distance Education Committee talked about a variety of things, but most important we've got the CTE online pathways grant; that's totally wrapped up. It's been a year-and-a-half commitment to provide assistance, resources, and everything else to online CTE programs. It was really awesome to turn in the report and see the dozens and dozens of programs and classes that have been aided in the CTE area from that grant, including our training for Levels 1, 2, and 3. I also want to talk briefly about our POCR status. We are creating a local peer online course review (POCR) process. It's in the middle of being normed, that's what the consortium calls it, so we're preparing our application for that. We have two cohorts that are going through this online training for their courses to get approved. We'll have more information on our website as we create a formalized process for all of that. The committee also chatted about the Long Beach College Curriculum Audit and that was very exciting. I know M. Copeland reported out last time we were here and we had a discussion in our DE Committee about how we can incorporate that curriculum audit and all of the wonderful components of equity and inclusion with our existing POCR process we're creating now, so we'll move forward with	

		<p>that. We are also planning on applying for Basic Skills money and I'm sure we all received that proposal for the application. We do plan on submitting an application for that so we can create a student orientation for online students. We know there's a gap with that and we'd like to help, as a committee, in making sure our students are prepared to take online courses. That's obviously very very important.</p> <p>k. Personnel Policy [D. Smith]: We still have a new rubric this year for Advancement in Rank (AiR). Last term, AP 7210 automatically moved all professors with tenure to the rank of Associate Professor. Now what remains is one self-nomination level to full Professor. That still requires three years of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor. So a person can nominate themselves, or a colleague or department chair can do it on their behalf after seven full years of service to the community here. We also have Professor Emeritus status that continues to require a service record of 10 years or more. We'd like to give eligible people at least a month to compile their evidentiary materials. I would like to send out the information next week, and I'm suggesting a deadline for submissions of April 9. That will also give our evaluation committee time to read through the submissions before any service award ceremonies we may have in early May. As a reminder, we have three criteria for full Professor:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Evidence of professional growth as it relates to their service area.2. Evidence of service to the college.3. Evidence of service to the college community. <p>l. Legislative Policy [T. Heibel]: We're going to bridge the divide a little bit with legislative and budget here. I'll bring specific assembly bills and senate bills at my next report. There are some proposed legislation on expanding student housing, especially during the pandemic when there's been more of a crisis in homelessness and housing insecurity. Also an expansion of high school to community college pipelines, especially for CTE students. Finally, an expansion of baccalaureate pipelines on CCC campuses. We've got a few, but it appears there is some legislative support for expanding bachelor degree programs on community college campuses and then, of course, our continued focus on cultural inclusivity and equity. State and federal funding for students, faculty hiring, and more where legislation overlaps with budget. This is from the legislative analyst office here in the state of California. Essentially it's a proposal to provide a portion that for a 1.5% cost of living adjustment (COLA). The legislature is encouraged to increase augmentation for apportionments by redirecting funds from lower priority proposals. Then it suggests that the legislature could be more strategic with one-time funds. The governor's budget includes a one-time proposal for Prop 98, general funds proposals essentially pay down approximately 1.1 billion of the existing 1.5 billion in deferrals. Then a general call for</p>	
--	--	---	--

better coordination from the governor's office, so there are calls for additional funding for students' basic needs, including food and housing, mental health, access to technology, and emergency grants. Although there was some criticism of what was perceived as a rather relatively uncoordinated and piecemeal approach to addressing issues and how they could be more targeted through additional funding.

