

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	Meeting called to order at 3:05 pm Sign-in sheet and voting record	
2.	Public Comments: non-agenda and agenda-related (max. 10 minutes @ 2 minutes each)	<p>Motion 1</p> <p>Public Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Avelar: We need better guidance and clarity as to how much online content we can use in traditional classes or traditional face-to-face classes. For example, can we flip a class? Would it be possible to know ahead of time within the schedule of classes or not? We need guidance on that and directions on what to do from the office of instruction if anything is to be on there. We need to be up on the universal access point. If we do and it's a traditional class that we are flipping, how do we get access to the UAP? • D. Burns-Peters: Thank you. Those are some DE components we can follow up on. I'm happy to say there are title five changes as well as a state resolution to support some of those inquiries and some additional information we need to be sharing. I will also say that if you want to join the book club after the meeting today y'all should do that. I'm super excited because two of our deaf adjunct faculty are going to be leading that discussion today. Therefore, I am going to skedaddle to support at a certain time and Maggie the vice president is going to resume taking care of the rest of the meeting. 	<p>Motion 1: Move Section 9 of today's agenda to follow section 4.</p> <p>1st: M. Worsley</p> <p>2nd: L. Henkle</p> <p>20 Responses</p> <p>Aye: 100% (20 votes)</p> <p>Nay: 0% (0 votes)</p> <p>Abstain: 0% (0 votes)</p> <p>Motion passes</p>
3.	Senate President's Report	<p>D. Burns-Peters: Hello, the main update I want to give is twofold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First, the student equity planning process and where we're at on that. I brought that to you last week and asked for some feedback. I sent out an intentional e-mail to the senators trying to be more specific and I got back more questions about 	

		<p>“What do you want? How do we do this?” I got some great input and some great feedback as well. We are in a space where we have a lot more work to do on the student equity plan. It appears that we might be able to have a little bit more time to do that. One of the ways I want to support the Senate's input on that plan is to open our next Senate meeting to work in a focused format on how we as a faculty body can support a vision for that plan. Our next meeting will be really focused on student equity planning. There may also be an opportunity for an open form as well on the 4th I did not get to confirm that but that might be coming. I posted what our current writings, input, and feedback have been and that is on the Senate website. If nothing else, feel free to look at that to understand what the template looks like, and maybe that will give you a broader view. I hope the open forum sections will provide the parameters of really what's being asked so that we can avoid confusion and be more directed in our feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second, there will be a discussion about in-service days. Start thinking about in-service days and what your experience has been with them, and the professional development around them. We have professional development which is an Academic Senate purview component. There's been a lot of feedback about them but there will be some intentional discussion around that as well. We will have an intentional conversation about what in-service days are, and what they look like, and to make sure that we have a faculty perspective on how they're used, now and in the future. 	
4.	Committee Reports	<p>Accreditation Committee (C. Huston)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I just wanted to share that we've got the funding list for the 21-22 needs assessment. Handouts in the back. This is what we receive from the office of the Vice President of Administration and attached to that is a table format that I compiled. There's a note that says every attempt has been made to accurately cross reference. I put it on this one so you can see if you are unfunded, you have a score. If you don't want to rewrite the program review this year or write another needs assessment request and you're happy with this score, you can let it ride, but you need to let me know by November 4th. If you want to write a needs assessment thinking you can do a better job this time because the rubric has changed just a little bit, you are welcome to always write on it whatever you want to. The most recent score counts students. Our first workshop is on Friday, September 28, from 9 am - 10 am, and another two weeks from now. We're going to have an online workshop, and also a face-to-face workshop in Library 109. Each of the co-chairs will be hosting one of those workshops for the needs assessment. You can reach out to Celia Huston or Joanna Oxendine or your division representatives. We are happy to work with people one-on-one or put together mini workshops as needed. An email went out to all the department chairs and all the managers about the workshop. • D. Burns-Peters: I have a question on priority. If we decide to let it ride and somebody else jumps from #10 to #1 that means, we get shifted as well, right? Those who know I'm like #5 on the list. I'm super excited. • C. Huston: It's not position in the list that rides; it is the score that counts. The prioritization list will always be by the score which can get really close now that we have gone to a rubric. 	
5.	Additional Reports	Tabled see Motion 3	
6.	SBVC President's Report	Tabled see Motion 3	
7.	Consent Agenda a. Approval of the minutes for 9/7/22	Tabled see Motion 3	
8.	Action Agenda a. Starfish Lead b. AY23-24 and AY24-25 Calendar	<p>a. Starfish Lead</p> <p>Tabled see Motion 3</p> <p>b. AY23-24 and AY24-25 Calendar (C. Crew)</p> <p>I would like to identify myself for those of us who haven't met, I am Christopher Crew - District Director, SBCCD Research Planning & Institutional Effectiveness & Academic Calendar Subcommittee Chair.</p>	<p>Motion 2: Move to approve the AY23-24 and AY24-25 Calendar with minimal corrections. 1st: A. Avelar 2nd: S. Meyer 20 Responses Aye: 95% (19 votes) Nay: 0% (0 votes)</p>

