

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

	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Action</b>
1.	<b>Call to Order and Roll Call</b>	<b>Meeting Call to Order at 3:04 pm</b> Sign-in sheet and voting record	
2.	<b>Public Comments: non-agenda and agenda related (max. 10 minutes @ 2 minutes each)</b>	<b>None</b>	
3.	<b>Senate President's Report</b>	<p>D. Burns-Peters: We have two guests today who will be zooming in. They're not voting members, but they're participating via zoom.</p> <p>I wanted to take a moment to highlight a couple of events that are coming up. You probably have received the information via e-mail, but we are inundated with emails. Here are the highlights.</p> <p>The President's Holiday Party, which is on December 2nd at 11:30 am over in the Lois Clark Campus Center. I am excited to go to that first big official event outside of the naming ceremony. There are baskets for fundraising for the foundation for our student body and scholarships for textbooks. They do other scholarship-related things. The Academic Senate usually does a basket. It was very last minute last year. I did that on my own. I am letting you know that I'm happy to do it on my own again, but I welcome any support. Even if it's an idea for a theme. Feel free to say this might be a fun theme to do. I'm willing to support and get that going. If you'd like to support in other ways, let me know.</p> <p>The other event is the Chancellor's Tailgate Party. This is happening at the previous district office on Del Rosa. If you went last year, it was a lot of fun. It was a good time to be had. There were games to be played. There was a chili cook-off. I encourage you if you can go take some chili so that we don't get awards by default. I love my engraved wooden spoon at home. It's beautiful, but I'd like to act to win it and not by default. Come join the chili party. It was good. I'm a good cook. I have no qualms telling you all I'm a</p>	

good cook. This year I think I'm going to smoke my prime rib and make a prime rib chili with smoked meats. If that will get you there, come on over.

I also wanted to point out a couple of things from the Board of Trustees meeting. It was a very long meeting last week. Probably the longest we've had since the pandemic. It was long, but it was good. I wanted to point out that there was a fairly decent-sized cohort of faculty, staff, administration, and Board of Trustees members who went to Ghana to the All African Diaspora Education Summit. I think I'm saying that right. A couple of you are in the house today. Feel free to correct me. Part of that group was there to present some of their experiences and highlights of that event and trip. Keynasia Buffong and Sandra Blackman, who teaches history here on campus, were able to go. The Board of Trustees meetings are recorded. I would encourage you to go and listen to that presentation. I really would. I don't often refer you to go listen to Board of Trustees meetings, but I would encourage you to go and listen to that portion. It was an actual presentation. It's part of the agenda time post public comments and a few other places, but pretty early in the agenda. I would encourage that because if you're not on board yet with the work that we're doing and still needs to be done, they lit a fire. It was hot in that room. Everybody in the room was moved by their experiences and what they shared. It was just a reminder for me. I left inspired. This is why we're here, and this is what we're doing, and there's more work to be done. Something really important came out of that, though. The Board often asks in various ways, "What can we do? How do we support you as faculty?" There was a call by that group to the Board of Trustees that as we do this work in diversity, equity, and inclusion, we need the Board to cover us because it's messy. It's not easy. Hard decisions have to be made, and it's challenging. We need to know that you have us, and you cover us and surround us.

Trustee Williams then highlighted that he, too, participated in that trip, and he had that same comment to his fellow Board of Trustees members. He said, "They're absolutely right. We need to provide them the cover to do this work." That's a really important statement to be made by a Board of Trustees and for the recognition. I backed that up in my report, and for the sake of trying to support in whatever way that I can in that space to call out that it's absolutely necessary. It was a great presentation and conversations on how we take that from that group and bring it back to the campus to spread far and wide to help propel what we're doing.

The Honors Program reported on the various updates on the honors program. Daihim Fozouni also did a presentation on his sabbatical leave which was also on the honors program and highlighted some of the good things that we've been doing. He highlighted some of the positive movements we've made in honors and how we are doing well with supporting our honor students. Then he also made some recommendations, which included looking at summer coverage for the honors lead. The fact that we're offering summer programs is great, but we also need the support behind that. There were a few other very relevant recommendations made.

There's also a "Coffee and Donuts with HR." This one you might not have noticed this in your e-mail, but I want to highlight it. HR is working to connect more with the campus and put faces to names as well as be more accessible. They are doing a "Coffee and Donuts" on December 12th from 11:30 am to 1 pm in B100. Come and join them.

