



## SBVC Academic Senate Agenda

Wednesday, May 5, 2021

3:00- 4:30 pm via [Zoom](#)

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."

Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and places courses within disciplines  
 Degree and certificate requirements  
 Grading policies  
 Educational program development  
 Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success  
 District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles

Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports  
 Policies for faculty professional development activities  
 Processes for program review  
 Processes for institutional planning and budget development  
 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)  | Meeting called to order at 3:04<br><a href="#">Sign-In Sheet and Voting Record</a>  |        |
| 2. | Public Comments on Agenda Items (max. 10 minutes @ 2 minutes each)   | None  |        |
| 3. | Senate President's Report (max. 5 minutes)   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Read the Senate President's report</a></li> <li>Say their names: Matthew "Zadok" Williams</li> </ul>   |        |
| 4. | Committee Reports (max. 20 min.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>Student Services</i></li> <li>b. <i>CTE</i></li> <li>c. <i>EEO</i></li> <li>d. <i>Professional Development</i></li> <li>e. <i>Elections</i></li> <li>f. <i>Curriculum</i></li> <li>g. <i>Program Review</i></li> <li>h. <i>Accreditation &amp; Outcomes</i></li> </ul> | <p><b>a. Student Services</b> [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr]: The Student Services Committee have additional points to share with you after we considered the points raised at the Student Services Council. This is in the hopes of providing a wider perspective for Senate to approve the request of the CTE faculty and to not consider a GPA for admitting concurrent students. These are the recommendations we would like to advance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If it's going to be considered to have a GPA of less than 2.0, are there specific rubrics that are defined if a student makes the appeal, and if so, there has to be a reminder, or we would like to remind the student that filing an appeal does not mean approving the appeal.</li> <li>Specific rubrics to be generally applied without an appeal for those with less than 2.0.</li> </ol> |        |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Financial Policy</li> <li>j. Distance Education</li> <li>k. Personnel Policy</li> <li>l. Legislative</li> <li>m. Ed. Policy</li> <li>n. <b>Guided Pathways</b></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Also if there is a specific plan to increase the awareness of high school students that GPA counts and filing for financial aid when they will have become high school students and college students from high school to college at SBVC.</li> <li>4. It was raised, how about considering some other successes theories to back up the big four not considering the GPA of 2.0. And since they did not provide specific theoretical frameworks, I thought we will just bring in some of the robust studies that the literature provide, for example. There is a very strong longitudinal study about social and emotional learning for students starting 2011 to I guess 2017 or 2018, who are by the students who underwent social and emotional learning program did attend and finished college, and all the other positive outcomes and also, for example, academic self-efficacy, our very own colleague N. Sogomonian had a dissertation on the academic self-efficacy. Also something about growth mindset, all of us underwent a retreat on growth mindset and this has been well proven in the high school that students increase their GPA, or that they became more interested in performing academically, well also something on resilience and grit and multiple intelligences, among others, so if they can provide us more specificity to the recommendations that we have, including those that were advanced in our previous meeting.</li> </ul> <p>These are the things that we would like the whole senate body to consider since AB 30 and AB 288 did mention that other kinds of assessments can be used other than the GPA, so that's all.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Questions/Comments:</b></li> <li>• M. Worsley: Quick question about the study that was done, was it done on a community college population?</li> <li>• A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: No, these were done for high school students, so I'm referring to perhaps having our students before they come to Valley College as concurrent enrollment that they will have undergone such programs like those because then the positive outcomes are ensured, knowing that there are other predictors of academic success, but there is a very big weight in terms of effect size and especially in the longitudinal study where they have considered all the other variables, you know holding constant, for example, socioeconomic status, you know, location of housing, etc. So those are referred to students that have undergone those programs that I mentioned, not necessarily at Valley College, in other words we're thinking of having them be prepared for college.</li> <li>• J. Garcia: So in looking at the high school students are you taking sort of a general look at the high school population of a specific program or is it because when you mention the high school students, I immediately think of the middle school students that attend SBVC, so is it sort of a different population than that?</li> <li>• A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: That's a good question because what was brought out was actually for students that would be under the CCAP, meaning College and Career Awareness Program, which we have, those are our concurrent students in the high schools that are taking</li> </ul> |  |
|---|--|--|

classes, either on campus or are taking our classes at the high school location. So AB 30 and AB 288 were actually intended for opening up the doors for our high school students who may not otherwise think of going to college, so in general, that would be the case and we do have our program at Valley, where you know for so many years we have been having concurrent enrollees. I don't know if that answers your question, But yes it's not just it's not just the Middle College High School.