- One of the things we work on is the calendar. I wanted to demystify that today because we don't have a lot of decisions to make on the Academic Calendar because it comes from the state. They give us guidelines on how to put the calendar together. My job with the calendar is to carry forward that which the State has given us to do, as well as to include 175 days of instruction determined by the CTA contract.
- The unwritten rule is to end the process before Memorial Day.
- The State doesn't distinguish between our flex days and our in-service days as the CTA contract does.
- The holidays, we don't have much to say about that either with the exception of Lincoln and Presidents Day, we can have either 2 "three-day" weekends or 1 "four-day" weekend, so we alternate between them each year.
- Part of what is done is moving this through the collegial consultation process which got us this year because of switching to the advisory committee this year. Normally this would have been completed already last spring.
- Spring Break is in between the first and second eight-week courses during spring. This was determined after 1000 responses to a survey that provided nonconclusive input from students about their preferences.
- Mistakes that were previously pointed out were addressed including correcting 2 Saturdays for Finals adjusted to 1 Saturday and dates that that mixed up have also been adjusted.
- There is no longer a block schedule for finals, and this is a question for management rather than the calendar committee.
- In-service days happen prior to the start of the academic term and are a CTA contract conversation that will happen.
- Concerning changing "Thanksgiving" to "Holiday Break" in the calendar, according to the State, we can't do that because it will affect apportionment since it is a nationally mandated holiday. If the name is changed the State will consider it a local holiday. Mandated holidays are covered by the State. Local holidays are not, thereby missing instructional time. There is a path forward with this idea. We could leave "Thanksgiving" on the calendars turned into the State. The calendars for local use, ones not given to the State, could be re-labeled. It is suggested that this goes through the process. On a district level, the DEIA committee would be a great place to have that conversation. This could also be brought through institutional effectiveness, then going through the Chancellor's Council, and then it would come back to the Senate. If a decision like this is needed, it would be better to have that as a district-wide conversation where everyone had input to provide a collegial kind of feel.
- A new district-wide enrollment management committee will be formed. One was disbanded maybe two or three years ago but now there is a need to bring it back. This would be a good place to have a conversation about a winter session. The 175 instructional days may have to be stretched to accommodate a winter session. The timeline will be tight and will affect the start and end of the terms. The academic calendar committee should not be making that decision, rather it should go through the process.
- With that being said, I am here to see if we can get approval for the calendars.

Discussion:

- A. Hecht: This is a question concerning in-service days. Is there any way the campus could be closed for non-instructional personnel to attend in-service days because, as of now, it's still open? There are students lined up at our door and by 2:30 pm, when in-service ends, everybody is complaining, "where are your counselors at?" Is there any way that the campus can be closed?
- C. Crew: That that's a management conversation.
- A. Hecht: Who would I go to with that question?
- C. Crew: I think Dina is a good place to go with that kind of conversation and maybe even Olivia.
- M. Worsley: Andrea, we're going to have more discussion about in-service days. That's what Davena opened with and Armando you talked about that last time. It's being addressed.
- T. Vasquez: This calendar is for 2 years, correct? Is it possible to approve just one year in order to have time to discuss with management and across our collegial consultation?

