



SBVC Academic Senate Agenda

Wednesday, October 20, 2021

3:00-4:30pm 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 3:05 p.m. Sign-in Sheet and Voting Record	
2.	Public Comments on Agenda Items (max. 10 minutes @ 2 minutes each)	None	
3.	Senate President’s Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College Council and Board of Trustees have not met since our last meeting. • I attended the Area D meeting last week and got a lot of updates on legal issues and things going on with ASCCC. After that, we went over the resolutions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An assembly bill, I want to say AB 936, is going to move us into a space of having a common numbering system of courses across CCC and CSU, with UC recommended to follow. That went through. It’s a grave undertaking. The UCs cannot be mandated to do anything by law in the same way that the CSUs and CCCs can, but they can be asked to participate. There’s no funding tied to that if I recall. That was one of the greatest concerns – how are we going to come together. ○ Another one is a common GE course pattern across all three systems. That’s AB 928. ○ You will hear movement about this. I don’t know how that’s going to look when it comes down to the campus level. The first step is having committees 	

		<p>come together to get that work started. They outlined the representation from the Academic Senates from all three educational systems on that work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It's very early in the game, but it's coming down the pike. ○ One good thing is allowing us to continue to meet in a virtual format, which we already covered here. ○ We will talk about resolutions later in the agenda. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strategic planning is continuing. At the district level, we are utilizing a consultant group to help with the development and writing of that project. Some proposals were submitted, and I'll talk vaguely because I don't know how much of that is proprietary, and they're being reviewed by the workgroup that does include representation from both faculty senates, Program Review, research offices, the VPIs, and Presidents. That's for both Crafton and Valley, so there is a lot of representation and there's a rubric being used to determine who will be selected. More to come. ● There seems to be a new level of tired these past couple of weeks. Just as a reminder, let's continue to press on as a community, as fellow faculty. I want to recognize that "tired" now is different from what it was a year ago or six months ago. We also have a time change coming. Be kind to yourself and know it's okay to be tired. 	
4.	<p>Committee Reports</p> <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. <i>Distance Education</i> k. <i>Personnel Policy</i> l. <i>Legislative</i> m. <i>Ed. Policy</i> n. <i>Guided Pathways</i> 	<p>c. EEO [R. Hamdy]: The committee met. We elected some chairs. I'm happy to announce that the faculty representative is A. Blacksher. Congratulations for being a representative in the HR DEIA Committee. I will be involved in the EEO subcommittee, so I will continue to do that work with just a small group of people towards training on our hiring processes and how to make them more equitable, and with a small HR team. So, we're excited about that.</p> <p>d. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]: The Professional Development Committee has two upcoming workshops. It's about supporting students in online and in-person spaces. We have some tips to share, but we also really just want to dialogue and know what best practices people are doing, what their pain points are, and to just support each other as we support our students and humanize ourselves. Here is the link to register: https://www.canva.com/design/DAEtS_q8k1w/ixnR9hno_fc8dpHXBVUX8g/view. Please take this back to your constituencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sabbaticals are in progress. Get that to the Office of the President by November 1. There are some guidelines – you have to have been here full-time for seven years. We hope to get a lot of applications this year. It's nice that the Board of Trustees has approved sabbaticals once again for us. 	