- M. Worsley: I think it's worth talking more about this just it's very it's multifaceted it's tricky because even you know I didn't realize that we had any kind of grade point average for anything to get into Valley, you know, and I thought we just kind of we took everyone and that that's been part of how we teach how we, how we can take students and help them and give them a you know, an education and pass them along and I feel the same way about this and I know that a 2.0 is pretty low, but at the same time, you know Middle College across the street doesn't necessarily have, you know, they're not taking the crème de la crème either they go through this interview process, and they do take students that get lower grades on purpose, sometimes, because you know there's an opportunity there obviously so I just think that this discussion is worth carrying through and continuing to have for the opportunity that concurrent enrollment has the College experience that we can have that a student may not have a 2.0 but may end up thriving in a program here so. I don't know it's I think it's a tough conversation to have but I'm on the fence for sure.
- A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: It's certainly worth pondering over because there are some pockets in our college that may think GPA is really important to be able to handle their course content and there are also pockets of our community where we think there are other sources of success other than GPA. As J. Stankas mentioned last time, the intent of AB 30 and 288 were actually intended for opening up those students that may not even consider college and now would be able to think about coming to college, and I agree with you, M. Worsley, that this is worth considering through and through and perhaps we need to talk more about it and how to prepare our faculty if we ever go with that direction, and if not, how may we help the CTE division or department and the CCAP program, how can we help them do the outreach and invite students and have a sustained program for that matter. So I'm not really sure if we are even ready to take action, I would suggest, just like last time I mentioned that our community last time agreed that unless these questions are answered and they're able to provide us a sound formidable rationale, then we are not ready to take action on this.
- T. Simpson: I just wanted to clarify about the GPA being the only requirement and like with Middle College, they have multiple things they look at. They're able to look at like projects students have done. They will look at test scores and some things we don't necessarily have access to. That's how they can take students that aren't necessarily performing GPA-wise, but they do really well test-wise and the do well when they have the opportunity to apply things.

**c. EEO** [H. Johnson]: R. Hamdy attended the meeting. At the Board Meeting in May, K. Hannon and I think anyone that's willing to join her from that committee will be presenting the updated plan to the Board. If anyone's interested in that you'll see the presentation at the Board Meeting.

**d. Professional Development** [R. Hamdy]: Quick update for faculty, you have seen my multiple emails about Flex reporting. I have almost everyone's report in, miraculously, so I am really pleased with how the Flex reporting is happening through the Vision Resource Center. There's been some kinks that we have to work out. When all of you report back to your divisions, please remind them to get their flex reports in and remind them if they did not receive a confirmation email from me that their Flex report has been closed. It could be that they fell into a black hole if they weren't submitted correctly, so I'm trying to figure out what they did. So I have to force close those reports, I will only reach out to those next week who have not submitted their flex hours, so if they don't receive an email from me about needing to submit additional hours or that they haven't submitted at all, then they're okay. We really need to get those reports in. One additional thing – there is a professional engagement opportunity coming up on May 17. You may have seen that the chancellor's forum is happening. The email was sent out by the district, so I want to encourage everyone to attend. We have three finalists for that forum. You may have seen a familiar name and face on that as well. I encourage everyone to participate via Zoom. It's a good opportunity to engage.

**e. Elections** [A. Pave]: I wanted to report some really good news. There were 12 nominees for the full-time award and rather than two awards, due to a tie in the voting this year, there will be three awards. It's nice to recognize our excellent faculty. There were 11 nominees for the adjunct award and we had one winner. There are a total of four faculty winners this year. Those will be announced at this year's Spotlighting awards. Other than that, there are senator terms expiring at the end of spring 2021. So if you haven't been reached out to or reached out to me, D. Burns-Peters, or B. Tasaka, we're trying to make sure we have a full roster of folks on Senate for fall 2021.