Abstain: 5% (1 votes)
Motion passes

Motion 3: Move to table agenda items 5, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, & 10, until a future Academic Senate Meeting.

1st: A. Avelar

2nd: C. Huston

20 Responses

Aye: 100% (20 votes)

Nay: 0% (0 votes)

Abstain: 0% (0 votes)

Motion passes

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Crew: I've been doing some research on that. The reason why we do it two years in advance is for instruction and A & R. There's a timeline in which A & R and instruction need to get the course's opened and registration available. It actually starts October 1st this year. Until this calendar is approved, they cannot even open the courses and they cannot open the registration item. That's the reason why we do it two years in advance. However, amending the calendar is a very simple thing. If down the line, you need to change and you want to amend it. It's just a matter of me taking that and sending it to the state and the change is made. It will need to get board approval again, but it can go back to the state. I would suggest we keep it in that two-year planning cycle, so we don't run into a place where we're affecting instruction or A & R from doing their job. Just know that an amendment being made is a very simple thing to do. • M. Worsley: That's good to know. I think today it's only appropriate right now to move forward with the potential motion for support of this. • C. Jones & J. Banola: Pointed out certain dates and weeks on the AY23-24 & AY24-25 Calendar draft that were still mislabeled and in need of correction. • C. Crew: OK, let me line that up. Thanks for your feedback. • M. Worsley: I think today it's only appropriate right now to move forward with the potential motion for support of this. <p>Motion 2</p> <p>Motion 3</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Information Items</p> <p>a. AP/BP Review</p> <p>a. AP6305: Level 2 change</p> <p>b. AP 2510</p> <p>b. AB 928 and Local Degree Pattern (Janice)</p> <p>c. EMP update: timeline updated</p> <p>d. Senate Liaison Positions and Committee Structure</p>	<p>a. AP/BP Review (D. Burns-Peters)</p> <p>Our first item is 9A related to AP/BP Review. We have two APs that are open, and I need to bring them to you for feedback and input. I printed them out for you. The AP 6305 I printed specifically because it has the redlined items. The AP 2510 is straight from the district AP/BP webs or policies and procedures website because there's no redlining to it yet.</p> <p>a. AP6305: Level 2 change (D. Burns-Peters)</p> <p>D. Burns-Peters: Let me start with AP 6305 Level 2 Review. As a reminder our review process in the policy and procedures advisory committee, we call it PPAC, is every AP or BP that is opened, whether that be as a requirement as part of our 10% review every year or whether it be a chapter owner saying I want to open this AP. Every time it's opened it is now assigned a level; a level one, two, or three.</p> <p>A level one is a verbiage change, i.e., if there's a procedure that has disabled student services in it and they've now changed their name to student accessibility services there's no change to the policy. It's just literally a title change. I don't think we're all going to have an issue with that. It's expected to move forward without a whole lot of input. There are some legal things too that come through that you have no choice on, like the State says thou shalt do A, B, & C and it must go in there. HR things, those of the sort.</p> <p>Level 2 review recognizes that it's a mild change or it's a non-controversial change or there are other considerations. It's just not expected to be major, but it should go through process. AP 6305 is level 2. It does need to come to us, and this is the only section that is identified for change right now. I need to point out to you that this red line information is coming from the State. This is a practice we've already followed by the district but it's coming from the state. Instead of saying 10% of your budget or a permanent percentage, it's saying approximately 2 months of expenditures because how much that is varies, from district to district. This wording is pulled from the state. What's not on here is the first section, "the final budget shall include an un-apportioned." that is going to be struck out. I don't know why it's not on here. In the committee, we identified under the title "current SCCD version and changes," the first two sentences in black are supposed to be lined out. I will make sure that it is. If not, they contradict each other a little bit. According to all things budget, this aligns with the state and aligns with the practice that we already have in place. This is your first read. Should you have concerns, comments, or feedback, bring them forward to me and we'll get that included.</p>	

b. AP 2510 (D. Burns-Peters)