		<p>f. Curriculum [M. Copeland]: I just wanted to say the Curriculum Committee knows about the course numbering situation. The articulation officer was at a meeting yesterday and we talked about it. I believe the Curriculum Committee will be heavily involved in getting that off the ground; it will be a monumental undertaking. I'll be in discussions with D. Humble and others about the best way to do it. We have until 2024, I think. We have some time to get all that done, but we are aware of it. Keep your eyes out for Meta updates in terms of training faculty.</p> <p>g. Program Review [C. Huston]: We anticipate the Educational Master Plan (EMP) documents and Needs Assessments to come out no earlier than November 5, and initially the committee had decided to have those due mid-December. T. Heibel, the Chair-of-Chairs and also a member of our committee, talked to some department chairs and brought back a reasonable request to extend the deadline through January 21, 2022. That way everyone can have their division meetings and get their rankings done. So now they are due January 21, 2022.</p> <p>h. Accreditation and Outcomes [C. Huston]: The committee met and made some changes to our charge and membership. We will take that to Exec or bring it up again when we talk about committees later this term. We added some things, and it looks pretty good. It was a lot of work by B. Tasaka, Y. Lee, K. Yarborough, and J. Oxendine.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We also talked about our Institution Set Standards. If you remember we have a phrase that if we fail to meet our floor, it would, "trigger an investigation," and there was concern that the wording was kind of negative. We changed the language to, "if we fall below the floor, that prompts analysis." It was also suggested we survey the students who did return during COVID to see what prompted them to do so. We could see if it's something that can be used for outreach or replicated. We got that information over to Research and Planning.• The other thing that came up with Institution Set Standards had to do with the fact that the COVID data is going to be with us for a long time and pulling our numbers down for our Institution Set Standards and might lead us to missing our standards for several years to come. The committee talked about it and we do have the authority to change our Institution Set Standards and bring them forward through the system. We really thought it would be better until we get this year's numbers, so we would have two years of COVID numbers to look at and see if we want to make any changes or do a "hold harmless" on ourselves.	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both committees had a motion to adopt Meta for CurriQunet and to encourage the district to purchase that. This would revolutionize Program Review for Needs Assessment as well as SLO and SAO assessment. We could fully integrate it with our curriculum. It looks amazing and I'm going to shout out K. Yarborough who reached out to the people at Laney College and they answered all of our questions about how Meta works with Program Review and assessments. It was really useful to have that information and that prompted us to motion to adopt Meta. <p>I. Legislative Policy [T. Heibel]: Read written report.</p>	
5.	Additional Reports SBCCDTA	None	
6.	SBVC President's Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As D. Burns-Peters said, the baccalaureate degree is exciting news. If there's interest on our campus, it's definitely something we can explore and identify possibilities. It's always nice to have that option. I'm looking forward to that conversation now that it's no longer a pilot. I was able to attend the Association for Community College Trust Conference in person. Chancellor Rodriguez and myself had a presentation. We spoke about what we're doing in our district – how we responded to COVID and the social justice movement all coming together at the same time. We were able to share the case study of our district and really laying out the approach we took in regards to entering into COVID-19; the flexibility we've had all along, the communication we've done as a campus and a district; really, just sharing the insights of how we navigated this uncertainty and the theme of the presentation was compassion and empathy, but also communication and the statements that were made by our district with the resolution, but also by this Senate, making resolutions about anti-racism. We were able to share that out and just really explaining how we have been able to navigate this process together. It's a really good experience to highlight our college and district as we continue to navigate this pandemic and make our way hopefully to coming back to whatever our new normal will be once we get there. Little by little we're making progress in that regard. If you had a chance to see the state chancellor's office, they do bi-weekly webinars, and once again our district was highlighted for our Books+ program. It's been a good week for our district and college. There are a lot of people looking at what we're doing to potentially replicate or model some of our practices and approaches. The emphasis is around supporting and helping our 	

		<p>students and doing it as a collective. I think that really resonated in both of those presentations the past few weeks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This week is Undocumented Student Action Week. There's a lot of activities and workshops happening throughout the week, along with great speakers around supporting our undocumented students and providing resources for our students to be able to navigate everything they're dealing with as well as being in school. Great effort by our teams in Student Services, Equity, and Instruction. • Spring 2022 is right around the corner and the schedule is live. Priority registration is November 1. Time is moving quickly. 	
7.	<p>Consent Agenda Approval of the minutes for 10/06/21</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion 1 • Discussion: None 	<p>Motion 1: Move to approve the minutes. 1st: M. Copeland 2nd: J. Bjerke 24 responses Aye: 96% (23 votes) Nay: 0% (0 votes) Abstain: 4% (1 vote) Motion passes</p>
8.	<p>Action Agenda</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> CTE Toolkit Exec Committee Structure AP7210a and Faculty Hiring Handbook Feedback via Forums 	<p>a. CTE Toolkit [D. Burns-Peters]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [View CTE Toolkit] • D. Burns-Peters: I presented on this at the last meeting. As a quick review, we are bringing this back for a vote now and are asking for official support in a motion to actually utilize the CTE Toolkit in the equivalency process – that is a district-wide process. When using the CTE Toolkit, we will ensure content experts in the case where artifacts or evidence or supporting documentation is utilized to satisfy an area in which a person is lacking academic units. The intent is to utilize the toolkit that's been provided from ASCCC, we just have not officially put that into play. It would not circumvent our equivalency process; it would be added to the process. If a person comes to us and does not have a two-year degree but they have x number of units and they're lacking science or math, they might have the opportunity to provide documentation that would support having depth and breadth of knowledge in those areas. We would then pull in, according to the CTE Toolkit guidelines, content experts, which we already do, to look at that documentation to see whether or not it actually would satisfy and meet that depth and breadth of knowledge we're looking for. Also, to clarify one question that came up: Could somebody submit an application and be lacking in all areas in all areas 	

		<p>because it really boils down to an associates degree requirements and if they're lacking in all those areas could they technically go through this process and meet all those areas? The response was, "I suppose, technically they could, but that would be really, really challenging to do so." I don't predict or foresee that would be a pathway or that it would be feasible. It's not meant to qualify any person who just decides they want to teach. The intent of the toolkit is to uphold the expectation that the students are being taught by those who not only have a skill set, but also a knowledge set that supports the goals and the missions of our educational system as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion 2 • Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Is there a proviso or can we review this at a certain time just in case we think eminence and some of our processes involved would have to be changed, or is it necessary? I'm saying we should cover ourselves for some other eventuality when there might have to be changes later on. Should the motion be amended to say it will be used in the meantime? Or is it assumed that we might change it at a certain time? ○ D. Burns-Peters: Change the toolkit itself or the use of it? So, the Toolkit was written by ASCCC, so it would go through them to be changed. It is a living document, like everything we do really. We just haven't implemented it. In terms of revisiting if it's working for us or not, whether it's creating the results we would expect or providing equity or not, because the whole purpose behind it is being more equitable and creating a larger, more diverse pool of candidates to bring into some of our areas of instruction. That's up for review at any point. I don't think anything excludes us from that, if you would like to propose an amendment? ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: It could be that we will revisit this after five or 10 years, or during our cycle of evaluation which is usually three or five years. I think that's the practice of our college. ○ D. Burns-Peters: It is somewhat included in the motion that we constantly review, but I also know that sometimes to be very intentional, to set purpose for us to come back and revisit is a good thing to do. If not, several years can go past. ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Proposed amendment – The Senate supports the CTE Toolkit implementation at the district, with a view to reverse its implementation and practices after five years. ○ M. Copeland: It seems like we would organically review that. If we start to implement this and it's not working where people start saying, "Bring it to 	<p>Motion 2 with amendment: Move to support and adopt the CTE Toolkit as amended (to review and revisit it on a regular basis). 1st: C. Seager 2nd: T. Allen 24 responses Aye: 92% (22 votes) Nay: 0% (0 votes) Abstain: 8% (2 votes) Motion passes</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Senate because this is problematic,” we will look at it. I don’t know if we need a timeline, we want to be consistently reviewing this to make sure it works. What if we decide six months from now that it’s problematic? It seems like you might say to review it as needed. It seems like a five-year time frame is limiting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ T. Allen: I agree, I don’t see where we need to have a set timeline on this. If there are issues early on, we want to implement changes as needed, but to set up five years who knows what kind of damage can be done in the meantime? We’re here to serve our students and a lot are only here a couple years, so we want to try to address any issues if we can. Does that make sense? ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: That does make sense, that’s why I think it’s more arbitrary. I use five or three years because that’s the practice of the college. I will have to amend the amended motion and I would take the solution M. Copeland and T. Allen offered. ○ D. Burns-Peters: Is it safe to say the amendment was withdrawn and we understand that the original motion brings with it an understanding that we review on a regular basis? And should there be any concerns we would naturally bring that back to Senate? ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: I was under the impression that the amended motion will stand as it is with an additional word from M. Copeland’s suggestion that it will be reviewed as need arises. Did I understand that correctly? ○ M. Copeland: My recommendation would be to review it as needed; the five-year stipulation doesn’t seem to be based on anything like data. It’s just that we would review it if we’re getting information that it’s needed. ○ D. Burns-Peters: So the updated amendment would be to ensure that this is reviewed as needed and on a regular basis? ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Yes, I accept that. ○ D. Burns-Peters: Do our original motion-makers accept that? ○ C. Seager: Yes. ○ T. Allen: Yes. <p>b. Exec Committee Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● D. Burns-Peters: I have the current Senate Exec Committee Structure, as is published on our web page as well as within our bylaws. We’ve had a lot of discussion about how we can be more efficient in our Executive Committee process and also in looking at streamlining some of our roles and responsibilities, particularly given the changes at the district level with the advisory committee changes. And really trying to be thoughtful and 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>intentional about the purpose behind what we have in place, structures that have been in place. Currently we have our standing committees, which are subcommittees of basically everything highlighted. They've been established over a period of time through various needs and there's probably a lot of history to that. Those items in yellow (President, Vice President, Secretary, Past President, Curriculum Chair, and Program Review Chair) are not only established in our bylaws, but there are mandates that indicate we're driven by certain requirements in Ed Code. They tell us what the structure should be. So this is kind of the bare bones of what an Exec Committee should look like for an Academic Senate. All of the other areas we created as subcommittees. We're finding in practice, we are not meeting as subcommittees on a regular basis. It's not a blame game and it's not reflecting anything, we are just seeing how it's progressed and where we are now.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• My proposal is rather than having those committees, I would like to move these to liaison positions: CTE, Ed Policy, EEO, Financial Policy, Legislative Policy, and Student Services. So, rather than being chairs of a subcommittee, they would act as a liaison. The reason behind that is liaison gives us a better indication of what the role looks like – a liaison between the Senate and the state and any other advisory committee they may participate on. The state has also identified some of these positions as a liaison with ASCCC, so they are really a communication link and pathway for us from the Senate to the district or the state. Should there be issues that come up along the way that need to be addressed, they can bring them to Senate, or we could bring together an ad hoc committee to address those issues. Outside of that, these roles would act as a liaison, and we would leave them on the Exec Committee structure for now and change their titles and have clarity on what the role and position is and reflect those changes in the bylaws as well.• You'll notice I did not highlight Elections and Personnel Policy. The idea there is not changing these to liaisons. Those two subcommittees do a lot of work throughout the year. Elections is a very active group, but in spurts. Same with Personnel Policy. During those spurts there is still a need for a committee. Personnel Policy has traditionally taken care of our Advancement in Rank as well as applications for Outstanding Professor.• My proposal on these two is that the President, Vice President, and Secretary roles would co-chair these committees and would then create an ad hoc with representation from the divisions at the point of need. Those points of need are very clearly outlined by process and procedures in the	
--	--	---	--