**g. Program Review** [C. Huston]: I don't have a preview of the results for budget equipment and classified. We're doing the faculty this week. I'm just really proud of the Program Review Committee, it's not easy to implement change, especially after two decades of essentially the same process. The committee responded to the survey that went out to the campus at the beginning of the year. They took a huge chance and a big step to try a different type of rubric based on scoring for needs assessment. It's not perfect, we know we've got this big laundry list of things we want to work on, but some of it went really good and we're excited and going to work on the results again next year. I'll have a full written report that will include faculty, the budget and the equipment list have already gone to President's Cabinet, so they had that information to work with as soon as we were able to get it to them. The committee worked hard. It was tough this year, but they worked hard and tried something different. We're kind of waiting to get the full report together and

|    |  |   |  |
|----|--|---|--|
|    |  | <p>we're going to upload it and we've got feed back. We have all kinds of back end data that D. Algattas pulled together from the Google Form that we used to submit online so it's actually given us a lot more information than we've had before about how we're reading, interpreting, and voting. Are we being consistent? It's really fun stuff.</p> <p><b>h. Accreditation and Outcomes</b> [C. Huston]: I'll have a report on the work of the committee ready for next time. We're going to bring some information about Institution Set Standards. We had the newsletter from the Accreditation Committee go out earlier today. We eagerly anticipate a curriculum demo because CurrIQunet has an SLO module and a Program Review module. We're hoping to see that before the semester and get some feedback. It looks like something we can use for Program Review and SLOs so we can combine all our processes under the same software. As it was mentioned last meeting, I was selected to be the faculty lead again for the next two years. I really wanted to thank everybody for the opportunity to do this work. I really enjoy it and I'm excited about coming back and doing it for another two years.</p> <p><b>i. Guided Pathways</b> [T. Simpson]: I wanted to let everybody know we attended the summit last week for Region 9. J. Stankas did a very good presentation. I was on the closing panel and I was a little hurt because me and M. Robles have been on that planning committee for over a year and we were nowhere on that agenda, but that's just me being petty. Other than that the conference was very insightful and good to know we are not behind as much as you know, others would like for us to feel, so I wanted to thank the entire team.</p> |  |
| 5. | <p><b>Additional Reports (max. 5 min)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. SBCCDTA</li> <li>b. District Assembly</li> </ul> | <p><b>a. SBCCDTA</b> [S. Lillard]: It's been a busy couple of weeks with negotiations. This past week we did sign four MOUs; one was extending the honors stipend, so the honors stipend that was put in place in December is continuing for the next academic year. We signed full-time benefits and also an extension for the plan year because you might remember that our benefits plan year has shifted to October 1 from July 1. We signed an MOU just taking care of that gap. Then today we signed the return to work or fall transition stipend and we are happy to report that all faculty will get the stipend of \$300, both adjunct and full-time, so we're really happy about that. We still have a lot of work to do and our final day of negotiations is this Friday so next week we will have the tentative agreement available for members to be able to vote. We will post that on the website, but we'll send an email out to everyone and then voting. We will have three things to vote on during the voting period, which will be May 17 – 21. The full-time reps election will take place on the same ballot, the union's budget, and then the ratification of the contract.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Questions/Comments:</b></li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters: I have a question about the stipend. Is there a process to receive that stipend and what does it specifically cover?</li> <li>• S. Lillard: Basically it's a stipend that recognizes everything that everybody has to do to transition back in the fall. We've been online for a whole year and many people will be transitioning back to face-to-face who haven't been already, and so it's a stipend to help</li> </ul>  |  |