I requested [AP 2510 to be opened back up for review](#). We've seen 2510 for so many years. I think all of us are like 2510 again. Why? But it needed to come back forward. What you may not recall is that several versions back the collegial consultation was not represented in 2510, yet every one of our campus committees was identified in the AP, and even some of our memberships were listed. The list that you use to sign up for a committee makes references to AP2510 and it's changed. There's conflict there and we need to fix that. Then the question came up, "What happened to our collective consultation? It's all gone." The collegial consultation is implied. I recognize that is not sufficient for us.

It identifies what the Chancellor's Council and the advisory committees are. Each advisory committee has outlined a membership that is representative, inclusive, and has all the collegial parts to it but again that's not quite enough. We cannot go back and just list all our committees and our membership because what we do is different from Crafton. An AP should address a district-wide policy. I'm going to be working closely within the exec. body and closely with our past president, but my recommendation is that we add a paragraph that recognizes the local collegial processes.

Then on this chart here, identify how the local collegial process, i.e., Academic Senate and campus committees, connect to the five advisory committees as well as to the Chancellor's Council. In my preliminary sketching and conversations, one option is to put Academic Senate off to the right of Chancellor's Council with a little red dotted line showing that we connect and we're part of that process. For each of these five committees, we can also draw a direct line where the local Senate body has representatives assigned intentionally in those committees and they connect back to the Academic Senate.

Another option is to add a bar that shows the Senate body locally advises and is participating in those advisory committees. We could make a direct and clear line of communication by having a senator who is on the local budget committee also represent on the advisory committee and who could report back to the senate body. We could do the same with institutional effectiveness, with program review, with accreditation, with facilities, etc. Currently, we've got a faculty member who is a senator on the local facilities committee and serves on the advisory committee.

One gap that I haven't been able to work out is this HRDEI. We do have the option of putting in ADEIA liaison who also would communicate with the state Academic Senate. The other gap is policies and procedures because it is all AP/BP. That's where this one is heading. It's open. This is not going to come back until probably the next time. It will be a process of making sure all the lines are in order but that's where it's heading.

Comments:

- C. Huston: Going back a decade this Senate fought extremely hard to keep our committees and our structure in the AP so that there would be a process established and nobody could just willy-nilly change the campus structure without the participation of the faculty. That's gone and I'm not quite sure how it happened. It also creates an accreditation gap where we no longer have any formal documentation of our processes here at Valley. We need to probably resurrect a very dusty draft of the governance handbook of data and get it around, so we do have documentation of what our processes are and how we go about changing our governance and community structures. That's what we're going to need to do before the committee comes to visit us in October of 2027.
- D. Burns-Peters: Thank you for that because though the assurance used to live in the AP. That assurance, in terms of our local process and procedure, doesn't exist anymore.
- C. Huston: It's currently unprotected.
- D. Burns-Peters: Let's shore it back up. We'll bring that back forward and, of course, it will come through the Senate body.
- T. Vasquez: Often I as a leader of a standing committee, co-chairing with administrative services, ask, What's the infrastructure of shared governance in the aspects of function? I feel that it is important too. Charting is a start, but I feel that it's more useful for everyone who participates in our college district to have examples of functional processes. Here's a topic, just as you said, the facilities conversation. Where does that get started? How do they fit together? It's closing loops. I feel a flow chart is that way. It's closing loops. I feel a flow chart is that way with different arrows going off to different things, going back and forth. It's more fluid and it understands flow all the

time, and back and forth, not just the one time. I feel like charts drive this sort of top-down/bottom-up. Shared governance, to me, is always. The visuals help tremendously.