		<p>bylaws and CTA contract, so there are definitely times where we would meet together. For example, the upcoming presidential election – that committee would come together do the work, and, when the job is done, disband. It’s a two part motion: I’m looking to officially change the title of what was subcommittees and move them into a liaison role and approve the Elections and Personnel Policy Committees to be tri-chaired by the Senate President, Vice President, and Secretary, who would then be responsible for creating an ad hoc committee at the point of need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R. Hamdy: Point of clarification – Would the liaisons still be part of Exec? • D. Burns-Peters: Correct, I’m not changing who is on Exec. This group would remain on Exec and that’s how we’ve been practicing. • J. Bjerke: Point of clarification – Are other liaisons part of the reorder? I’m thinking of positions like the OER liaison since that’s another statewide liaison. • D. Burns-Peters: That’s a good point. There are some liaisons that are not on this list, one being the OER liaison. I think that’s one who’s missing and there are additional ones that need to be added, such as a DEIA liaison. I think for now we are changing what’s here and we need to consider additions at another time. • Motion 3 • Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: We may need to amend our bylaws to reflect the functions of the committees. We are assigning liaisons and I’m inclined to think that our bylaws spelled out the functions of the committee but not necessarily the one being appointed by the President to co-chair or be a liaison for that particular committee. Perhaps would this be another motion that we need to amend our bylaws or do they go together? I’m just trying to see how we can do this with appropriate reflection and our bylaws because we are in a sense changing the entire naming and the functions that you’ve assigned. ○ D. Burns-Peters: A comment well taken. The bylaws would have to be changed to reflect the difference with the intention of the bylaws being very clear on outlining the roles of the liaison. Our bylaws are open, but do we need to add that the bylaws be changed to align with that? ○ R. Hamdy: We can make that amendment. I assumed it’s a given. I assumed we are clarifying those roles and that we would change the 	<p>Motion 3 with amendment: Move to change the Executive Senate structure to reflect a change in title from chairs to liaisons and the elections and personnel policy committees be tri-chaired by president, VP, and secretary and be made up of ad hoc committees as needed at the point of work, and make those changes to the bylaws.</p> <p>1st: R. Hamdy 2nd: B. Tasaka 22 responses Aye: 100% (22 votes) Nay: 0% (0 votes) Abstain: 0% (0 votes) Motion passes</p>
--	--	---	---

bylaws as well. To me that was a given, so I was comfortable moving forward. We can make it a friendly **amendment** though.

c. AP 7210a [R. Hamdy]:

- [\[View AP 7210a\]](#)
- D. Burns-Peters: We have been talking about AP 7210 because it needs to be reviewed. We have AP 7210a, which is new, specifically addressing adjunct faculty hiring. We have a complementary or supporting faculty hiring handbook. We already brought this to the Senate for feedback and it's gone to the chairs' meetings to some degree as well. HR did a presentation about the hiring process. We may want to bring that back for a little more discussion with the chairs as well. In talking in Exec, it felt like this is new and deserves a thorough collegial consultation process
- We've been talking about AP 7210 which has been established and needs to be reviewed. We now have AP 7210a and the supporting complementary Faculty Hiring Handbook. We've put it out there for feedback, there was feedback from chairs, and HR presented on it. It's new and deserves a thorough collegial consultation process to ensure we know what we're approving or what we're contributing to what should be approved. In order to really ensure that process is looked at with a really close lens rather than just bringing it to Senate a few times with a comment here or there, but to be really intentional about going through it because it's a new AP. There was a recommendation that we do so with some of the forum work across campus and departments and stakeholders; holding forums to get intentional and specific feedback that can then be documented and put through the process as it should be.
- R. Hamdy: Professional Development had a lot of success with Guided Pathways on this last year when we got feedback for AP 7210. J. Stankas and K. Hannon worked with us quite a bit. I'm looking for a motion for Professional Development in partnership with EEO and Human Resources to create additional feedback on the adjunct hiring processes and best practices for what goes into AP 7210a and the hiring handbook. We would create additional forums with Human Resources. I really want to do our due diligence to get feedback from chairs and adjuncts on what they experienced and what did or didn't work and what was equitable or not equitable.
- **Motion4**
- **Discussion:**

Motion 4: Move to charge Professional Development and EEO with getting feedback on AP 7210a.
1st: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr
2nd: L. Cuny
22 responses
Aye: 95% (21 votes)
Nay: 0% (0 votes)
Abstain: 5% (1 vote)
Motion passes

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Ortiz: You made the comment that it will be the chair and I did not hear talk of the faculty, so I think that should be included because we attempt to hire adjunct faculty and the chair is not a subject matter expert in that case supersedes the recommendation of the lead faculty. ○ R. Hamdy: I want to make sure I reached out to everyone to get feedback. I will write your name specifically down. I will not leave you out of the process. I'll send an email and they will be open to everyone who wants to attend to talk about equitable hiring practices for adjunct faculty. ○ R. Hamdy: I will reach out to HR and start setting up those forums and set up those meetings. I'll report back to HR, probably jointly with K. Hannon, and let you know when those forums will come up. ○ D. Burns-Peters: December is the projected goal at this point. 	
9.	<p>Information Items (max. 25 min.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. AP 7210, AP 7210a, Adjunct Hiring Handbook b. ASCCC Fall 2021 Plenary and Resolutions c. Elections: Academic Senate President AY22-24 	<p>a. AP 7210, AP 7210a, Adjunct Hiring Handbook [D. Burns-Peters]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [View AP 7210 and AP 7210a] • As a reminder, please take these back to your divisions. Please send any feedback to me or L. Cuny, our liaison for Ed Policy. As we just saw, AP 7210a and the handbook will also go through the forum process, so please find time to participate in those if you can't find a way to give us feedback. <p>b. ASCCC Fall 2021 Plenary and Resolutions [D. Burns-Peters]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [View Fall 2021 Resolution Packet for Discussion November 2, 2021 Final] • There are a handful of resolutions up. It's not as robust as a list as I've seen in the past. If you can take a look there. The Area D meeting was really smooth; there wasn't a lot of controversial stuff. Many of the resolutions are on consent agenda and really are just in support of work that's already been done. There's a couple that are on curriculum. I do get to vote, if you have any particular feelings about them, let me know. We have another meeting on the third. You can certainly provide direction for my voting so I reflect the voice of the body. <p>c. Elections: Academic Senate President AY 22 – 24 [B. Tasaka]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D. Burns-Peters: I'm going to hand this off to B. Tasaka because it deals with the President's position. Just note it should say 2022 – 2024 academic year. • B. Tasaka: We are opening the floor for nominations for the election of our Academic Senate President for the next two academic years. Right now we are open to nominations from the floor and we will also send an email where you can nominate somebody virtually. We do check with the person nominated to ask if they're interested in running because sometimes you know we get names of people who have no interest in running, so I'm not 	

		<p>allowed to just write T. Heibel’s name without his consent. Look for an email, I’m thinking from either me or M. Worsley at this point, about the nomination. Please remind people in your division about this as well. At some point D. Burns-Peters will put together a list of some of the duties, it will probably never be comprehensive because I think the job never ends.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role comes with 1.0 reassign. Should someone who is not D. Burns-Peters be elected, they will also get .2 reassign for the spring term to shadow the current president. If you have specific questions relating to the role of the president I will direct you to D. Burns-Peters and C. Huston, our past president. They both have a lot of insight to the role. I do encourage you to be very thoughtful and considerate with your nominations. We want to make sure whomever this is does represent the entire faculty body, so let’s be conscious of that. • I will open the nominations now. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D. Burns-Peters: I would like to nominate myself for president for this next round. I also want to make it known that if I am not the right person for this role or if the body feels that they want somebody else in this role, I encourage you with true authenticity to move forward in that format. I have been challenged by and enjoy this role enough to say I’m willing to go one more round. I do not want to discourage anybody who may be sitting in the wings going, “I want to do that.” ○ B. Tasaka: Nominations are open through November 5. We will move on for now, but if you would like to run or if you would like to nominate someone else, you may do so on the form. Look for the email. 	
<p>10.</p>	<p>Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items-including announcements (max. 8 minutes @ 2minutes each)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •B. Tasaka: I said I’m going to do this every time, so I’m going to do it every time. Our Asian Pacific Islander Association sort of has a timeline to get approved through the district, which is really exciting. I also want to announce we are starting to plan some events and I’m very excited about that. May is Asian Pacific Islander Heritage Month, but because May is so busy, we are going to use part of April too. If you or anyone you know is of Asian or Pacific Islander descent and you would like to be involved in those events, let me know. Maybe you’re an excellent presenter with a great story or a fabulous artist, let me know. You can reach me at btasaka@valleycollege.edu. •L. Cuny: The 48-hour film festival tickets are on sale. Funds go to scholarships for FTVM students. Three student films will be featured. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •T. Simpson: Last year the work we did with ASCCC in terms of our faculty role in the Learning Centers was actually adopted at the last Academic Senate Exec meeting. 	
11.	Adjournment Next Meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11/3/21 	Meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m.	

[ASCCC Fall Plenary](#): November 4-6, 2021

Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-25-20 on March 12, 2020, Executive Order N-29-20 on March 17, 2020, and signed AB 361 into law on September 16, 2021. Portions of these orders and not now relax parts of the Brown Act under specific conditions. 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). EO N-08-21 extended the permissions for Brown Act bodies to meet virtually through September 30, 2021. The signing of AB 361 into law allows for the above conditions to remain in effect through January 1, 2024 as long as specific conditions are in place, the main condition being operating under a State of Emergency.