|    |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|
|    |  | <p>with maybe some costs that faculty will incur in that transition during the fall. There's not really a process. As long as faculty are working in both spring now and the fall, they will get the stipend.</p> <p><b>b. District Assembly</b> [B. Tasaka]: [view the <a href="#">District Assembly agenda</a>] We had our very last ever District Assembly meeting on May the Fourth. We did have a little fun nerding out over Star Wars before the meeting. We ended up pulling the Social Media policy. I know this group had concerns around it. There were a few other APs and BPs that needed to be consolidated with it and checked in addition to that. It will be reviewed by our new AP/BP subcommittee in the fall, so it's not going away, it's being put on hold. The rest of the APs/BPs on the list were approved. J. Torres also did an update on the reopening, which I think will be presented to the Board of Trustees. Most of the rest of the conversation was centered around the Chancellor's Council.</p>   |  |
| 6. | <p><b>SBVC President's Report (max 5 min.)</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are making progress on our return to site plans. There have been numerous presentations that have been happening. I appreciate everyone's input in making that report stronger. Soon your managers or deans will be reaching out to each one of you to talk about your space and where you work to see what your needs are in terms of feeling safe and if there's any special materials or things you might need. They have a form that they will be filling out as the two of you have conversations or groups of you have conversations. It might be a little challenging at first to talk about your physical space, especially if you set up these meetings via Zoom, but I want you to know that these forums and materials and supplies we're going to provide for your safety are fluid. So if you talk about something you need, then come late August you realize there's something you forgot or didn't think about that you need, that's okay. We will get those things to you as soon as possible, so if you think of things again after your visit with your manager, but school hasn't started yet, please let us know. The plan really does evolve every day; we had a really good conversation at our all campus meeting for those of you that were there. A lot of great suggestions by faculty and our classified professionals that we're already following up on, so thank you for that.</li> <li>• There was an email that went out to all of our students and I believe all employees that Valley College will be hosting a vaccination site for our students and employees who have not had the opportunity. They are scheduled for May 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>. We are still working with the organization to figure out the best way to move folks through. It's going to be a drive-by. I really want to thank P. Quach and C. Rodriguez who are going to be doing the heavy lifting for our college. We appreciate their work. We will get more information out and we will keep pushing information out to our students. In order to make this a go, we need to guarantee at least 250 vaccination appointments at minimum, so if you have contact with students and you know they're interested, please let them know and there is a sign-up site. They'll have to log in and sign up, that's how we'll track if we have the proper number, so please help us get the word out. I appreciate it. It's also available to Crafton students as well, so it's across the entire district.</li> </ul> |  |

|    |  |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|
|    |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I also want to give my thanks to the Program Review Committee for being bold and courageous enough to try something new. I think they listened to the input from the campus community about revisions to the document and how we can advance our Program Review Process, so thank you for that.</li> <li>• <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ T. Vasquez: I was working with some part of the Facilities and Safety Committee, P. Walker and M. Nguyen, from the district. There's a little typo on the flyer. I just want to make sure the information is correct when it goes out to students. I'll also post the link where to sign up <a href="http://redlandshospital.org">redlandshospital.org</a> and the Group Code: COLLEGE.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: Yes, and no guarantees but if we have a successful program and we get a good number of students to come through, we're going to keep pushing to have the college as a vaccination site until there's no longer a need.</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: I would just add that, due to our student population, there may be some who need to come through our public transportation systems. And you mentioned, it could be drive up, just as they planned for that, if we could also plan for those who won't be in a physical car given their mode of transportation.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: That's a good suggestion. I appreciate that. There may be a call for volunteers to help with the vaccination site, as many of you are interested and able to volunteer, it will be appreciated. A call may go out.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |   |
| 7. | <p><b>Consent Agenda</b></p> <p>a. Approval of the minutes for 4/21/21</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Motion 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No discussion</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | <p><b>Motion 1:</b> Move to approve 4.21.21 minutes.<br/> 1<sup>st</sup>: T. Allen<br/> 2<sup>nd</sup>: L. Cuny<br/> 26 responses<br/> Aye: 96.2% (25 votes)<br/> Nay: 0% (0 votes)<br/> Abstain: 3.8% (1 vote)<br/> <b>Motion passes</b></p> |
| 8. | <p><b>Action Agenda (max. 15 min.)</b></p> <p>a. Guided Pathways: Design of Program Maps</p> <p>b. Honors and Non-Credit Faculty Lead Positions</p> <p>c. AB 30 Dual Enrollment Update</p> | <p><b>a. Guided Pathways: Design of Program Maps</b> [T. Simpson]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [view <a href="#">Guided Pathways Design (plan) for Program Maps</a>] The document was read at the last meeting.</li> <li>• T. Simpson: We updated the Senate about the progress towards our goals and we're asking for affirmation or direction design of the maps. So basically what we're asking is that the Senate supports Guided Pathways in developing these maps by allowing our counseling faculty to come in and update and make whatever changes we need in order to make sure that our maps are aligned to the needs of our institutions, if it's a local transfer or certificate, so we need to make sure that all of the general education classes are selected. We ask the Senate that we will select their general education from the top</li> </ul>  |   |