m. Ed Policy [L. Cuny]: We met last week to discuss the APs/BPs we needed to review. Our findings were on 4105 (DE), we felt that the DE committee needed to look at it more. A couple of things came up, for instance, the policy says "distributed education," is that still a term that's being used right now? And should there be definitions of synchronous and asynchronous within the policy? The other issue we came up with was the titles of BP 4231 and AP 4234. They are supposed to have the same numbers. This has to do with the grade change or appeal process. We felt, reading it, that this is a generalized guidance, where the campuses have their own approaches. It's something that the faculty is asking the Senate to review on our campuses and the great appeal process in general. It seemed like we will be getting into the woods about it and trying to tell Crafton how to do their grade appeal process. Our faculty is asking the senate to review the process for the campus itself and then also in terms of an edit, line 38 on the academic policy side of it, we felt it should read as follows: District shall implement security measures with campus Admissions and Records. Currently it says with a full-time person, but who is that full-time person?

n. Guided Pathways [J. Stankas]: We appreciate you adopting the motions from the last meeting- the recommendations Guided Pathways put forward after a long collegial process regarding hiring of full-time faculty in AP 7210 as well as recommendations to our hiring practices that aren't written in the AP. I know they've been forwarded to HR, though I'm not aware of any responses from HR yet. We appreciate the support of the Academic Senate doing the work you asked us to do.

- T. Simpson: In terms of educators of color, there was an ask to get as many students as possible who are interested in teaching. We have a group under E. Gomez's group. We have four names we identified as ready to transfer over to CSU San Bernardino this fall. We will have to make some adjustments, but they will hopefully take our four students. The San Bernardino School District will pay for those students to take the CSET and CBEST, and maybe RICA. They also agreed to have placements where we can do student interns or teaching. That was one of the big breakthroughs, also I wanted to bring it to Senate because we have our annual regional conference for region seven, which is our Guided Pathways Summit, and we are asking if anyone is interested. Please let me know so that way I can make sure you are registered with our group. That's going to be April 29 – 30. It's going to be pretty good and we're actually planning with the region. We are

		going to be speaking at that conference. We also met per the request of our colleagues on February 2, in terms of working with draft maps. We came to a consensus of agreement that we would get those maps out to everybody so everybody can see each other and work forward. We had a hiccup in terms of getting that canvas that we agreed on getting done. Hopefully we'll be able to get that soon. I can't give you a date because we need to do some formatting and there's little issues and some behind-the-scenes work, a little bit more than we anticipated.	
5.	Additional Reports (max. 5 min) a. SBCCDTA b. District Assembly- No Report	a. SBCCDTA [S. Lillard]: Reminder that our monthly union virtual lunch is next Wednesday. J. Herrera sends the link. We will be presenting the results of lab/lecture parity to the district tomorrow at our negotiations work group. That will set the stage for how we move forward with those continued negotiations. We will also be presenting our counterproposal for the evaluations article next week at the negotiations with the district.	
6.	SBVC President's Report (max 5 min.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our softball field as part of our Measure CC project, the design has been completed and sent to DSA. All parties are excited and optimistic that we will get approval. • Our CTE building is on schedule to award contracts in September of this year. • Our spring coaches met and together with the athletics director and the management decided it would be best for students if we opt out of athletics for this term. I want to thank the coaches for doing their due diligence and looking at all the options, then coming to the conclusion that it is truly what's best for students and program. • Quick COVID update: Thanks to all who replied to the email from K. Hannon over the holiday weekend. We know the timing was not perfect, but I do appreciate their efforts in working over their holiday weekend to get the information out to our campus. Hopefully those that were interested got their appointments, so fingers crossed that you were able to do that. • Accreditation – thank you all for your efforts. As Dr. Singer said at the Board of Trustees meeting, it's an incredible and remarkable accomplishment to get the highest rating by the ACCJC possible, not a lot of colleges do that. He expressed his time as president of both colleges and not being able to grasp that high of accreditation and he was very excited for us. Thank you all for that, we appreciate it, and when you see your colleagues from the classified professional ranks. 	
7.	Consent Agenda a. Approval of the minutes for 2/3/21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion 1 • Discussion: None 	Motion 1: Move to approve the minutes for 2.3.21. 1 st : N. Sogomonian