		<p>The Program Needs extension, I don't know if that was going to be included in your report Jesse, but I'll include it here. There was an extension to program needs until November 23rd. If you are part of that work or responsible for program needs and the date slipped by or you didn't have the time to do that, you have until the 23rd. Thank you for the extension.</p> <p>The Educational Master Plan is out for feedback. That e-mail came from "SBVC information" reminding us about the feedback on that plan, and we have until November 30<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>J. Herrera: I remember in the meeting, they said we were going to work with the Deans in the individual areas to try to do meetings. Are we still doing that?</p> <p>D. Burns-Peters: Working with the Deans to do individual meetings for the feedback on the Master Plan. I don't have the answer to that.</p> <p>J. Herrera: I didn't know if that was actually going to happen. I would rather do it if we were not going to meet.</p> <p>D. Burns-Peters: That's fair. Joanna, take note and maybe let us know how we might manage that. Thank you. OK. I'm going to end my report there.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Committee Reports</b>  <b>a. Program Review</b>  <b>b. Curriculum</b></p>	<p><b>Committee Reports</b>  <b>a. Program Review</b>  D. Burns-Peters: We do have a presentation on program review later on this agenda under 9c. Informational Items.</p> <p><b>b. Curriculum</b>  B. Tasaka: We are in the very early stages of addressing AB928, which is the change in the GE pattern. I want it to be known that we're in the early stages of getting the group together. We're calling it a planning group. It is a foundational group only. The intent is to spend time over the next semester and beyond bringing in other voices that need to be included in that process. A great example is when we were at Leticia's division meeting and Susie Mattson, in Communication Studies, said that we want a voice, and we said absolutely. We will bring you in when the time comes to talk about that particular area. I want it to be known that's being put together.</p> <p>This is a faculty-driven process that the Curriculum Committee and Senate support; we brought it to the exec team. We've requested that a handful of counselors be involved in this process. We are in the process of working on that. I want to emphasize that we want to get ahead of the ball regarding AB928. We don't want this to be a catch-up after the fact. How do we get to where we need to be? We really want to be ahead of it. We really want to be planning and be as proactive as possible, not reactive. I want to say thank you to our Senate Exec team to the Curriculum Committee for supporting these efforts because it's really important that there's trust in this process and that we will get done what we need to get done. Thank you very much.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Additional Reports</b>  <b>a. CTA</b>  <b>b. Other</b></p>	<p><b>Additional Reports</b>  <b>a. CTA</b>  B. Williams: The general membership meeting is tomorrow from 5 pm to 7 pm. We really appreciate your support if you would come out. It's updating the faculty on a couple of things. If you have questions or if we can do something for you, know that we are here, and you can reach out to us.</p>	

		<p>Thank you.</p> <p><b>b. Other</b> None</p>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>SBVC President's Report</b>	<b>None</b>	
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Consent Agenda</b></p> <p><b>a. Approval of the minutes for 10/19/22 and 11/2/22</b></p>	<b>Motion 1</b>	<p><b>Motion 1: Move to approve minutes for 10/19/22 &amp; 11/2/22.</b></p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup>: J. Herrera</b></p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup>: B. Tasaka</b></p> <p><b>20 Responses</b></p> <p><b>Aye: 85% (17 votes)</b></p> <p><b>Nay: 0% (0 votes)</b></p> <p><b>Abstain: 15% (3 votes)</b></p> <p><b>Motion passes</b></p>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Action Agenda</b>	<b>None</b>	
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>Information Items</b></p> <p><b>a. District Support Offices and Student Services Reorg: Kristina Hannon (rescheduled from 11/2/22)</b></p> <p><b>b. First Read: Student Equity Plan (rescheduled from 11/2/22)</b></p> <p><b>c. Program Review: Efficacy Pilot Program for Spring 2023</b></p> <p><b>d. Baccalaureate Degree: Application Process</b></p> <p><b>1. Selection Process</b></p> <p><b>2. Rubric and Parameters</b></p> <p><b>3. Workgroup</b></p>	<p><b>Information Items</b></p> <p><b>a. District Support Offices and Student Services Reorg: Kristina Hannon (rescheduled from 11/2/22)</b></p> <p>D. Burns-Peters: Kristina Hannon is joining us via Zoom. Being back in person and semi-remote, it can be a challenge, so we are accommodating. We do want her to present this information that needs to go to the board of trustees. They wanted to make sure that that has been covered here as an information item before that happens.</p> <p>K. Hannon: Thank you all for accommodating me today. I'm here to talk briefly about two reorgs that are happening in the district and to talk about the process, then open it up for questions. I will be sharing just some general information specific to the DSO. I can send this to you for your records. The plan is to have a first read for the reorg in December. The documents that we'll be sending to the board for a first read will be sent to the Senate if you ever wanted to ask questions or to clarify any of the information that's given today.</p> <p>We'll do a final read and implementation as of January. I'll start with the DSO reorg. Over the last few months, we have been looking at ways of becoming more efficient and operating in ways that are more meaningful and helpful to the campuses. The DSO (District Support Operations) is comprised of Human Resources, Fiscal and Business services, physical business services, facilities, and construction under Farrah's [Farzaneh] team, technology services. EDCT (Economic Development &amp; Corporate Training), Police Department, the Chancellor's office, Governmental Relations, and KVCR. That's what comprises the District Support Operations or the DSO.</p> <p>As managers, we got together and started talking about ways we could look at our areas to utilize technology to become more efficient and productive without costing money. Specific to Human Resources, in April and May, I lost two of my managers to other organizations. I had to start looking internally at what to do. We also knew that we were going to be having some retirements coming up. We needed to accommodate and work within what was going to be happening with those. As a result, we did start looking at a reorganization that made sense. A reorganization that would utilize how we do</p>	

business and change how we do business for the betterment of our district and the betterment of the campuses.

What I'm going to show you are the positions that will be eliminated due to a vacancy or someone who has vacated the position and is no longer coming back. Since this spreadsheet has been prepared, we've already had several changes happen. This is another reason why I'm not sharing anything today. When I went to Crafton, same thing. I shared my screen, but they didn't take anything away because things have already changed from that point to this point. We have had some resignations since that time. Some additional people have decided to vacate their positions. This will be a live document and a moving process. That is why the first read will go in December, and the second read will happen in January.

In Human Resources, we have two management positions that will be eliminated. We will also say goodbye to Colleen Gamboa at the end of this year. She will be retiring. We will say goodbye to Susan Ryckevic. We will have a vacant director of audit. We have the telecommunication specialist, which is a CSEA (California School Employees Association) position. These positions are not going to be recruited for. They will not be backfilled. We are going to be merging roles, merging duties, reanalyzing, and reimagining how we're working, and we're making it work within personnel that we already have. There will be some changes in Human Resources. Right now, we have Tiffany and Karla working as interim associate directors. Karla's focus besides Human Resources has been Payroll Services. Many of the administrative functions that Colleen has been performing will be transferred over to Karla. We're also looking at the duties and the structure of the payroll team and making sure that we're working with CSEA on updating their job descriptions and capturing any work or any gaps in work that we will see with Colleen's retirement.