- D. Burns-Peters: Understood. I would agree. What I'm hearing is that if we can include some of those more dynamic aspects of what that collegial process really looks like rather than just a top-down, if we would resurrect our local government process documentation whatever title that ends up being, we would not only have the flow charts but also identify the roles, the responsibilities the starting point of A, B, & C. There are lots of conversations like that on lots of things happening right now. We have practice in place with whoever's at the table and it's not just administrative roles, it's faculty leads, it's faculty chairs, it's faculty and departments. As we come and go, culture changes and understandings change, and I'm just trying to codify some of that. I think I've captured what you said and hear you.
- A. Avelar: When did this pass?
- D. Burns-Peters: I'm reading the organization and advisory committees can adjust as they see fit to promote station and efficacy. That means people can be excluded on purpose. There are ways to say, "well that person, that area is just going to slow us down. So, we should just exclude them." When did this happen? This says in February 2022.
- D. Burns-Peters: It did happen in February 2022. I can't negate that it. It absolutely went through the board book.
- A. Avelar: Did it come to the campuses?
- D. Burns-Peters: Yes ma'am, it sure did. I can only say that it went through process. I will say that there were some growing pains in the advisory committee process last year. I will also say that I'm on a learning curve of my own and it is likely that I missed it, but everybody did. I don't think I'm alone in that. It passed on both campuses.
- A. Avelar: Collegial consultation is such a strong part of the Senate and is literally used everywhere. It is part of the law.
- D. Burns-Peters: Title 5, the law. I will say, and I don't mean this in defense of anybody, but one of the board of trustees did ask, can we make sure that the law is actually represented here? Yet again, it passed. What we know is that it's not strong enough for our liking. I don't think we can revert to what we had. I don't know if that's the way we should go. So, let's shore it up. It's open and that's what we get to do. That's the upside to it. We get to visit it again. Let's try to make sure that we're all aware when I bring 2510 to the table that this is what it's about. It's making sure that we are shoring up our prime responsibility.
- A. Avelar: It must have clear language that whatever the changes, in practice, need to come to the Senate for a first and second reading. Often "that it takes too long" is their rationale to push things without consulting us.
- D. Burns-Peters: I hear you. There are no timelines to it, but it needs a first and second read. I'm repeating that so it's captured for the notes. We need to ensure that there's a first and second read process to it and any impact on faculty is identified.
- A. Hecht: Does that mean that if we work on the equity plan at the next meeting, it's not the second read? or is it the second read? Do you know what I mean? This is the first read, is the second read the same as student equity plan discussion day?
- D. Burns-Peters: No. This is not coming back next time. This will be a process.
- A. Hecht: As you said we are going to add in collegial consultation, even though it's assumed we're in there, but clearly, things have already happened on our campus where that wasn't happening. I just wanted to reiterate that you said that any faculty on here because even though it says overview, faculty must be on here.
- D. Burns-Peters: This is not a first read. I want to make sure that that's clear. This is not counting as a first read. The first read will not happen until some of the actual textual changes start getting to be proposed. I'm letting you know that this is open. Let's start thinking about it and this input is helpful.
- C. Huston: There is a change in the APs and BPs and this specific language in there for Academic Senate. There was another battle a few years ago and the language says that you have two Academic Senate meetings to review something because the way it had been written, they could launch something in May and pass it before we got back because they only had a certain number of days. So, we got it changed to Academic Senate meetings so that at least both campuses get eyes on it before a first and second read. There are always loopholes.
- D. Burns-Peters: I will say that we're here today. Let's fix it. We have the ability to do that, and we can move that forward.

- D. Sandoval: I had a quick question. Is there legal stature or anything that we can go back as far as the records to show that this has been standing and proceed that way? Usually, if there is legal standing you can go back and show that this has been the norm. If everybody agrees to that, shouldn't we be able to change the wording then?
- D. Burns-Peters: Of course. That's what this is about. We have the ability to open this up and identify what we see as gaps. I'm just going to leave it at that. It is what it is. This is where we're at and I don't mean to minimize where we're at but I'm not going to try to point to how it happened. This is where we are. Let's fill in the gaps. We identify these gaps and yes, we get to go back and make recommendations through this advisory committee process which, as Tatiana mentioned earlier, is very much back and forth process. It's a communication process. The Senate will get to decide that in terms of legal references. They're actually listed here, but it isn't enough to just say there's Title 5 information. It's finding that balance where it's not so specific to our campus versus Crafton because it is a district policy, but also ensuring that we are not cut out of the collegial process that we have a right to.
- T. Allen: Is this something we're working on with Crafton since it involves them?
- D. Burns-Peters: It has to be in tandem. It's a very good point Tammy and again it's not. There has to be some conversation about what makes sense to reflect both of our bodies. The preliminary conversation has been that we're open to that. Feel free to take a bit of a lead on that and I'll support it.