20 classes that students take their freshman year. We ask that we narrow it down to what was agreed upon, which was three general education classes options for each of those selections.

• **Questions/Comments:**

- D. Hunter: I have a question regarding page 2, the last paragraph where it says, “We trust the judgement of our counselors in this task and anticipate the top 20 general education offerings may be modified periodically as enrollment trends change over time, perhaps every five years.” As we in our department read that together, it seems to indicate that those changes would be automatically made by counselors and it doesn’t say anything about faculty input, so I was wanting to ask about that and if the Senate is affirming this as it was read, then I’d like to see that changed to include department chair faculty, because as we know curriculum changes frequently, especially now as all the departments are in the process of working on new courses, classes, curriculum, and so on. I guess that’s the purpose.
- T. Simpson: Would you be fine if we just add in periodically that will include faculty chairs? What else would you want me to put besides that?
- J. Stankas: That periodically be reviewed by the Academic Senate.
- D. Hunter: Okay, so in other words, not by the counselors, and I don’t mean this as any negative against the counselors, it’s just I saw faculty missing form this.
- J. Stankas: The reason I suggested the Academic Senate is because it’s a public meeting that’s run by faculty. If we’re talking about general education, it should go through the Senate. Hopefully the Senate will sponsor some broader discussion among faculty.
- T. Simpson: I will make that correction.
- B. Tasaka: I am wondering because we talked about earlier in this meeting about having a new Guided Pathways person or persons come in – wouldn’t something like this restrict that person in their role? If they’re coming in and these things are already decided, I’m not inclined to bring additional restrictions. Is there a way to maybe pilot this on a smaller scale in the fall instead of having it apply to everybody right away so that whomever steps in has the flexibility needed to do what they need to do?
- T. Simpson: It’s not going to limit them, it will support them and getting it done. Because that’s part of the reason why we can’t finalize, because we needed some direction of how the campus wanted to move it and just because the leader’s there, the campus still has to say all how we want it to look.
- L. Cuny: Are we only looking at how electives are chosen?
- T. Simpson: We don’t have electives, we have General Ed. and major preparation.
- D. Burns-Peters: To clarify, this would only be for General Ed. Requirements, the core courses would still be faculty owned and driven, that is, the subject matter expert instructor.
- T. Simpson: Neither, they are right maps, it’s how we will make sure they stay on the permanent maps.

**Motion 2:** Move to affirm as amended.

1<sup>st</sup>: T. Vasquez

2<sup>nd</sup>: C. Huston

28 responses – vote by roll call

Aye: 53.6% (15 votes)

- A. Ababat, A. Aguilar-Kitibutr, T. Allen, V. Alvarez, J. Garcia, R. Hamdy, D. Hunter, C. Huston, H. Johnson, T. Simpson, D. Smith, S. Sobhanian, N. Sogomonian, T. Vasquez, M. Worsley

Nay: 39.3% (11 votes)

- J. Banola, J. Bjerke, A. Blacksher, M. Copeland, L. Cuny, K. Lawler, M. Lawler, S. Meyer, A. Pave, B. Tasaka, P. Wall

Abstain: 7.1% (2 votes)