One question that was asked, which I think is important for everyone to know, is how are we going to ensure we have internal controls when it comes to the creation of positions and when it comes to certain things that happen right now? There are a number of checks and balances. Human Resources has to check off on some things as does Payroll Services, Fiscal Services, each Campus, and Administrative Services. There's a lot of checks and balances when it comes to position creation or comes to the use of money and personnel. Some of those things will remain in Fiscal Services. Larry [Strong] and his team will determine who will be the final authority over certain things that Colleen or Susan used to sign off on. Just because Payroll and Human Resources are merging, those internal controls will still be maintained. As a result, Human Resources can't be the one all, the beginning, and the end of positional control. We may be the start or the finish, but we can't be both ends. Fiscal services will have to have a role and authority in that process. I know that was a lot, but that is important for everyone to know that we won't have this authority to do whatever we want. There are those checks and balances that will remain.

D. Burns-Peters: There was a question. Will this be shared at all?

K. Hannon: Yes. This will be part of the first read document.

Because we are not backfilling for these productions, that does render a net savings of \$965,000. We will look internally to do some updates, specifically in Human Resources. When you eliminate two management positions, even though we have our associate directors, they're also taking on additional

roles. Karla will be taking on all the Payroll Administrative Services. Again, some of those items will stay at Fiscal Services, but the majority of them, the employee-facing ones, will remain with Karla. Tiffany will take on a more active role in our police services area. As you know, the Police Department does report to me, but we also need just that additional alignment and support. They don't have the same job description, but one has a focus section on Payroll, and one has a focus section on Police Services. This is for you to know that if you have a payroll or police services question, you can always reach out to me, but you can also reach out to Karla or Tiffany.

We have our HR analysts, Jenea Jacoby, and Melanie Gonzales. They will be taking on a more supervisory role over their program, meaning Jenae will be able to officially supervise our benefits, our leads, and our ADA program, and that is important when working with our outside vendors. Many times, I have to be the final authority because I'm the name that's listed on every single document, but for some of these things, Jenea can oversee. She will be the benefits person that will represent benefits, leads, and ADA for HR out there externally. Melanie works behind the scenes, but she will maintain our employee records, HRIS, MIS, and many things of that sort. We worked with our Neo Gov system and are now using that for our talent and recruitment. We'd like to eventually merge it for training and tracking as well as with other systems. We're excited about the work that we're doing. There was a component of MIS that Colleen was doing, and we've gone through this process over the last six months to understand her job. She had her hand in a lot of different things, and so she will be missed. I told her we can't replace you, so that's why there will be about 10 of us doing your job. Those are some things that will be added to those job descriptions.

We have executive assistants, those who support our area. Brooke [Quinones] is my executive assistant. Kelly [Goodrich] is Jose's (Jose Torres, Executive Vice Chancellor, Fiscal, Administrative, & Media). We will be recruiting an executive assistant. I believe that should be going out, if it hasn't already, for Dr. Ornelas (Nohemy Ornelas, Ed.D., Vice Chancellor, Education & Student Services) to have for her area. Then we have Heather [Ford], who supports the Chancellor's area. We added those in as well, just so that it's reflected on this document.

We have Stacy Holloway, who's at Valley [College], and will be a senior generalist. She will still work on recruitment and will be there for any of your HR needs. You might see her involved more in our Worker's Comp. world and EDA world and doing slightly more with higher level items to help support our Associate Directors, as well as Jenae and Melanie. Christine will remain in her role, and nothing will change with her job description. We just received notification that we've lost another generalist stationed at the district office. Karen Thomas was at Crafton [Hills College], and then over the summer, she was moved to the district office. She's taking on a different role now. You are going to see us recruiting two generalists. One of those would be a captured here, and one is her vacancy. We feel that's the best route to go when it comes to those changes. I will not jump into all these changes because these make sense for those areas.

We know that now, Tenille [Norris] is Interim Vice President of Administrative Services (SBVC) but back home at the DSO, she is our Associate Director of Fiscal Services. We are looking to have two Associate Directors at Fiscal Services instead of having an Associate Director and a Manager. We will make those equal positions similar to how I will have two associate directors. Fiscal services will change Jorge

[Andrade] from Accounting Services Manager to Associate Director of Fiscal Services. I don't want you to think Tenille's job is gone. That job is still there, but in the event of whatever happens with the recruitment, then we will determine what will happen with that recruitment for her. We are have already started having conversations with CSEA and so to accommodate for Susan's loss. We will be updating Lidya [Alamsyah] to Senior Accountant. We will be having some changes in our purchasing area. Our Purchasing Assistant will be upgraded to Purchasing technician. We have already made a custodian as a lead custodian.

I'll pause here and talk about two changes that are being made. First, our Senior Director of Marketing, Public Relations, and Legislative Affairs was reclassified to Associate Vice Chancellor and is Angel Rodriquez. Let me briefly explain the process that happened with that.

A. Aguilar: What happened to the Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Services position (Jose Torres), and why isn't payroll running under that?

K. Hannon: Nothing. It is still the same.

A. Aguilar: Why is payroll moving to HR? Was it always under HR?

K. Hannon: Payroll is moving to HR because we're losing Colleen as Payroll Manager, and there was a lot of duplicate work done at HR and Payroll Services. We did an analysis and looked at all multi-college districts in the State of California to determine which ones have Payroll under Business and Fiscal Services or which ones have Payroll under Human Resources. It was almost an even 50/50 split. It is common to have Payroll under Human Resources because there is a lot of duplicate work. In our structure, we just had Payroll under Fiscal Services.