b. AB 928 and Local Degree Pattern

B. Tasaka: For a quick intro, we're doing this as curriculum but Janice's brain has all this information so she will do the talking. We want to start the conversation today, but this is not the end of this conversation. It will be back. This is the first four date of many to come. Curriculum will be talking about this quite a bit more. We'll be talking about it on Monday. We'll have some office hours and places to talk about it but we just want to start by making sure it's on everyone's radar.

AB 928 Update Presentation (J. Wilkins)

I am the articulation officer here at San Bernardino Valley College. I am also a counseling faculty. I'm so happy to be here. We've been presenting and this meeting is number five or six. I'm excited to bring it to this body because this is like top tier, so I want to make sure it gets here. Like Bethany said, this is just information. There are some webinars that are being offered at the state level that I'm recommending everybody attend. There's actually a recording that I have Linked in here that you guys can just look at the recording.

Let's just start off, AB928 for those that do not know this is happening. This is legislation that is making our transfer general education a singular GE. Does anybody know how many transfer patterns we have currently? No counselor can answer this. Yes, CSU GE, IGETCE, IGETCE STEM. This is going to replace all of those eventually. I'll say eventually because we have students that are on catalog rights which is a whole other thing. They will be able to stay with their current GE pattern. The singular GE is going to be the single pattern for transfer, and this is happening now. It's being vetted at every Academic Senate in California as well as ICAS statewide is making the decision about this. If they can come to a consensus by May 31st. That date is so key because if ICAS does not state, confirm, or approve a GE by May 31st then the other bodies will do it for us, and we do not want that. We want ICAS, our academic Senate bodies, to make that decision.

Refer to [AB 928 Presentation PPT](#)

Slides:

1. AB928 Establishes a singular lower division GE Pathway.
2. Steps to approving lower division GE pathway.
3. Proposed CalGETC Pathway with differences of current GE transfer patterns.
 - Pivotal changes: Oral Communication, which is currently only a CSU requirement, will now be a CSU and UC requirement.
 - Some downsides: Lifelong Learning is being removed and it's going to be an upper division GE but that's still being decided. Languages other than English are not on the single GE. They're going to complete at the UC as an upper graduation requirement.
4. ASCCC: Proposing a GE pattern for the Associate Degree.

5. Title 5: Minimum requirements for the Associate Degree.

J. Banola: Janice is calling on me because my first venture into statewide work was when I was appointed as local VP to a workgroup about defining the associate's degree. We took many resolutions to the statewide academic center. The one that passed said that you have to have 18 units that constitute a major preparation and 18 units of general education. Then the rest could be elected. Prior to that in 2005, which is when this was originally written into title 5, there wasn't any guidance about it. Any accumulation of 60 transferable units and some colleges would slap a degree on it and say go. There was a real debate in the field about whether that was good or bad for students. The current requirements define the general education pattern. Last year the Board of Governors adopted the recommendation of the statewide academic Senate to include ethnic studies as part of the required GE pattern for the 2024-2025 catalog year for our students. That's our local degree that went to the Board of Governors. It had two reads. It had an open vetting. It went to the Department of Finance, and they decided it was OK. A memo went out to all the colleges in October 2021 that said, "Hey, by the 2024-2025 catalog year you better have an ethnic studies requirement in your local degree GE pattern."

J. Wilkins: Thank you, John, for clarification of that because there's a lot of confusion. This is what is approved. It has ethnic studies on there but what's in Title 5 currently on Westlaw, I just checked yesterday, are the old requirements. In regard to ethnic studies, our local GE has been aligned with CSU since 1997. With this whole discussion about aligning and proposing we are actually not in the worst of situations because we are already aligned to a four-year college/university but there will be some differences. Ethnic studies is actually on our current associate's degree because we are aligned with CSU. Students wanting to transfer to CSU need to have it.