			<p>2nd: D. Smith 34 responses Aye: 94.1% (32 votes) Nay: 0% (0 votes) Abstain: 5.9% (2 votes) Motion passes</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Information Items (max. 20 min.) a. COVID Forums-Tatiana</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [view the COVID Forums webpage] • T. Vasquez: As a biologist, it has been a really interesting time with COVID-19 and the vaccination process because I have training, but I know most of us are not biologists and most of us don't have the training. There's a lot of confusion and misinformation out there, so myself and other members of the college have been talking about this. We wanted to create forums or spaces where we could actually have some conversation on topics like COVID-19 and the vaccines, but also acknowledging things that are intersected with healthcare. Being Latinx myself, I know my family has experienced a lot of racism in the healthcare system and that's also intersected with my thinking about these conversations. I want to tell you who my team is. It grew organically out of the Facilities and Safety Committee that I am co-chair of. I brought up that topic as part of our anti-racist subcommittee. We're trying to look at things with regards to safety with an equity lens. We thought this idea of an education campaign would be helpful. The Biology department and Student Health Services essentially created a series of topics. The idea is we will have six forums. The Arts, Lectures, and Diversity Committee and BFSA made an invitation to Harriett Washington who definitely dives into the practices of racism and the crossings of healthcare and medicine. We want to have another forum about discussing with members of our community and discussion those sensitive topics about how healthcare really is helpful when it comes to the mindset of taking care of ourselves. There's been a lot of inequities, and we are actually facing those inequities currently. Also like I said it's confusing to understand what COVID-19 is and what it is about viruses, like why do we have these variants here today? Every day we have new information. Addressing information about investigations of vaccines and what they have been in the past and what they currently are, and what kind of vaccines do we have currently? What is the vaccine distribution like- what are these phases? We want to share stories about COVID-19. If you are interested in sharing your story, let me know. The fact is we've had losses as well, it can be interpreted in different ways for different people. We've actually even had the loss of connection. These are very sensitive topics that I hope we get to touch on and discuss in a Q and A discussion. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass it along and invite family and extended family. It’s not just for biologists, it’s not just for the educational setting. Everyone can come and just absorb and talk. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Jones: I just want to add that MESA invited someone to speak on the 23rd at 1 o’clock. They’re going to talk about COVID testing. They’re a Ph.D. working in the Microbiology Department at UCR. 	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Action Agenda (max. 15 min.)</p> <p>a. SSHDPE Division Resolution on Guided Pathways-second read</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [view SSBSPE Division Resolution re: Guided Pathways] • K. Lawler read the resolution (2nd read) for the SSBSPE division. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It was brought to our attention that what was read was not the same as the first read from our previous meeting. A. Pave presented the “resolved” from the original resolution. ○ A. Pave: The goal was to put instructional and counseling faculty together as one. • Motion 2 • Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Clarification that “pro” is in support of the motion and “con” is not in support of my motion. ○ D. Burns-Peters: That’s correct. ○ M. Lawler: I want to be sure of what I’m voting on. Are we voting on the amended [what was read by K. Lawler] or the original [what was first read at the 2.3.21 meeting and read again by A. Pave today]? Because I’m confused now. ○ D. Burns-Peters: It’s on the original. It would take a separate motion to actually amend the original resolution. ○ (Pro) N. Jimenez: I will defer my time. [Deferred to: K. Buffong] ○ (Pro) K. Buffong: I’m in support of dismissing this resolution. There have been numerous meetings that were held across campus with almost 300 attendees of faculty, staff, and students at the meetings to discuss career fields. Through our collegial process, career fields were approved through the Academic Senate on November 19, 2019. It was presented to the Board of Trustees on January 30, 2020, and was approved on January 31, 2020, during the Board retreat. Any degree that is developed from this point on will be added to the career field, thus expanding it. The Senate should not support this resolution in its entirety as numerous concerted efforts were done across campus to address student success and support programs. The work is ongoing to further student equity and achievement. The primary function of the Academic Senate is to make recommendations for academic and professional matters and the CTA agreement outlines our primary duty and functions as reflected in Title 5, it is not the purview of the Anthropology, Sociology, Psychology, History, Kinesiology, Philosophy, Political Science, Child Development, Human 	<p>Motion 2: Move that the Senate does not support this resolution in its entirety.</p> <p>Amendment: Move that the Senate does not support the resolution (A. Aguilar-Kitibutr and H. Johnson).</p> <p>1st: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr 2nd: H. Johnson</p> <p>34 responses Aye: 64.7% (22 votes) Nay: 29.4% (10 votes) Abstain: 5.9% (2 votes)</p> <p>Motion passes</p>

		<p>Services, Religious Studies, Economics, Administration of Justice, Corrections, and Police Science, to outlines what counselors' duties are. Discipline expertise is different than the holistic overview counselors provide. Counseling faculty are discipline experts who are in full compliance with the CTA agreement. Therefore, once, again, I support dismissing this entire resolution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ (Con) K. Barnett: The senators who are a voice for the Social Science, Human Development, Physical Education division, I want to say, we appreciate all the hard work and time to everyone working with a Guided Pathway process. After several meetings, our division as a whole unanimously supported to create a resolution. The resolution was done to voice our concerns to facilitate a solution for our students can have more options flexibility to succeed and their education journey. This week I was forwarded an email with a YouTube video attached. Imagine, to my surprise, in the video not only the division, but also three faculty members, were singled out, stated that the resolution was hateful, which I thought was inappropriate. Since when is being an advocate for our students considered creating hate? We're all, I'll say it again, all, advocates for students, we are better than this. I am confident we can work together to meet our students' education goals and needs.○ (Pro) A. Hecht: Yes, as mentioned in previous meetings, Guided Pathways is a choice provided to students, not a requirement. Students can decide not to participate at any point. Counselors will continue to work with students throughout their academic path and provide additional options, as requested by the student. It is apparent that the resolution that has been advanced shows a lack of awareness that Guided Pathways is an additional option for students. Guided Pathways reinforces student choice. On the Guided Pathways meeting on January 26, 2021, the Guided Pathways Committee came to the new agreement to work with the draft maps and would include additional class choices for students. Therefore I support dismissing the entire resolution. Nothing can be discontinued because the maps have not been used. This has been addressed in several Guided Pathway meetings. Social Science, Human Development, and Physical Education had questioned if the maps drafted in 2020 were being used, and they were told by faculty that the Guided Pathways team and management that they had not been used or finalized at a majority of Guided Pathways meetings in spring inservice activities and a series of correspondence in January of 2021 with the counseling co-chair faculty members from Anthropology and Sociology inquired about the use of the Counseling Department's assurances. And also Social Science, Human Development, and Physical Education continue to question the integrity of the Guided Pathways team and counseling faculty by continuing to ask the same question. Resolutions are a final step after all other avenues	
--	--	---	--

		<p>have been exhausted. In fact, this resolution would have been removed based on the recorded agreement made in the Guided Pathways meeting on January 26 of 2021. In that meeting it was decided to build upon the original map drafts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ (Con) R. Pires: [Shared screen: Guided Pathways SOAA] So at your last Academic Senate meeting you approved the SOAA report, which at this point I would like to bring a few things to your attention. Our first resolved here on this resolution recruitment of counselors to assist in the development of degree and certificate maps to ensure degree transfer and certificate requirements are met. Over the last year that Guided Pathways steering committee and currently the standing committee has been dedicated to working with departments, faculty chairs, and deans. To develop pathways, many of our programs have tentative program maps, these are currently in the process of being finalized. That is not happening. In addition, the committee held a workshop to share the results of our mapping work to students in order to get input on career fields and program apps. I have not been included in that, and I believe no one from our division has been included in that. Our division has been vocal over the last two-and-a-half years. We have been continually minimized. Our suggestions, it was not until the resolution came up that we're restarting the conversation. It is my understanding that the Senate never approved any choices for students. We continue to hear the pathways people say students will have choices, however, when we see this type of language, where when the student goes through onboarding the pathways will be explored with them, but nowhere in this report did it say that other way. [2-minute time expired]<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ D. Burns-Peters: Point of clarification on one of your statements, could you repeat for me please, the statement regarding the student forums and the faculty not being, was that involved or invited?▪ R. Pires: What I meant to say is that when M. Robles came to our meetings, he only presented to the students. No one has ever reached out to me from the Guided Pathways Committee. I keep hearing at the chair meetings that Guided Pathways leads or whoever's representing will reach out to every single department chair, so when I read these maps or career wheels and so forth, are being presented to the students, I as a department chair and my colleagues in the division, we don't know what's being presented to the students.▪ D. Burns-Peters: I don't want to interrupt, but my point of clarification was regarding understanding if you were stating that you were not inviting to the student meetings or if that was...▪ R. Pires: Not invited to the student meetings. What happened at the student meetings and every single inservice Flex day, any meeting the faculty from this division has been	
--	--	---	--

		<p>very vocal that what we're saying, our opinions don't matter because we're constantly being told that there was only one way to do Guided Pathways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ D. Burns-Peters: Okay, excuse me, thank you. I think that clarifies and you've added further details there. I would like to ask the Guided Pathways team, can we have clarification on these if you have had that at the student forums, and were those forums open to faculty for attendance. I just need that point of clarification and then we will move on.▪ T. Simpson: Yes, the student forums were open to anybody that came in. We did an initial one in the cafeteria on November the fifth, where we had over 50 students in a matter of an hour and a half. We had a pizza party. We took the remaining time and went and had faculty up in the President's conference room. So yes, there was actually invitation after invitation. We did three events in less than three months, asking for participation.▪ R. Pires: T. Simpson, can I ask you a question?▪ D. Burns-Peters: No.▪ R. Pires: How many maps were given to me?▪ D. Burns-Peters: Let's make sure we stay in order. I will add clarification. T. Simpson, was November 5th last year or this year?▪ T. Simpson: 2019. <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ (Pro) J. Herrera: I'll defer my time [Deferred to: H. Johnson].○ (Pro) H. Johnson: Since the last release we made to the department chairs that has been an open invitation for the past nine months for the departments to modify or replace the draft maps. Therefore, I support dismissing this entire resolution. After a year of collaboration, events, and meetings, the Guided Pathways asked for program maps from all areas. Twenty-two maps were submitted out of 364. The counseling faculty were given directions by Dr. Humble to work with the submitted maps to create the draft maps that would eventually go back to the departments for discussion and collaboration to finalize the maps. When the draft maps were sent in May 2020, it was explained that the drafts were a starting point and we expected them to be modified through collaboration with the discipline experts and counseling. That concern was not about the options, but was about the fact that they were only given their respective department drafts and not all 364 maps that were created. It was brought to our attention by the chancellor's office that Valley was in the top three colleges in making progress towards implementation, and currently we're the last three in our region. Therefore I support dismissing the entire resolution. Thank you.	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ (Con) A. Blacksher: I'm speaking on behalf of the division. We understand and support the ultimate goals of Guided Pathways. We really want to make sure that pathways reflect quantitative but also very qualitative experiences students have. Please we ask that you view the resolution and vote con for the resolution as an effort to support and continue conversations as tough as these conversations might be, as uncomfortable as these conversations might be, we want to understand that the resolution reflects a very real concern for students and our departments in classes. We want you to understand that the resolution reflects that very genuine and deep concern for students in our departments in classes and subjects. Understanding that many of use came to help our communities in ways that would not have been possible through Guided Pathways. Understanding that many of us found out ways into our disciplines through very serendipitous processes and we don't want to see students who can benefit out communities lose out from some of that serendipity and happening to find mentors and professors in research questions that really allow them to maximize their academic potential.○ (Pro) M. Tinoco: I'll defer my time. [Deferred to N. Jimenez]○ (Pro) N. Jimenez: I'll offer my time to A. Aguilar-Kitibutr.○ (Pro) A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Thank you. I speak and join all senators for a total non-support of the resolution in its entirety. To answer some questions about the dates. The drafts were released in May to the department chairs. There has been an open invitation for the past nine months for the departments to modify or replace the draft maps. Now, consistent with SBVC's mission that faculty members are agents of change and are expert professionals, the Guided Pathways Committee can engage in difficult respectful conversation and together problem solve for the good of the students at the core of the Guided Pathways to student' success. No one can take away the power of choice of students and Guided Pathways ensures this by providing students additional options to complete their educational goal. Guided Pathways this state initiative has awarded to SBVC \$1,383,526 approximately during a five-year span to be expanded by June 2022. As such, we are accountable for deliverables by way of implementing the four pillars, so our course maps are enfolded within these pillars. The task at hand is to be accountable for the work to continue because we are grant recipients. In contrast this resolution undercuts our plan. This Senate body cannot be triangulated to what can be a problem solving opportunity for the Guided Pathways Committee and for members to distinguish between faculty and issues and reaffirm the charge given them and move forward within the model given by the chancellor's office. Let us not support the entire resolution.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ B. Tasaka: Can I get some clarity? When A. Aguilar-Kitibutr first made the motion, I may have misunderstood it because of word choice. So, "Move that the Senate does not	
--	--	---	--

		<p>support it in its entirety,” makes it seem like some of it is supported and some of it is not. Was it your intent to fully not support the resolution?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Yes, fully not support the resolution. ▪ B. Tasaka: Would we be comfortable with maybe a slight wording change? Am I the only one who read it that way? ▪ R. Hamdy: I read it that way as well. You can amend it. ▪ T. Vasquez: I also hear that. ▪ Amendment ○ K. Lawler: I would like to talk about our friendly amendment [this was the amended resolution that was read, not the amendment to the motion that was just made]. The Social Science, Human Development, Physical Education Department has thought long and hard about this resolution and here in the past week we have met and collaborated on an amendment and it’s a friendly amendment that our entire division has arrived at. Saying that I hope the Academic Senate will move to pass the second amendment on this resolution. But furthermore, I like to say that you know first generation students will not understand that they have a say in a counselor, say to a counselor I don’t want to follow a pathway or I can’t take a different class. As a division of faculty members and experts believe that pathways needs to offer options to our students, our faculty chairs, our department faculty want to have a chance to control their pathways for our students, for student success rates, for equity. With that being said, I again, I plead to the Academic Senate to look at our friendly amendment to this resolution and we get past the first reading and get to the second reading of our friendly amendment as... ○ H. Johnson: Your time is up. ○ D. Burns-Peters: We have come to the end of our debate with pro versus con. I will re-read the motion once more. The motion is to move that the Senate does not support the resolution and that was clarified as just straight across not supporting the resolution. ● D. Burns-Peters: In terms of where to go next, if the division would like to amend the resolution that would come back again as a first read and it would go through the same process as the original resolution. 	
10.	Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items	● None.	
11.	Announcements	● K. Buffong: Tonight we have another Black History event that we’re celebrating Black History Month with; it’s called Psycho Hairapy where she joins mental health and the hair process and how that’s been for African Americans in this country. If you would like to join us, please do so. It starts in nine minutes.	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Huston: I want to thank D. Burns-Peters for running a Senate meeting with a controversial resolution that didn't descent into people attacking each other. That's a very hard thing to do when people are so passionate. I think she deserves a round of applause for keeping things collegial. ○ D. Burns-Peters: Thank you. I hope it was transparent, that was my intent today. I recognize we are educators and we are passionate about our craft and we care about our fellow faculty. 	
12.	Adjournment Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 3, 2021	Meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.	

Upcoming Events:

- [ASCCC 2020 Spring 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).