Jose [Torres] oversees Fiscal Services, Business Services, Facilities, and KVCR. He's also acting Chancellor, as stated in our board policy, because he is the Executive Vice Chancellor. He will always maintain that Executive Vice Chancellor designation because in the event that our Chancellor is out, it automatically kicks to Jose as acting Chancellor.

Two positions were held off from being reclassified with the other management positions. You may know CSEA went through and had its classification study, which ended last year. We finally signed off and implemented it in the spring of 2022. Anytime you have a classification study, which should happen every three to four years, we have by practice, as long as I've been in my leadership role, to also look at management roles. Changing a classified position could impact a change to a management role. There are a handful of faculty roles that do have a job description that we would also look at. We do look at those job descriptions anytime we're looking at classifications to make sure that we are having people do appropriate work. The law is very clear in delineating work between faculty, classified, and management. We always look anytime there's a new recruitment, per their contract and the Ed code. We did a full study for CSEA. Then starting in January 2022, we engaged with managers and said, "Hey, send in your PDQ," which is a Position Description Questionnaire. This questionnaire basically has them look at the job description and completely fill out what duties are being done, what duties are no longer being done for that position, what duties they are doing but are not found in the job description, the frequency, duration, and the level of importance or severity of that work. We analyze that, and we have seven different districts that we use to do our salary comparisons and use to do our CSEA classification study. As a result, in June of 2022, we had a number of managers that were found to be

working out outside of the scope of their job over that period of time. The law says if it's a gradual accretion of duties over a certain period of time, you then have to take another look and determine if you're going to reclassify them.

Angel's position, Christopher Cruz's position, and a number of positions that were found in the student services world were found to be working outside and in a higher scope of the job, with a gradual accretion of their duties over time. As a result, we do have an obligation to reclassify them into the appropriate position. The reason why that didn't happen in June for Angel or for Dr. Crew and for the position at Crafton and the positions at Valley, for just those student services, is because we knew that this was going to be coming. We said let's pause because it's June. Now we're done, but because we're going to start having conversations about the reorg, we don't want to reclassify people when everything hasn't been settled yet. However, the law does say that people that are found to be working out of class do need to be made whole.

We did wait until the faculty was back in August-September to announce that these positions were being reclassified because there was a question, "Why did you reclassify them in August-September, yet the reorg isn't happening, or it's not being finalized until December-January?" We had to recognize and make them whole for the work that they were already doing. For some work will be added. For example, my area and Karla's position. She's already crashed training when it comes to payroll services, but she's not going to be the supervisor over payroll until this is fully implemented, although she has been working at that higher scope. This happened with the Senior Director of Marketing, which has now passed and reclassified to Associate Vice Chancellor, Governmental Relations and Strategic Communication. The same goes for Dr. Crew, who was a CSEA member working out of class that was found to be working out of class at an even higher rate. Dr. Crew will be reclassified as Executive Director of Research Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. We've already had conversations with CSEA and recognize that the work that he was doing was outside of the scope of the work that he was assigned.

That is important to know when it comes to having the conversation about student services because that happened a lot more on the campuses, and so that might be a little bit more relevant for you than the work that was happening at the DSO. Through this reorg, after we looked at the past positions and subsequent positions, can we incorporate and merge with other positions? Once we did that work, we said, "OK, now we have an opportunity to look at where gaps still exist." This HR Personnel Records Coordinator position is the one I'm going to turn into a generalist because we realized that we have an opportunity to have someone that can do multiple things instead of focusing only on personnel records. There are different records for payroll than there are for HR, and there also are some that are combined. Everyone will have to take part in knowing and understanding that. This position is a new position that we will be recruiting for. Senior Program Analyst in Education and Student Support Services is to replace Dr. Cruz's position that he was in when he was a CSEA member. A Video Communications Producer is a position we already have, but its funding is being split 50% bond and 50% general fund. That rendered a cost of \$615,000. I'm sorry, I forgot to mention this amount up here. Once we did the reclassifications, that was \$323,000. Three positions are categorically funded, so they're not using general funds and are not included. The total difference of doing this reorg and reimagining how we're working has a savings of \$26,000. I know that's not a lot, but it shows that we



are not just going to keep copying and pasting negative vacancies and say, "OK. We're going to recruit." Every single time we're going to cost. We are going to say, "What makes sense? Who's doing what? Can we still be efficient? Can we still utilize technology in a way so that way we can make a determination if we do need to backfill this position? or do we need to make other types of changes?" Because we have this way of thinking, we were able to save the district money.

I don't have a document to share for the Student Services reorg because that one was slightly different. Similar to what I explained for our Dr. Crew and for Angel Rodriguez, the same things happen when we were looking at the classification and Position Description Questionnaire for all of our managers. We saw that there was a manager, specifically at Valley, that was working as a Director in Student Life, that's Dr. Rick Carlos, who was doing similar work if not the same or sometimes even higher work than a Dean position in Counseling Services at Crafton. We had a similar issue with Rejoice Chavira at Crafton who is the Director of EOPS/CARE/CalWORKs, that was doing the job of multiple directors at Valley. We paused and said, "Hey. We may have a problem." It's not a bad problem to have, but it's a problem that HR doesn't want to keep duplicating. When you have directors or you have managers that are working for the same district using the same job description but doing work found outside it—for example, they are director here, but they're doing work that is qualified or considered teamwork at Crafton, or you're doing directorate here, but that's vice president work at Valley. It could even happen with the district office—then we had to pause, bring everyone together, and say how do we make this right?

After some discussion at cabinet and then further discussions with our Vice President and President, we determined that we would create a general Dean position for student services similar to how the division Deans are generalized in instructional services but then have like a working title underneath it. For example, if you're Dean of Student Services but you're working title, or your internal title would be that you oversee admissions and records, financial aid, SAS or EOPS, or whatnot, but your title and your job description would be Dean. Then we also created an Associate Dean position. We are looking at the Associate Dean positions in the instructional world, but we did capture the Associate Dean position for Student Services. There were changes on both campuses due to the PDQ and the reclassification process. There are going to be additional things that are going to be added as legislation changes, as different grants change, and that may be incorporated into the current Dean or Associate Dean job descriptions.

T. Vasquez: I have one question, but it's part A and part B. When you ask about reclassification, you say that there was a questionnaire being asked about what are the roles that people were doing in their reclassification study. Part A is... What if the person in that position was an interim, and they don't really know what the description of the job really is? They're just trying to continue to occupy that position. Obviously, they're helping out, but they don't have the full idea of what that position is compared to somebody who has been in that position for a long time. Maybe after 25 years they understand what their position is about. So, the information being shared is incomplete. That's one part of the process of I think that there's flaws. Then there's the flaws of what if you actually answer those questions where you actually are taking up a lot more duties, they don't belong to you, but you are informing the public that you're doing all of these duties, but they're not really part of your job description itself. Then we actually are going into a circular effect because then we actually are like making the job description changes because of that information that was provided and not necessarily

because it was what is needed to be done. There are two kinds, incomplete information and then the information that might not be accurate at all because it is just subjective to what I'm doing. I actually do a lot of different jobs myself. That doesn't mean that my job description is going to get amplified. I'm trying to kind of figure out where are the checks and balances of the flaws in the system. It seems to be accurate, but it's not accurate, and there's no accuracy in the information you guys are receiving. How do we know that is accurate?

K. Hannon: OK. That was a great question, and I can clear that up. The PDQ has two sections. It has a section for the incumbent or the person filling it out based on their experiences. It's 17 pages long, and they fill that part out based on their experiences. What they have been doing day in and day out. The second section is for their supervisor. If there's anyone that should know what you are doing it is the supervisor. In the management world, that is the case. Supervisors should know and be aware of the work that their managers are performing. That by itself doesn't trigger a change in the job description. Title 5 says that the board shall prescribe the duties and that work has been delegated to me. We don't just take what someone is doing and say, "Oh, now we're going to change the job description." Even if that manager says, "Yes. This is what they're doing." Especially if that is a shared job description across the entire district. Which this case was. That's why we brought in the Vice Presidents and the Presidents to help further the conversation. Part of the classification analysis is not just internal alignment. It's also external alignment. We look at job descriptions from our comparison agencies. Those seven agencies that I was talking about, we actually look at those job descriptions. We're focusing on multi-college districts similar to ours that have, for lack of a better term, a bigger and then smaller set of campuses or different demographics. We're not just looking at those around us. We're not just looking at Orange County. We're actually looking at other community colleges that operate similarly to ours to determine whether this work makes sense being in this job description. Then we make changes based on the external alignment. We look at how they pay. What are the additional duties that they do?

One example, some agencies have enrollment management built into the Dean position. It's part of the Dean's job description to be a member of enrollment management but actually do certain strategies. Other agencies will have a Dean of Enrollment Management. Does that mean the Dean that is there has never done enrollment management? There is a chance they have. We don't know until we see that PDQ, and then we ask the manager, then we look externally. We bring that information back. Then all management job descriptions go back through Cabinet. The final check and balance are, "Hey, presidents. Hey, Vice Chancellor of HR. Hey, Vice Chancellor of Education and Student Support Services. This is the work that we've done. This is the methodology we use. These are the steps that we follow. Do we agree that we are going to change this job description, or is it not going to be changed?" Those are the steps that are followed.

If it is incomplete, then there should be a manager that's able to help fill it in. If there are things that a person didn't put in their PDQ or have been doing naturally just because that's just how they are... I think we all, to some extent we do go above and beyond because that's why we chose to serve in this community, but the law says if that work has been valued at a higher scope and rate, we at HR have an obligation to look into it.

Now there have been times, and this has been more in the classified range, not necessarily managers.

In the classified world, there have been times when somebody, like myself, when I was at another agency. I was an overachiever. I was doing everything, and they sat me down and said you're only getting paid for this, and you will only continue to get paid for this. Stop overachieving, and instead of making it right and upgrading, I was told to stop. Which that agency has the right to tell me to stop. I'm not sure if that helps with your question, but it's not just based on the PDQ. There are a number of things that we looked at before we change.

T. Vasquez: So as a concern, I'm expressing a concern, you still have flaws in the system and how you're evaluating, because you might have places where there's inexperienced managers answering those questions. There are managers who don't necessarily know exactly what that job is, so you're also going to have incomplete information or also inaccurate. Not intentional, right, like nobody here is, you know, misaligning things, but unintentionally you're going to get information that might not be the case. Also, as you're doing comparatives, there are so many variables in this. I want to express the concern that there's some recodification that is happening that does not really have a clear picture of the checks and balances. That really is my concern.

K. Hannon: Internally, we have them. I appreciate your concern and I have been told that there have been a lot of questions, but we do try our best. There is never going to be 100%. I'm not sure if you heard all the pain that they had to go through with CSEA when you're looking at over 100 positions and getting PDQ from some groups that have 17 people using the same job description but are doing 17 different things. That's why as a district, the final bucket is with me. What makes sense? What have my colleagues said? This is how we're going to operate and move. Yes, the human experience is very important. The external alignment and reviewing what they do is very important. At the end of the day, We come together as the leaders and say, "OK. Yeah. This is what's in the best interest of this work." We always have the opportunity to improve. We will be talking about the reclassification process as outlined in CSEA CBA. We do talk about it more with CSEA than with faculty service because, as I said, there are only a handful of faculty job descriptions. We do take your feedback seriously, and it's similar to feedback that we've had. We have to use all the methods that are in front of us and all the information that's been provided to us to make the right decision.

A. Hecht: Listening to you and hearing the changes that have been already made, but I'm also part of the student equity. I just looked over the EMP that was sent out. I looked at our new vision statement with our new mission, and our new values, and all of it pretty much directs to inclusion. I'm not feeling that. I'm not feeling that belonging because when we hire or move classification, you said these people worked above and beyond. At your last job, you were told no. All of us faculty work above and beyond. Our temporary full-time faculty work above and beyond. Our adjuncts are told don't keep working because we're not going to move them up. You have to work a certain amount, 23 hours. If you work over that, we're not going to move you up. So, we have to really monitor those hours. Where here, I'm seeing you're not monitoring that. It's like, oh, I can do above and beyond because I'm going to be reclassified. That's what I'm seeing. Then, when you talk about hiring a new Dean, I'm in student services, so I do want to be a part of that. Why wasn't I or any student services, like nonstructural and counselors, involved with that? Now, this Dean is going to oversee us. That's a concern for me. Not only that, but maybe I wanted that leadership role. How do I get a part of that if now you hired a new Dean, and I don't even know what this is? Did that Dean have faculty under them because I know all my other Deans have faculty under them, but this new Dean, I have no idea. These are high concerns that I have, not just for myself but for my colleagues.

K. Hannon: Thank you for that, Andrea. Let me clarify. No one was hired. The law states that if someone is working that has a gradual accretion of duties and working outside of the scope of their job over a period of time, as the employer, as the person overseeing Human Resources, I have an obligation to either stop them from doing that, and say, "Sorry, you need to stop," or we say, "OK. What's going to happen?" A Dean's position was created through the reclassification process. That Dean was performing the same work that a Dean at our sister campus was performing. That person was a director, and they were performing Dean level work. That was the issue that came up. It was the same with the Director of EOPS at Crafton, who was performing the work of two managers at Valley. So, we had to pause and say how do we do what the law tells us to do for this person's experience and does it make sense. As far as reporting relationships or whatnot. If this was a recruitment, of course, we run a recruitment, and we have all of that. But this was a reclassification, which is different. It's a personnel action that happens for that person and their experience. To the point of the question regarding somebody that does it on purpose, again, there are checks and balances in place to ensure that doesn't happen. What happened, in this case, was that we did the PDQ, which we hadn't done in a while. When we do the PDQ, we look at it. We just finished with the CSEA. There were some major changes with our CSEA job descriptions that, by natural design, practically changed management.

A. Hecht: When you're talking about two different managers doing that job at Crafton that has a lower student population than we do. We have way more than they have. They have what 4 to 5 thousand students and how many do we have 17 to 18 thousand. You're saying two managers over here, and they're going to move up that position over at Crafton because two managers do it here or whatnot. But we have to do it here because we have more students here. Then you're looking at a Dean position at Crafton, and they have a lot less faculty, a lot less students, and a lot less classified. But you're telling them, "Oh wait, here at Valley because we're going to compare it over there, it's the same role." I don't think it is. There are a lot of students here.

K. Hannon: Unfortunately, the law, when it comes to equal pay for equal work, doesn't designate numbers. It would be similar if we said for faculty, at the time of census, who only have 10 and their class, "Hey. We're going to cut your pay because you have fewer students in your class." That wouldn't be fair because that's not what the law says. I do understand that there is a difference of opinion when it comes to how we do reclassifications, but we do reclassifications based on what the law tells us how we have to do it. As an agency, we hadn't done a true classification study in over 20 years. For the last 20 years, especially for our classified professionals, we have been working in jobs that were obsolete. We still had chalkboards in some of their job descriptions. We still have antiquated language in some of their job descriptions as of 2021 and 2022. We have to have a benchmark for getting better, and so this was the first step in what makes sense how we are reimagining and reorganizing in a way that we're going to be able to get better and build upon that. Looking at Crafton and saying that the numbers are different, that's true the numbers are different, but the work is the same. The law says equal pay for equal work, not as long as it's the same amount of students.

D. Burns-Peters: There's been a lot of interest in what you're sharing. Can I ask the body now to process this information? Should you have any other questions, reach out directly to Kristina Hannon. We've been waiting for this information. I think a lot of it was transparent, showing the budget and that information. Thank you for that. Any of that you can share with us would be appreciated. I am going to ask you a question that you probably cannot answer right now, but the body's asking. When will we know (SBVC President Search)?

K. Hannon: We're still conducting reference checks.

D. Burns-Peters: OK. Thank you.

**b. First Read: Student Equity Plan (rescheduled from 11/2/22)**

D. Burns-Peters: The first read of the student equity plan. We met yesterday as a workgroup. A date of November 30th was set as the final input date for any other feedback that the workgroup has. Compiling all of the constituent body input by making sure everything is there so it can then be put into a presentable form. It was agreed that we would bring that to the November 30th and the December 7th Academic meetings, which is in alignment with the extension that we were granted. I think I mentioned that there was an extension request which had been offered to many campuses. We were just one of them. That will be submitted on December 15<sup>th</sup>.

**c. Program Review: Efficacy Pilot Program for Spring 2023**

J. Lemieux: We've been devising the new SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, & Threats) efficacy. A reimagining of the efficacy system and it's a series of small reports over the course of several years. We've got a draft of a new type of report that we want to do that's much shorter. What we're looking for is feedback. We are going to roll this out in the fall (2023), but we wanted to make sure that it's coming out right. So, in the spring (2023), we would like to have about 20 constituent groups on campus volunteer to fill out the three-to-six-page short SWOT efficacy report early. This would be in the spring of this year. We would have one meeting at the beginning of spring and one in the middle of April to evaluate your feedback.

We would like to get volunteers for that. On your table, you may have several copies of a document with the QR code. This is where you can provide your name and your department and let us know that you would like to write this in the spring. Then we will evaluate your feedback for the true rollout in the fall. We're asking you to sign up for this and to communicate or to e-mail the chairs, Celia or Joanne. Sign up to have the meeting with us on January 12th before the semester starts and April 11<sup>th</sup>, which would be the follow-up meeting. The volunteers would provide constructive feedback to the committee about our process and instructions to make sure it's understandable and what everyone is looking for. This new FCC report is meant to be easier to write, more user-friendly, and meant to be one that we will all collaborate on throughout the year because we'll all be focusing on these smaller parts of the efficacy report instead of one job.

If you would like to see this early and participate in the development of it. Please scan this QR code. Grab one of these sheets on the left of your table and scan QR code. Put your name and department in to communicate with us, and we will get back to you to set up this meeting for January 12th to begin the work. Then evaluate your feedback in April.

R. Hamdy: I sent a communication with a survey. A lot of the feedback was for more time to do work that we would have to do throughout the semester anyway. When I spoke with Celia when she was feeling a little bit better. I think now she's on the mend but still not 100%. We decided that two in-service days, January 12th and April 11th, will have two blocks of time where those people that are in that pilot program, those 20 constituents, will be in B100 working on everything that the Program Review Committee is going to take them through. Then they'll work on some additional stuff throughout the semester. Then there will be a culminating meeting on April 11<sup>th</sup>, which is also an in-service day. We're really trying to utilize that faculty focus time to do this work. Even though we recognize that there will

be other folks that are not faculty working on their program review because I think the Program Review Committee is really trying to get as cross-disciplinary and cross-areas as possible. I just wanted to point those times out. They're not like additional times that people would have to come in extra. They're already in-service days and for those not participating in the program review process, there will be other concurrent running workshops and times that folks can engage in other activities. Thank you.

D. Burns-Peters: Thank you, Jesse, for that presentation, and what a great opportunity to help shape program efficacy. Program needs are done now, but program efficacy is in the future. There's been a lot of talk about making that less of a burden for us as faculty and less overwhelming. I've known chairs to say, "I'm not going to be chair because of that document." That is not OK so. The team is doing a lot of intentional work to change that. This is your opportunity to test it out and see if it works so we can find the gaps.

**d. Baccalaureate Degree: Application Process**

D. Burns-Peters: You should have received an e-mail announcing the application process for the baccalaureate program. The baccalaureate program is re-opened. It came around last year sometime with a very short turnaround. There was no time to respond efficiently. We were not ready at all, but here we are again. This will potentially be a yearly process, but we never know. We might find that things change, and they get bottlenecked. The window is open now, and we would like to strike while the iron is hot and take advantage for our students. Here are a few of the strategic goals that it aligns with if we were to bring a program to our campus. It aligns with our current strategic goals. I can tell you it will align with what's coming, but I don't have those numbers yet. It does align with our current strategic goals as well as with the district's strategic goals. The intention behind the process of considering the baccalaureate program is to be student-centered in our decision-making and not have it be a half-hazard process or the loudest voice or the most excited people. Rather, to be student-centered in that decision-making, have transparency, and to be as inclusive as possible with a quick and efficient response because we don't have any choice on that one. It's still a very quick response, and to provide Senate support behind that.

We do have a workgroup established for this. The purpose is to communicate with you and with the campus regarding the process and to get input which is in that e-mail that went out. There's an interest form. Please fill out that interest form. It is being encouraged for anybody to fill that out because it's also got feedback about prioritizing what we should consider as a workgroup with the selection process. The membership of the work group at this point is the Curriculum Coordinator, Articulation Officer, Curriculum Chair, Program Review Chair, Senate President, Academics Senate Secretary, and the Vice President of Instruction, with the recognition that as we move forward, we may need to add people to this group based on the needs at that time. I believe this to be a fairly inclusive group in terms of the key stakeholders and the key people to start the conversation and get that ball rolling.

There is a timeline. This was included in the e-mail. The only difference is we said November 8th through the 23rd. I put the 28th as the last date of input. Sorry Dr. Humble, but in recognition that we're on break, we're not meeting as a workgroup until the 30th. We have changed that to the 28th to allow a little more time for you to include and input your feedback and fill out that interest form. If you have a program that is CTE program— let me highlight that this is only for CTE programs—that you believe would be of value to become a baccalaureate program. You will want to make sure you fill this

out. Doing so indicates your interest. It's a yes, I'm interested, or no, I'm not interested, or maybe. As you can see, the application is due January 13th.

Once the program or programs are selected, there is a lot of work to be done over the break. There is a commitment to support that work through that break. You won't be working for free, but it will be a lot of work nonetheless. Just being transparent there. What I wanted to present to you today is the idea that we don't want to be just randomly selecting programs. We don't want to randomly say this sounds like a really great program. Let's pick that one. Let's support it and push it through. Rather we should be transparent and thoughtful about that. We are relying heavily on the California Community Colleges Chancellor's office for that input.

There is an application form that they have, and it is very detailed. We should not be wavering too far from that because that's what they will use for their selection. Just because you apply doesn't mean you get selected. For example, one of the pieces in that selection and application process is the need to address whether or not your proposed program has an associate degree. In the rubric, it is yes, or no. You get points for having an Associate's Degree and not so many if you don't. They have a rubric to determine their selection process. We will be using that same criterion minus the first top two. I do want to point out that our rubric may be weighted a little differently. There is a point system, but in that feedback form, it asks you to inform us of what you think is the emphasis. Is student success the most important thing to emphasize? Is workforce entry the most important thing to emphasize? We need to look at that as a committee. The points will stay the same, but we might need to know what the campus believes to be the strongest thing to consider when looking at the various programs. That e-mail went out yesterday, and within an hour, we had like 21 responses. I don't know what that means. These are the rubric pieces that we can look at: Labor market demand and the research office, as well as the district research office, are in support and helping us get all that data, including Katie and others. There's a whole team working on getting this data together; Institutional capacity is really important for us to know so we can support this program if we bring it here. Do we need to build a new building to have that program? This might not be realistic, but if it is not, what kind of resources do we need? Questions that address that; and the actual design of the program, intersegmental alignment, and the overall concept.

Grounded in all of this and when you look at the rubric—the Chancellor's office rubric is very detailed—it centers around student success. Are students already succeeding in the program? Do we have a successful program already that we can then lift up? The rubric also looks very strongly at the upward mobility of students if they were to complete a bachelor's degree. For example, if getting a bachelor's is just a really cool thing for that student, but it's not going to help them with income or move them up the ladder in terms of workforce, is that something we want to promote as a campus? Probably not. That's something that we need to look at. The rubric is very detailed that way. The next steps are to share with your department and share with your division. Please get this out there. It is a short turnaround, but I know we can do it because news travels fast when we want it to. Complete that form, and then the Senate body getting behind it and supporting it. I don't want to push an agenda, but it aligns with our strategic goals. It's in alignment with the desire of the Chancellor. Crafton does have a Respiratory Therapy Baccalaureate program. This is an opportunity for our students to receive a bachelor's degree at the community college level and community college prices. I think it's a great

		<p>opportunity.</p> <p>A. Avelar: It is a great opportunity, but I think in all of our excitement, let's not forget the workload component because I can already picture some manager saying it's not extra work. If you're going to offer up for division work classes, then yeah, it's extra work to develop all that curriculum. I think it should also be in conjunction, negotiated, and also a fast turnaround, but are union people need to know so that our faculty are protected when they're doing this important work because we don't have that nice vice chancellor to do that whole reorg and reclassification to make sure we're compensated for all the good work we do.</p> <p>D. Burns-Peters: That is an important piece of it. The support piece of it. The work that it's going to take and it's not just the application process. There's curriculum to be developed. The minimum qualifications for those positions are also different. They're higher. There's a lot of curriculum-level work to be done in terms of articulation and GE requirements. It will be a big task. The intent is to support that work and keep that at the forefront. Thank you for that. The chairs will be heavily involved as well. This is still a great opportunity, but let's be thoughtful about that. If the time is not right now, you can hit "maybe" on that form. When that cycle comes back around, that might be the glue for us to say, OK, it's open again, and now's the time.</p>	
10.	<p>AP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BOT 2<sup>nd</sup> Read (constituent feedback incorporated) 2220, 2345, 2720, 2725, 6305, 6370</li> <li>• BOT 1<sup>st</sup> Read (constituent feedback provided) 2350, 5030</li> </ul>	<p>D. Burns-Peters: We have already looked at these AP's. I'm just giving you an update on where they are heading. I will tell you on 2030, where there was a change to the public comment time that has been addressed. The intent of the board was to add more voice in 20 minutes, not have less voice. The intent was to have 3 minutes per person at a total of 20 minutes. They go from 5 minutes per person which allows only four people in 20 minutes. With this change, it will then give almost seven people time to speak. The time total of 20 minutes has stayed the same. They are reducing it to 3 minutes per person.</p> <p>Attendee: But if there are not seven that want to talk, then it reduces the time overall.</p> <p>D. Burns-Peters: I'm happy to continue to carry that message, and I will do that.</p> <p>Attendee: Why not just make time slots longer, like 25 or 30 minutes?</p> <p>D. Burns-Peters: I will again carry that voice. I do it very well. That was the discussion that was had. I will carry that voice. I have no problem with that. That's where those AP's and BP's are. If you have any questions, let me know.</p>	
11.	Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Little Shop of Horrors, at SBVC Theatre, Dec. 1-4, 2022.</b></li> <li>• <b>Please consider a "Meet &amp; Eat" for our last meeting on December 7, 2022.</b> Maybe a potluck style.</li> </ul> <p>A. Avelar: How about we ask our Vice Presidents and Presidents office to provide because we are in the middle of the end of the semester, and guidelines and recommendations actually say we should not have meetings at the end of the semester in order to finish our work, but if we are going to have to meet.</p> <p>D. Burns-Peters: We end our meetings on December 7. I didn't put a meeting on the 14th. We'll see what we can do. Fair enough. I will send feelers out. I would like to do something a little more sociable. I do think that we could all use a little more positive social activity, especially at the end of the semester.</p>	



<b>12.</b>	<b>Adjournment Next Meeting: 11/30/2022 B100</b>	<b>Meeting Adjourned at 4:34 pm</b>	