6. Proposed General Education Pattern for the Associate Degree.

7. Proposed Title 5 Associate Degree GE graduation requirements/SBVC GE Crosswalk

- Title 5 states we determine what we want to satisfy under the communication and analytical thinking area. The premise of all this is we decide locally what courses will fit under each area.
- Some requirements removed from CalGETC could be part of the local degree graduation requirement but we have to decide that.

Questions:

- Hecht: Since you mentioned the grad requirements, I know Cal State has both History and American Politics as part of their requirements, are they going to keep that until CalGETC gets passed?
- J. Wilkins: From what I understand yes, but everything is kind of fluid. Nothing has been decided. I know from the meetings that I sat in, I just had a Region 9 articulation meeting and the Cal States that were there do not want A to be an upper requirement. They said that makes no sense, which I agree, but those are still being decided. Decisions are still being made. My understanding is that history and American Politics would stay.
- M. Worsley: I think you're answering my question but I'm deeply concerned about the reduction in Arts & Humanities and social science. You're saying, if I'm hearing correctly, that we still have some local control to have what we want.
- J. Wilkins: Absolutely. That's a campus decision. As long as we're in compliance, we interpret it for our students, our community, and our college.
- M. Worsley: What's the best way to talk about that and get feedback to whoever is participating in this process?
- Tasaka: For the local ones, this is really the start of the conversation and we're trying to open the door now. We do plan to hold some more conversations as a curriculum committee. Being connected with who your committee representatives are is helpful because bringing those questions through them and then allowing us to talk it out as a committee is going to be really good. I know we are going to try to visit different divisions to try to talk some of these things out. I think we've already had an invite from your dean so we'll be visiting your division. We want to get as much information out there as we start to make a decision and really try to decide what's best for our students.

- J. Wilkins: I just want to add the end goal. Discipline is important but we have got to keep it student-centered. We are kind of competing, in a sense. We have this singular GE that's coming. It's going to be fewer units. Students say, "Yes, I can do this." We want our associate degree comparable to that. So if the student does decide to transfer there are still courses that are going to make sense for them upon transferring. However, locally we can say what we want within the guidelines.
 - M. Worsley: Which still be student-centered.
 - J. Wilkins: Yes, exactly.
 - T. Vasquez: Just for clarity, when you say graduation requirement are we talking about Bachelor's degree? I know for UC, students can do upper-division ethnic studies and they don't have to do lower division currently. Are they now required to transfer with ethnic studies?
 - J. Wilkins: Starting next year IGETC is adding Area 7. Students will be required, if they want to get certified for IGETC, in 24-25 to have ethnic studies.
 - Sandoval: As I'm looking at this, is this set up so we transfer students from here to the local CalState, or are we looking at all the different CalStates and UCs and making sure our students can go anywhere without having any type of issue? Where students go, "Valley didn't tell me I needed to take this extra class," which would have been pertinent in getting them to transfer. Are we basing this off that or how are we basing this information?
 - J. Wilkins: That's a good question. People may not understand how the transfer patterns work. The tract or patterns go to any CSU. The CSU general education requirements are for every CSU. They're not differentiated as far as which CSU Campus they're going to. There may be some upward division requirements. The GE lower division are what we are in compliance with to provide for students. Our GE pattern for CSU allows students to go to any CSU. Our GE pattern for IGETC allows students to go to any UC. That's not going to be an issue.
 - B. Tasaka: A piece of that is we want to make sure we trust our counseling faculty. They understand that better than all of us.
 - J. Wilkins: My role as articulation officer and I take this personally, is I want to make sure students don't have that barrier of completing additional courses. We submit it annually and it gets approved. That process is vetted so once a student takes a course here it is guaranteed to transfer to that four-year CSU or UC. For the privates, it's a little bit different. Sometimes they will accept our CSU and IGETC and take it as its whole by applying it to the GE. That also eliminates barriers for students.
 - N. Jiminez: This is for the associate degree?
 - J. Wilkins: This applies to our local degrees only. If students start a degree and need to come back to it later because life has changed for them or they want to make more money because they have got a family or whatever the circumstances, we want to make sure that they do not repeat classes. That is why the alignment is important because students can just move over to the CSU pattern or IGETC pattern without delay. It still keeps the uniqueness of our community, and our college needs and course offerings.
 - Sandoval: I definitely appreciate that. Being a former student from here, I was basically in that situation.
 - J. Wilkins: Did you have issues transferring?
 - Sandoval: Not from here, actually from Chaffey College. I actually had some issues there and transferred over here and got things straightened out. I had a way easier time here. I just wanted to see if that was a standard because I hate to see students get bogged down or not being able to move to upper division.
 - B. Tasaka: I think our counselors share those feelings. They're on the same page.
8. Next Steps to Proposing an Associate Degree GE Pathway: Comments, Discussions. Resolution.
 J. Wilkins: What's next in regard to this? This is the initial conversation on this level. The next steps are comments. There's a survey that's out for your comments. They need and want your comments. There's going to be a resolution drafted that will be disseminated to the area meetings and then the resolution will be debated and voted at the 2022 fall plenary session in early November.
9. Webinar Information
 10. Survey Information