- D. Martin, M. Valdez

**Motion passes**



|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M. Lawler: So the Guided Pathways and the pathway to help the students to graduate on time, there's still that if they want to change to a different class that's offered in that department, they still have the option to do so? Like for instance, I'm just gonna say, I don't know, like one of the classes on the pathway might be boxing for fitness, I'm from Kinesiology, and they chose to take yoga, which is also fitness, I mean that's still okay? Am I correct in saying that?</li> <li>○ T. Simpson: Yeah, that's fine if they want to opt in or out, so they don't want to take the classes that are on there, they don't have to.</li> </ul> <p><b>b. Honors and Non-Credit Faculty Lead Positions [D. Burns-Peters]:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•[view <a href="#">E. Gomez's letter of interest: Honors Faculty Lead</a>] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Motion 3</b></li> <li>○ <b>Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A. Blacksher: I would like to emphatically, exclamation point with all the smiley emojis attached recommend E. Gomez as Honors Lead.</li> <li>▪ J. Lamore: I would like to say as a former Honors Lead, I would not support this motion.</li> <li>▪ M. Worsley: I would also comment that I'm voting no.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>•[view <a href="#">M. Lopez's letter of interest: Non-Credit Faculty Lead</a>] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Motion 4</b></li> <li>○ <b>Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ M. Copeland: Based on what the position calls for, I question the 50% reassign time. That's the same as the Curriculum Chair, that's a lot of reassign time.</li> <li>▪ D. Burns-Peters: The Non-Credit is .2 reassign.</li> <li>▪ M. Copeland: When did they change it?</li> <li>▪ A. Ababat: They changed it like last year .3, then now .2.</li> <li>▪ M. Copeland: Never mind then.</li> <li>▪ T. Simpson: I know you said these are people who applied now, what do we do in the situation where we don't know who's going to take over these lead positions?</li> <li>▪ D. Burns-Peters: That's a good question. In the even that either of these are not confirmed or supported by the Senate, they would remain open and we would reopen the time period for additional letters of interest to be submitted.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>c. AB 30 Dual Enrollment Update [K. Melancon and K. Miller]:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•[view <a href="#">AB 30 Dual Enrollment Update</a>]</li> <li>•K. Melancon: The ask is to remove the 2.0 GPA from the catalog. It sounds like there's a misunderstanding here. We don't have a choice with the 2.0 rule, it has to be removed. I do applaud A. Dale-Carter for having a conversation with us to get a direction of what is needed. Our rubric needs to be put together, yes, or is it together now, we do have a presentation to answer the last meeting's questions. We do need to remove the GPA, so where do we go from here?</li> <li>•K. Miller: I'll summarize the whole thing. We have guidance from the Chancellor's office saying the GPA cannot be used to restrict enrollment based on current standards. I know</li> </ul> | <p><b>Motion 3:</b> Move to affirm Ed Gomez as the Honors Faculty Lead.<br/> 1<sup>st</sup>: A. Blacksher<br/> 2<sup>nd</sup>: T. Allen<br/> 25 responses<br/> Aye: 52% (13 votes)<br/> Nay: 40% (10 votes)<br/> Abstain: 8% (8 votes)<br/> <b>Motion passes</b></p> <p><b>Motion 4:</b> Move to affirm Maria Lopez as the Non-Credit Faculty Lead.<br/> 1<sup>st</sup>: M. Copeland<br/> 2<sup>nd</sup>: A. Ababat<br/> 24 responses<br/> Aye: 87.5% (21 votes)<br/> Nay: 4.2% (1 vote)<br/> Abstain: 8.3% (2 votes)<br/> <b>Motion passes</b></p> |
|--|--|---|---|

that there was some question about the age of that legal opinion we used. I spoke to representatives from the Chancellor's office in January, they are saying it's still in Ed Code that GPA cannot be used. I do want to point out that this is in reference to all concurrent enrollment students, not just CCAP. The legal opinion cited was on clarifying the differences between CCAP and NCCAP, but the Ed Code which they refer to is based on all concurrent enrollment students. I did want to make that point of clarification that we have spoken to the Chancellor's office and they have given us direct guidance that we cannot use GPA and be in compliance with Ed Code. I'd also like to say we can't use Ed Code as a precursor, but there are other alternatives including having multiple measures, much like they do for Middle College High School. We want to have lots of faculty opinion, so I would like to invite everyone here and everyone who cannot be here to come to our network group. We're planning to work to come up with a rubric to replace GPA. But, as K. Melancon said, it's sort of two separate issues. One is that GPA must be removed per Ed Code and the other is what will replace it to ensure student success, which we are excited about creating a new structure to support students.

- There's a contact for Brenda Morales on the presentation, if you email her she will forward you the invitation for the Valley Now workgroup that meets next Wednesday and the second Wednesday of every month. We want everyone there to help develop a system that both is within Ed Code and that also will support our students and ensure that they are equipped to go forward. We've been working very diligently to improve student success, we now have all concurrent enrollment students that are taking courses through the Valley Now program meet with a counselor before they even turn in paperwork to make sure they know what they're getting into, that they understand college rigor, and are prepared for college classes. Most of the students who meet with them come back and reduce the number of courses they're interested in taking, they change the courses they're taking. I do want to point that out, and if you come to the Valley Now workgroup, our counselors have prepared a presentation to sort of elaborate on what they do in those meetings.

• **Questions/Comments:**

- A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: No one is above Ed Code. We now that. I was just wondering how come our Region 9 neighbors have not changed their GPA. I thought that the legal opinion which I mentioned last time on perhaps the 21<sup>st</sup> was that it was referring to another, I should say, another point and it does say that assessment it's not just GPA, right, there was a specific wording about no district should preclude any student by just using GPA, but then it continues to say that there has to be other assessments and so that is why the Student Services Committee was presenting two sides. So my question is then, how come other Region 9 colleges are still having 3.0 for the GPA, not even 2.0, I would like to know, we are under the same Ed Code.
- K. Miller: I think that's a fantastic question. I spoke with Chaffey College, who does not have the 2.0 and they cited the exact same code that was brought up, saying it's not

|    |                                  |   |  |
|----|----------------------------------|---|--|
|    |                                  | <p>allowable to use GPA to restrict enrollment. I know that the question was whether or not the legal opinion cited was applicable because it did refer to, I believe the Matriculation Act of 1984, and so I did see guidance from the Chancellor’s office before even bringing this to K. Melancon and talking about it at the workgroup the first time. They did indicate that although the Matriculation Act of 1984 has been replaced by AB 705, this standard is still in place for all students, so I can’t speak to whether or not our fellow Region 9 colleges follow this or are aware of this, even because I will say dual enrollment is so incredibly nuanced and unless you are constantly reading Ed Code, it’s very easy to miss all of these linked, you know codes. I cannot speak to why they don’t do it, but I will say that I agree and we’ve been working with the chairs of counseling to develop some sort of assessment tool for dual enrollment students. That’s where the workgroup is, we want a group of people to get together and come up with all of the ideas that we could use to predict success and use as benchmarks for students and have a very clear rubric.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: I think the Student Services Committee recommendations are comprehensive, both on the two sides of the coin.</li> <li>○ D. Hunter: I was wondering why can’t we develop the rubric first and then vote to get rid of the GPA. Real quick am I understanding that current Ed Code is in conflict with AB 705?</li> <li>○ K. Miller: No, current Ed Code dictates we cannot use GPA as a requirement a standalone reason for denying students to the college, which is the way the system has been set up now. The legal opinion that was cited was from before AB 705 and it referenced the Matriculation Act of 1984. But I have since reached out to the Chancellor’s office and they said, although know the Matriculation Act is no longer in place, the Ed Code pertaining to the GPA requirement is still absolutely in place and still valid.</li> <li>○ D. Hunter: I thought you said it was replaced by AB 705.</li> <li>○ K. Miller: The Matriculation Act was.</li> <li>○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: It was the replace, if I may say that AB 705 supersedes Matriculation Act of 1984. That is why we are dead earnest to put that in place.</li> <li>○ K. Miller: We just had a question about whether or not because it made reference to this old law, whether or not the legal opinion was still as valid today as when it was initially written. We did seek guidance from the Chancellor’s office who said that on the topic of GPA and it’s used to restrict enrollment we cannot use it.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Motion 5</b></li> <li>● <b>Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: I just want the Senate to consider all the exhaustive recommendations that the Student Services Committee reported to the body for two meetings.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p><b>Motion 5:</b> Move to come back to this conversation pending a rubric or unit of measure.<br/> 1<sup>st</sup>: S. Meyer<br/> 2<sup>nd</sup>: M. Lawler<br/> 22 responses<br/> Aye: 86.4% (19 votes)<br/> Nay: 9.1% (2 votes)<br/> Abstain: 4.5% (1 vote)<br/> <b>Motion passes</b></p> |
| 9. | Information Items (max. 20 min.) | <p><b>a. Advancement in Rank: Professor and Professor Emeritus</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will be an information item at the next meeting.</li> </ul> <p><b>b. OER Liaison</b></p>  |  |

|     |  |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|
|     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Advancement in Rank: Professor and Professor Emeritus</li> <li>b. OER Liaison</li> <li>c. DE Faculty Lead Position</li> <li>d. Chancellor Council: update</li> <li>e. Senate Reassigned Time</li> <li>f. Anti-Asian Hate: Resolution 1<sup>st</sup> read</li> <li>g. Transforming and Decolonizing Institutions: Share out of lessons learned</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome to R. Brown as our new OER Liaison. This position is not voted on, it's a selection process. We're excited to have him on board. We'll be meeting with him to see how we can get OER spotlighted more as we proceed through the academic year.</li> <li>• R. Brown: I look forward to getting everything started in August.</li> <li>• R. Hamdy: I want to verbally congratulate R. Brown. I first met him when I came on as PD coordinator, when he was doing the same role at Crafton. I look forward to doing events with him.</li> </ul> <p><b>c. DE Faculty Lead Position</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M. Worsley and D. Burns-Peters will continue to serve as DE Faculty Co-Leads.</li> </ul> <p><b>d. Chancellor Council: update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [view <a href="#">District Assembly agenda</a>]</li> <li>• B. Tasaka: If you look at the District Assembly agenda, we essentially approved most of what's there. If you look at the list with the individual subcommittees. I know District Assembly collected all of the notes that happened in yesterday's meeting. They'll be sending it to us in paper form. We can bring that back.</li> </ul> <p><b>e. Senate Reassigned Time</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters: as a result of some changes happening, reassigned time is available at the district level. There's been a lot historically to lay the grand work to support the President to have 100% reassigned time. That being said, there is an additional 50% reassign time to be distributed within the Academic Senate. There was conversation with Exec to go ahead and fill the rest of the Academic Senate President's position to 100%. I want to recognize the foundational work done for many years by previous presidents.</li> </ul> <p><b>f. Anti-Asian Hate: Resolution 1<sup>st</sup> read</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [view <a href="#">Condemning Anti-Asian Hate and Violence</a>]</li> <li>• This is a joint resolution with Crafton Hills College.</li> <li>• Direct any amendment suggestions to B. Tasaka (<a href="mailto:btasaka@valleycollege.edu">btasaka@valleycollege.edu</a>).</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters: There have been many involved, but I want to particularly thank B. Tasaka, A. Aguilar-Kitibutr, A. Pave, and B. Bailes, Crafton's Senate President.</li> </ul> <p><b>g. Transforming and Decolonizing Institutions: Share out of lessons learned</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters: I want to share that I will continue to work with the indigenous peoples of the land in the space where San Bernardino Valley College resides.</li> </ul> |  |
| 10. | <b>Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items (max. 10 minutes @ 2minutes each)</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>   |  |
| 11. | <b>Announcements</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters: I want to thank K. Miller for your attendance today in supporting information on AB 30. Thank you very much.</li> </ul>  |  |
| 12. | <b>Adjournment<br/>Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 19, 2021</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjourned 5:18 p.m.</li> </ul>  |  |

## Upcoming Events:

- [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).*