		<p>J. Wilkins: What's next in regard to this? This is the initial conversation on this level. The next steps are comments. There's a survey that's out for your comments. They need and want your comments. There's going to be a resolution drafted that will be disseminated to the area meetings and then the resolution will be debated and voted at the 2022 fall plenary session in early November.</p> <p>W. Tasaka: Input is definitely being reviewed and looked at. One way to get feedback, like Maggie is asking, at the state level would be these surveys. The local decision is something we'll be talking about moving forward.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T. Vasquez: Is there a timeline of when we are going to take that local GE in terms of modification? • B. Tasaka: I don't have one in mind yet. I don't think we've sat down to talk about it. • J. Wilkins: All I know is the singular GE has to start 2025-2026 academic year. My assumption is we're going to all roll out at the same time. That is the goal for the transfer singular GE 8928 is 2025-26 school year. <p>11. AB928 Drop-in Virtual Hours</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hecht: I just wanted to get some feedback, as a counselor we see these things all the time. If you notice CalGETC is really aligned with UC. I highly recommend that you guys go to these webinars. Do the surveys. There are a lot of our students that do want to transfer. Please see the benefit of having more classes. I highly recommend more options for students. CalState wants to get rid of lifelong learning as a transfer but wants students to take it during their junior year. Which doesn't make sense to me when the majority of our students don't have support from their schools on how to do time management. What does a study space look like? They don't know that. They don't even know about organizing and student development helps these students with that. At UC, those students already have that. Their parents have money to pay for that. Our students don't have that. So please fill out those surveys. • J. Wilkins: I know the current ASCCC president Ginni May stated that AB928 implementation committee is looking at that. They want it to still be open to having courses that may not be transferable. Allowing students to make that decision if they want to take it or not. Obviously knowing that UC may not take it. <p>c. EMP update: timeline updated (D. Burns-Peters)</p> <p>The update is that the new mission, vision, and value statement which was printed out and posted on the website for your review, has gone through a lot of collegial process all last year. A lot of feedback from the student body, faculty, classified, across the campus. This is the final version, not the version I read on opening day. This is the appropriate final version that is going to the board of trustees on the 14th. I just want to make sure you have a copy in your hand. I suspect that it will be approved by the board and supported. I don't suspect that it's going to come back to us and once it's approved on the 14th that will be our new mission, vision, and value statements. As we do our program review, our program needs, and things like that, we will need to be referencing that new set of information.</p> <p>d. Senate Liaison Position and Committee Structure</p> <p>Tabled see Motion 3</p>	
10.	Announcements	Tabled see Motion 3	
11.	Adjournment Next Meeting: 10/5/2022 in B 100	Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm	