

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 3:08 pm</b> Sign-in sheet and voting record	
2.	<b>Public Comments: non-agenda and agenda related (max. 10 minutes @ 2 minutes each)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (00:08:09): Welcome. We have not had public comment in a while. As a reminder it has always been, and it continues to be 10 minutes for public comment. Two minutes a person the only person I received a request for in advance was Diane Hunter. So I will call on her first from public comment and then we will go from there as you make yourself known. With that being said we are going to time today and again people think that we're just popping up with the time all of a sudden. We just haven't had public comment and I'm pretty sure there's more than one today.</li> <li>• D. Hunter (00:08:56): Thank you. Good afternoon. My public comment today is on behalf of all of the faculty in the liberal arts building that is soon to be torn down and become the SS D. So while the new building will be student services, the current building houses, the arts and humanities division departments, the faculty offices, as well as some other faculty offices of social sciences. Basically the work group has been meeting and there are plans in place which is pretty evident by the survey teams outside the building. Yet no one has contacted or included the faculty in some of the discussions including the writing center, lead faculty, who is Mr. Dirckson Lee. The writing center is a service area underneath the English department and provides exceptional services to students of all disciplines across the campus. In the building there are 30 faculty offices, one work room with faculty mailboxes, one event room where we host student events and student clubs and events for the English department majors, one break room, which is the only room where all of the writing center professionals and faculty can eat their lunch away from their desks and work stations. There are many, I don't know how many, I</li> </ul>	

lost count, several classrooms that we teach out in that building. The fact that there's no inclusion of faculty in the discussions about this is what we were discussing this week as a group. There seems to be a lack of transparency and inclusion and it seems to be systemic with the college and we-need to be included in that.

- T. Vasquez (00:11:38):

By the way, I didn't find this with Diane, but this actually is related to that. Our 10 plus one states in number 10, "Processes for institutional planning and budget development" and number 11, "Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate." I feel that as academic senate, we should be able to have a very clear and transparent process and procedures about institutional planning, and that includes facilities. As co-chair of the facilities and safety committee. I hear the same conversations. I as a department also felt the same thing where we were excluded from past planning. We also had consultants come in and create plans that were affecting all of us and that affects faculty, that affects classified, that affects students, and obviously we're here for students. So I want to inform that the academic senate takes this as a priority next semester as to develop specific procedures, processes, policies that are clear to everyone involved. When I say everyone, I mean classified faculty, students, where we could actually have input because it's not clear. it's not transparent. We are just kind of out here, right? You in the meeting, are you not at the meeting? And I actually hear a lot of it as a culture and safety committee and it's really difficult for me to have a solution when somebody just says, I'll get back to you on that. So I think that's wrong. Second as far as our 10 + 1, we also have policies for faculty professional development activities. We as a senate and the senators, we should be also involved in this planning process. What's involved in service days? We should be ahead of the game. In terms of in in-service days, we still don't have what's going to happen. If we plan ahead, like we plan schedules, we plan schedules six months in advance, 10 months in advance. How is it possible that we don't have planning for in-service days that will actually get better for faculty and meet non-instructional/classified needs when we have no clue what's going on. We need to be supported and the support that we need is very intentional. The curriculum dialogue means that we also meet with each other, the EMP was really helpful to figure out what we all meet with each other, but we don't have those spaces. I hope that we are doing this.

- J.Lemiux (00:14:50):

As many of us may have seen, we got a rather shockingly short email yesterday from the chancellor that we will we'll not have a new president selected. I think this goes back to same kind of thing we have talked about. I feel that that should not be [inaudible]. This is important to all of us and we don't have any explanation for why a search fails some times. I think we ought have one at least a short one. I think it's a little bit disrespectful to faculty. The email to faculty is so brief. I want to know what happened. There were a lot of people involved with a lot of work, done. Any information. It's not good [inaudible].

- L. Hector (00:16:08):

I just wanted to share just in regards to the LA building, just for clarification, that in regards to the writing center, our faculty leads Dirckson Lee. He's been part of the process as far as putting input in regards to the design and the space that's needed. I've been here over 20 years and I know that's been a complaint in the past, which is why I tried to voice the importance of that. I will say that the process seems to be changing and this regard, and really bringing in the user groups early on in the process in order to minimize problems that we are facing once the building is actually already built. In regards to

		<p>the placing of faculty that needs to move from there, which is a huge impact on our division, arts and humanities, I just want to share that I've made that very clear as well in any meetings that I've been at in order to make sure that it's there and on the list, but that conversation hasn't taken place yet. So that's just an update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (00:17:39): Yeah, so I'll also note again, I can't respond to public comment but I will say that that is noted and there is direction and a request to get very clear timeline on where people are going and at what point, temporarily, permanently, all of those things. We're good. We're done. All right.</li> </ul>	
3.	Senate President's Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (00:18:24): I just want to first of all say woo, we've almost made it through the semester. Almost. I recognize that some of us are crawling to the finish line. Maybe a little scratched up and marred by this asphalt we are crawling across. Some of us are half asleep due to our energy levels and I don't think any of us are outside of that experience. We're all carrying something, getting to the end of the semester. We might be drowning in grading and taking care of your students. I recognize that this time of the semester, our student energy is certainly ramping up, right? I'm not getting the classroom at the moment, but I have a college student at home so I get it. I still live, I should say. I still experience that student perspective. So I understand that that's where our feet have been and so as I said the last time do what we can to lift each other up and get to the finish line. Because it's close. It's close. It doesn't mean our work is done though, right? It's just a pause point and it's like a little reset point. When I hear people like, oh, I'm going to be better two years from now or New Year's resolutions. They're like, ah, just more of the same. But those pause points are important for us to just stop in and kind of reflect what we've done for a semester or what we intend to do next semester and know that that will be the same for senate. We have not had an exec meeting for a couple of weeks because of the way the holidays have fallen and the fifth meetings, et cetera. But that my intention is to do the same as Senate is to have that pause, that reflection. Where are we at? A lot of our energy was spent on our planning this year making sure that we did the best we could to have that be representative, inclusive, and collegial. I think we were finally able to do that with some success. With that being said, next semester will be filled with implementation. Which will bring a lot of stuff to senate, right? As implementation comes into play senate is going to need to look at a lot of that. We also have the Baccalaureate program coming. I will say coming but there's work to be done there. There will be some curriculum stuff forthcoming. So there's just going to be a lot of work to do. I will say that not to scare you, but to kind of give you a heads up that we get to do the hard but the fun part next semester. I want to thank you for your time that you spent this semester in being here and being present. We have been in person this entire semester and have we made forum today, Thomas? We have made forum every time, which really kind of amazes me and I'm very pleased. I just really want to give you guys a shout out for that. I'm happy because that's as big. There is a law in the books looking to change Brown Act but it's not here yet. So until then, we will continue to be in person unless some of these changes with our requirements. We need one more. If anybody has not signed in yet, please do so we can make quorum.</li> <li>• T. Berry (00:21:55): Is there anybody that signed online? Okay, we met Quorum.</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (00:21:59): Okay. So that being said that's part of my report. The other part of my report is I wanted to address</li> </ul>	

the email. It's not the email that I wanted to address obviously but I know that if I say nothing, there will be a lot of questions. I'm going to start by saying there's not a lot I can say. It's just the truth and I think sometimes we have to know that there's not a lot that can be said. I don't think it's any secret that the academic senate president has some role in that hiring process. That's not a secret, not breaking in the laws there. But everything that happens behind closed doors during an interview process is protected by law. The level one interview panel has been put on notice that breaking of that would and could results in action being taken. I like you all, but I'm not willing to go to jail for you and I'm not willing to have my records checked for all of you. So with that being said, there's not a lot I can say.

So yes, I think a lot of people want to hear more. Why? What happened? So the piece I want to remind us of is that the hiring process is a process of multiple steps. Each one of them is protected in a different way. All are protected by law. The applicants and candidates themselves have protection. That's really what it's about too. They have the right to have their process protected and confidential. So that being said after training level one interviews candidates go forward. From that point, it moves forward to the district level, which is not a single process either. There is a committee, there are the trustees, there's the chancellor, and there are background checks, all kinds of pieces that go into that. I can't tell you, even if I could tell you, I don't have those answers either.

What I am personally choosing to do is trust the process, I have been in conversation with the chancellor. She has shared with me, and I will share with you that she continues to have it the best interest of our campus in mind. It may not look that way, it may not feel that way depending on what your perspective is or what your experience is and what seat you sit in. But she continues to attest that she does have our best interests at heart and believes strongly that we don't have somebody yet. Yet we know that somebody will come. So I don't have much choice but to trust that process right now.

That being said we do not know who the interim is. That was obviously not enclosed in the email because that too is still in process. I'm not sure when and how that will go out. I do know that there is somebody that they're working with and they were waiting for some confirmation, but I don't know if that's going to go to a board strategy session. I really don't know. But as soon as we know, as I can share, I will let you know. If I know before you do. That's also unknown. I know it's a hard one. I just want to recognize that it's a hard thing to sit with. It's been a year and a half, two years, I've lost track of time. It's been a long time, and we are anxious, and we're waiting patiently and not so patiently at this point.

We want somebody to know that it is permanent. We want somebody we know who's going to be here. It is about that right at this point. So we'll see how long interim is. The recommendation is that it be long enough that we can begin our implementation of our educational master plan and our student equity planning. Those are two really critical pieces that are coming. We need somebody long enough to get us going in that process. I personally would rather wait longer and get the right person that we all need, want, and will work with all parts of our system than get somebody that will try not to have that. I don't want to live through that.

I know that it's maybe not being really what people are willing to hear, but nobody can tell you why and that wasn't directed to you, Jesse. Just so you know, that's a common question. Nobody can tell you why. That's just the truth. I think that's probably heavy enough for my report as much as I can say about that. I do see, Danny, do you have a question?

#### **Discussion/Questions**

- D. Graham (00:27:55):

My question is a process question. Given that this process is having significant difficulties and obviously leadership. it's very important for moving things forward. Is there a way to review the process to make sure some steps that are happening at the end are not being left to the end? So maybe things aren't falling part of the very end when people are investing significant amounts of time, showing up to forums, and getting feedback. If there's some issue that is repeatedly happening for the process and the transparency of the process and have dialogue around that rather than asking individual candidates?

- D. Burns-Peters (00:28:50):

Yes, that is very much a possibility and it is within the realm of conversation that has already happened. Part of the voice that I've carried forward is I don't know that we can do this again. It is hard. It's heavy. There is conversation about what can we do with the process? Is there things that we can do in the process to maybe better ensure that at the end we can get something that works for everybody. And again, I have to be really careful what I say. But yes, we can look at process and that is part of the conversation right now.

- T. Vasquez (00:29:30):

This is maybe a rhetorical question, there is not exactly an answer to it, but how do we know that the chancellor has the best of our interest based on the email that she said and when we have eroded trust as well, and it has been eroding for a while. How can we be asked that that individual does have the best interest for us speaking for the students, even for the faculty, and the classified staff. It's very difficult to understand that when there hasn't been, again, transparency and that they want us to buy into trust, as well. I'm not saying that they happen to reveal things that are legal, that's not what I'm talking about. But it is really understanding. That's what communication really is. Relationship building.

So how do we trust someone in that forum, in the district, any type of relationship? And it has been eroding. It has been eroding for 16 months and we are going to continue to erode trust and in many other ways. I think that's the impact that we're all feeling and we need strong leadership. Leadership that understands us, understand our students, understand what we all need at this time, and also what we need in the long term. So there are immediate needs. There are kind of not immediate and then there's long term needs. Then that's the other part to it, that there's been interim processes that are happening where are you holding out the job or are you making so severe changes that we're getting so impacted and it's making our work more difficult.

- D. Burns-Peters (00:31:13):

I won't say that's a rhetorical question, but it is the question that I go to bed with at night regularly right now. The lack of trust right now is not lost on me. I'm just going to be

		<p>vulnerable and put it out there. It is not lost on me. I go to bed with it every night right now. I think part of it though is understanding what trust means and sometimes it is really hard to trust things. So my practice has been to recognize all of branches when they're given, even though they're really small sometimes. I'm just speaking to process and the role that I have to play right now, and my responsibility is I hold onto those very small olive branches and I did in this process as well. But there's an erosion of trust.</p> <p>I am currently struggling with how do I as senate president help the faculty to come into a space of talking about trust. What does that mean? What does that look like? What kind of things would we want to receive that might help build that trust? And what kind of conversations do I need to facilitate to bring us into a workable trust, a level of let's keep working through this. So I don't have the answer right now, but again, it's a burden I carry and I'm always open to conversation and feedback and resource and thoughts about how to do that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M. Worsley (00:33:02): I agree with the lack of trust, loss of trust because of poor communication. And it's so ironic to me because during the pandemic I felt supported. I felt that there was lots of communication happening in a time and we really needed it. And it's weird right now we also need it. Maybe not all of us felt that, but I certainly did. And it's weird right now to have a lack in that area. This is my question should we as a Senate body consider making a recommendation to urge the hiring of an outside firm to nationalize this search and make that as a recommendation from the senate body? Because this process, if we just keep doing the same process over and over again, I mean that is insanity. Right?</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (00:34:01): Okay. Thank you guys. I do appreciate the comments and the feedback and duly noted.</li> </ul>	
4.	Committee Reports	None	
5.	Additional Reports	None	
6.	SBVC President's Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. S. Thayer (01:11:10): I just want to thank everyone for attending the Christmas party on Friday. It was the first time in three years that we actually did it in person. We had 30 baskets donated and we fundraised \$6,500 for book scholarships for students. [Applause] It was great to see everybody, chef Stacy, chef Tamara, the students did an outstanding job putting food together, decoration from marketing and the foundation and everyone involved, office of the president, all the volunteers. It really turned out well and a great way to end the semester. So I just wanted to wish you all a good finals week, Thank you.</li> </ul>	
7.	Consent Agenda a. Approval of the minutes for 11/30/22	Motion 1	<p><b>Motion 1: Move to approve Minutes for 11/30/22 on the Consent Agenda.</b>  <b>1<sup>st</sup>: J. Lemieux</b>  <b>2<sup>nd</sup>: C. Jones</b>  <b>20 Responses</b>  <b>Aye: 75% (15 votes)</b>  <b>Nay: 0% (0 votes)</b></p>

8.	<b>Action Agenda</b> a. <b>Student Equity Plan</b> b. <b>Educational Master Plan</b>	<b>a. Student Equity Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (00:36:46): The student equity plan was distributed to you in draft form. There have been some minor clerical pieces and cleanup. There's been some cleanup to that document. It is in final draft form. We've had lots of opportunity for feedback on that now. It is my hope that you took the time to read it and it is up for a motion of support. The reason why it comes here obviously is because it is a campuswide plan which has been in the work that we did all semester on that, right? In transparency, you only need to know I need to sign that. Well I'm asked to sign it and in this case I would like motion and support if possible so that I can put my signature on that. That is up for a motion.</li> <li>• M. Tinoco (00:38:10): Motion to support the student equity plan moving forward.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Hunter (00:38:43): This is just a question maybe for Carmen. Were you able to include what Paula had sent you for the update?</li> <li>• C. Rodriguez (00:38:50): Yes.</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (00:38:57): There's been some feverish updates of last minute edits or feedback over the last couple days up until last night at 9:30 I believe. So any of that feedback that happened this week, and I'm confirming that with you Carmen, anything that came up from the last minute or within this last week did get to Carmen and did get incorporated. Okay. Any other comments, questions or discussions?</li> <li>• S. Valle (00:39:21): The final draft you sent us, that's it.</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (00:39:43): The question was is it a done deal?</li> <li>• S. Valle (00:39:58): Yeah, because the final draft had little clerical errors.</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (00:40:02): Those have now been cleaned up.</li> <li>• S. Valle (00:40:04): Okay.</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (00:40:04): Those have now been cleaned up. So the clerical pieces had been done in tandem as a group, but that just came through last night.</li> <li>• C. Jones (00:40:15): I'm just noticing, I haven't finished reading everything, but there seems like there's inconsistency all over the place. Whether we're going to call it DEIA or IDEAA and I feel</li> </ul>	<b>Abstain: 25% (5 votes)</b> <b>Motion passes</b>  <b>Motion 2: Motion to support the Student Equity Plan in the spirit of the document and the overall intent and support for our students and the collegial process that went into it.</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> : M. Tinoco 2 <sup>nd</sup> : S. Valle <b>20 Responses</b> <b>Aye: 85% (17 votes)</b> <b>Nay: 0% (0 votes)</b> <b>Abstain: 15% (3 votes)</b> <b>Motion passes</b>  <b>Motion 3: Move to table support for the Educational Master Plan until the final draft is received from CBT and brought to the senate prior to the Board of Trustees.</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> : T. Vasquez 2 <sup>nd</sup> : B. Tasaka <b>20 Responses</b> <b>Aye: 100% (20 votes)</b> <b>Nay: 0% (0 votes)</b> <b>Abstain: 0% (0 votes)</b> <b>Motion passes</b>
----	--	--	---

like we need to go with one and just change everything to that moving forward.

- D. Burns-Peters (00:40:33):  
Okay. That's a good point. So one or the other, just as long as there's consistency in what term we're using. I don't know if it's helpful. The state senate uses IDEAA. The first A is anti-racism and the second A is accessibility. So maybe we can go with that consistency.
- P. Wall (00:41:05):  
Just comment out of respect for everybody that input into it. The library did send support paragraphs, there was not hardly anything included. So I just am making a comment that I and the other librarians are disappointed in not being included with that document.
- D. Burns-Peters (00:41:28):  
Okay.
- C. Rodriguez (00:41:29):  
I'll make sure that is in there.
- P. Wall (00:41:33):  
Okay. Thank you very much.
- D. Burns-Peters (00:41:35):  
If there's any question, maybe you can just follow up with Patty for what that might be.
- Dr. O. Rosas (00:41:43):  
The same thing as Carmen. We will go back and move to see what piece we may be missing. Absolutely.
- P. Wall (00:41:49):  
Okay. And I can resend that to you, Carmen.
- C. Rodriguez (00:41:58):  
That would be helpful. Thank you.
- T. Vasquez (00:42:11):  
I'm just a little concern that if we're voting for this document as is or is that with edits and then what edits are being made. I don't know. When I vote for something I want to make sure what am I voting on? I think that it's not clear if we still have some pieces that are missing or that are edit and even edits that are grammatical, I want to see those edits before I put my vote. I don't know, I'm just saying sometimes we vote on things that are not like what are we voting on? Is that going to get edited? Simple edits, other edits. Just saying.
- D. Burns-Peters (00:42:51):  
I hear you. While grammatical pieces are important, inclusion like oh we don't see ourself in the last version that was out. That's important to know. Outside of that, I think we are voting on the general content and the process and the assurance that it is representative of a collegial process, which we did get to. I don't know if that helps.
- C. Jones (00:43:37):  
I'm just noticing how it says, okay, we're going to enroll students in support services. I feel like we still don't have the support services set up to accommodate such a large number and we need help with counseling. We need that communication there.



Otherwise I feel like it's like here I'm giving you a ladder to help get over the wall but instead you're going to stand on it sideways and fall land on your rear end and get hurt because it, it's not there. They'll go in and I'll check a box like oh the student can have extra time on the exam or they can have, they're entitled to this side or the other thing. Or I have one student that was with the SAS, the what used to be disabled student services, I forget what the SAS stands for now, but student accessibility services. But instead they could take frequent breaks and sometimes the students, I talked to them, oh don't completely miss lecture, but then they get to the point where they go, oh that means I can just do as I please and then I don't have to come And I mean I don't want to say people have to, but if the communication's not there so that they can be successful, it ends up hurting them worse. And that's what I see and that's what I get concerned with putting everyone in special services, in special programs if we don't have the manpower to actually help the people and sometimes they don't want to hear some things from their instructor, they need to hear that from the other people. I kind of wish I had more communication with some of the student services that my students were in so that we could kind of be on the same page about what is actually going to help this student versus what they're doing that's making them kind of fall off and use the ladder inappropriately.

- D. Burns-Peters (00:45:17):

There is a component in there, I don't know if it's in this one, I've got two plans going on in my head, but where there's an opt-out. One of the directives was to have an opt-out for our Black and African American students into Umoja-Tumaini rather than an opt-in. Okay. I just want to follow up with that, recognizing that if that's what we actually do, we absolutely have to be aware that that is going to bring with it a load for a program that currently and probably could not handle that influx. So that's the next phase of the work is as we begin to implement that is really understanding what is it going to take to set the foundation, what hirings need to be done, what kind of restructuring needs to happen, whatever that looks like. I couldn't name it all off right now off the top of my head, but that has to be in place in order to be successful,

- C. Jones (00:46:18):

Right? Yes. The mindset of the student sometimes changes when they think, oh I'm going to have this so now I don't have to do this. And it's like that's not necessarily true to make you successful That's what I really worry about because I've seen sometimes support services end up not going as planned and I'd like to have more communication, although I always feel busy. So I think actually got to go over and talk to them and then I never have the time. So that'd be good for, what do you call it, the in-service days maybe to have that time for that dialogue.

- D. Burns-Peters (00:46:47):

It becomes more part of our processes. Not like I need to go visit them but more integrated. So any other questions or discussions? So I don't know if you want the motions to stand as they are or if there's any thought to amend those motions. But that being said, if I don't hear anything different.

- M. Worsley (00:47:09):

I just got one more quick comment. I'm going to vote in the spirit of the process. I'm going to trust that the good work is going to be done. So I'm going to support this even though it's not quite done yet.

- J. Herrera (00:47:30):

I think I would just some maybe clarification with the motion like that we're supporting more of the idea of the document with possible changes, additions, whatever. But the overall idea. So I don't want it to be Yes, this is the document.

- D. Burns-Peters (00:47:45):

So that's why I was kind of leaving the table open Michelle, if there wanted to be an amendment to that motion. That's what I'm hearing is that you're asking if maybe there's an amendment possible to the motion that the support is in the spirit of the document and the overall intent and support of our students and the collegial process that went into it. Are you open to that amendment?

- M. Tinoco (00:48:15):

I am open to that.

## Motion 2

- D. Burns-Peters (00:48:58):

Thank you for that. We will continue to work hard. Oh I should add to that that it has been made very clear and there's intention to carry through the work group on that student equity planning. There's been some conversation about maybe it being its own continued group or should it be a subgroup of another committee. Either way that that group will continue to ensure that we have accountability on the actual plan. We need accountability on the plan 100%. We absolutely have to have it. We've been saying that all year in a lot of spaces, not just with this plan. So for that reason one of the next steps for this next semester is figuring out in the implementation phase how to institutionalize that work but to have that committee be a standing ongoing working committee. I will keep you posted on that.

## Discussion

- S. Tillman (00:50:03):

I wanted to know if I could make statement, in regards to the equity plan. I know that the plan is a foundation that is being used. It's like a cohesive plan, a foundation for us to have something to work with to continue to grow. It's not something that is just going to be a one-and-done deal. So I don't want anyone to think that this is in concrete, that's all, and that's it. It's going to be a plan where it's going to continue to evolve.

- D. Burns-Peters (00:51:01):

Thank you for that. Yes, that is absolutely the intent is to have it be an ongoing process. Again, I should probably be more political but I know that maybe in previous times we haven't felt like it has been an ongoing plan. But I can tell you that everybody on that team, everybody on that team is saying the same thing. We cannot have it sit on the shelf and we have to have accountability and it needs to be an active living document. So that is the intent and this is where we have to sit for a little while and see if that's how it goes. Now we have to walk in trust, if you will, not wait for it but just kind of walk

in a little bit to see if that happens. If that doesn't happen, that's another conversation that will happen at that time. Until then we can't do anything. We have to let the proof happen. Does that make sense? So yes, that's the intent. Thank you for sharing that.

- B. Tasaka (00:52:10):

So in this period of building that trust, can I request that this comes back on a semi regular basis? Whether that's like six months from now or I don't know. So that we can make sure we see the changes in the library. We can make sure we see the changes in the language but with some sort of consistent updating so that trust is built and all that makes perfect sense but I think that that's what builds some of what you were talking about earlier.

- T. Vasquez (00:52:39):

In the same line with that means that the trust is built by specific procedures and processes that are transparent to everyone before we launch something. That is what part of the implementation is. It's not just faithfully going with something. I think I'm very careful about my words here, because faith means we're just waiting for it and I think if you just wait for it we don't always ask for it, and that is a problem that we've actually have as an institution. If we plan specifically like a project base, we have a timeline, here are the goals of those particular terms. I think the progress that we made this year, like the light at the end of the tunnel, all of those dates are already set in. We knew we were going to be participating and that effective participation was planned for, it wasn't an after thought. That's what we have been waiting for so long. If this is actually a truly living document and a foundation, then we have to see the concrete dates, timelines, projections of what we're going to do as part of that. It has to be seen, not set or not just set. Thank you.

- D. Burns-Peters (00:53:54):

Thank you for that clarification. Absolutely. I think that's part of making that an ongoing committee or work group or whatever we end up officializing it as because that's part of the work that needs to be done is timelines and expectations and benchmarks and when is it going to come back. So traditionally we have not had that right? Traditionally it comes to Senate and signed off goes to board and off it goes. We have not had those opportunities or those expectations set in place beforehand to bring them back. Thank you.

**b. Educational Master Plan**

- D. Burns-Peters (00:54:57):

So that takes us to our educational master plan which has been out for some time now. It too was shared with you the last time in as final a form as it could be at the time. I say that cautiously because today literally an hour ago was the last meeting of that group before that document gets sent to the consultation group. Once it comes back from them, it will come back in a form of a master plan with timelines and we get to then start the implementation piece of it. How that's going to work. It won't be the last time that we hear about educational master planning either. The establishment of the plan is done. However, I know that in today's meeting there were some additional last minute, hey can we make sure and we want to add this last little piece to it. So I don't know. Jamie, do you recall or can you share any last pieces that might have been added or

focused on today?

**Discussion**

- J. Herrera (00:56:38):

We just asked for any, at least in terms of student services and counseling just that terminology was used correctly. If it's not in there now we just make sure of that. I'm going to send an email later for the pieces I saw. We're just using the correct terminology because we know people from outside might not understand the difference in the language and we want to make sure it's consistent throughout the whole thing. I'm trying to think of what else happened. There was a student group that gave some additional information today. Then how we use data for everything and to make sure it's in the document. At least we have what we're referring to when we're talking about it in the document. Also providing the document that is also readable by people in the community that doesn't have the data throughout but it has the charts to refer to and things like that. Just so it's more relatable to others as well. That's all I can think of. Thank you.

- D. Burns-Peters (00:57:56):

Byron did bring a student group to that feedback meeting as well. The data piece, I will expand on that right now. There was some data that was pulled a couple of years ago now in preparation for this. If you look at it, it can be a little bit alarming because it really just looks at completion of degrees and there's like this quadrant piece. If you look at it, philosophy on there is shown as being very low need and low graduation, and welding on there is very high need, high graduation. On the surface it looks like wait, this is telling us that we need to get rid of philosophy. No. that's not what it's saying. We recognize very clearly. So if you read that and you looked at that, you might come back with concerns. There's been a discussion and we understand that that data is just raw data and raw data can be dangerous if you don't really try to understand it. In this case it can be alarming that raw data could be really alarming if you look at it.

There was a request to either redo that data but it is part of a larger report that was already done by Esry an environmental scan report. Part of the discussion today was to make that an addendum and to also recognize in some way that while that data is there, it's not reflective of our transfer students, it's not reflective of the fact that an associate transfer degree in anthropology will get you to UCLA. I believe it is that they transfer a lot of students to and that gets you the degree that leads to the workforce, right? So that line is not clear in the raw data. It was also talked about that our strategic goals or directives I should say the strategic directives within the plan, none of them reflect that data. They were really about other operationalized pieces. So we don't have any strategic directives in that plan that go well the data said that we need to get rid of anthropology and I'm sorry if you're reading this and I freak you out but I'm just using that as an example. It is on that list and it could be kind of tricky to see that you won't see that present in the plan. Does that help as well?

- A. Hecht (01:00:44):

Are we voting on a draft or are we voting on the final plan?

- D. Burns-Peters (01:00:49):  
It is like the student equity plan, it's in as final a draft as possible. There was at meeting today where additional input about what we just talked about. Those will be incorporated, much like Carmen's going to ensure that there's an incorporation of the library. Both of these items are scheduled and they're scheduled to go to the board. I don't want to think that we're schedule driven but we have already extended out and I don't know how much final we can get. I guess that's what I'm trying to say. Again, it's about content, it's about process, it's about collegiality. Did those things occur and do we believe overall if that has been reflective of the work.
- A. Hecht (01:01:44):  
I guess this is what I'm asking is the fact that I did write things when they sent it out, the email put back write in here, I wrote in there but I don't have the final draft so I don't know if what I asked for is put in there.
- D. Burns-Peters (01:01:56):  
So from last senate until now?
- A. Hecht (01:01:58):  
No, from when the EMP went out for everyone to request any comments, any concerns which I did in there, In that email, and I don't know if those were put in the final draft.
- D. Burns-Peters (01:02:11):  
Yes. So without knowing what those are, I couldn't tell you either at this point. I do know that after the meeting today it was everything that had been received through the Qualtrics survey which is how that feedback happened, had been incorporated. I did not personally check those off though. So I can only speak to what was said unless somebody else has other insight.
- T. Simpson (01:02:48):  
Is it possible that we can ask to put the vote off until we are clear on that? because I know we have talked about the recommendations but nobody has seen if it was done yet?
- J. Herrera (01:03:01):  
Actually that's what I was going to say. Sorry. I was going to say not necessarily that we put it off but if we do the same thing with the proof to make sure that with all the recommendations so if we realize anything was missing that all the right recommendations are added in. But that's like, I mean I'm fine with that but I also just same thing, I want to make sure everything was folded and if someone finds their stuff was missing then it shouldn't be excluded.
- D. Burns-Peters (01:03:27):  
And on that note, I recognize we're in a discussion and I didn't call for a vote before the discussion so I apologize. So I want to honor this as a discussion if we can. Okay. I appreciate Jamie saying if we depend on how the motion is supporting and how that's worded but also recognize that you might not see it word for word. I would support that we recognize that the intent or the content is included. Kind of like when we did the mission statement we had hundreds of people say this is what we want to be and we have to look at what that thread is and that piece is.

- T. Simpson (01:04:12):  
Okay. No my question is more against, in terms of a vote, I don't want to delay anybody getting done. My question is, because I know that the conversation of having outside people doing this work, I'm a little apprehensive saying [inaudible] through this with the understanding that being on the committee you haven't seen yet. Right? Am I wrong in understanding that?
- J. Herrera (01:04:39):  
I mean I've seen that last time I had it and that's what I think we had asked them in today's meeting, I don't what the last final one was given out. I just looked at my most recent email and that's the one I looked at when were in the meeting.
- T. Vasquez (01:05:01):  
So in this one I think that the EMP is such a very college-wide directive process that we're not right for a vote for support. I think the draft especially when we have made so many changes as college council [inaudible]. It was the EMP worker group. I would say major edits, right? Then bring those, but I feel that perhaps we're not ready for that. Because those edits need, its maybe different [inaudible] and the educational master plan is a big document for the directives for the entire college.
- D. Burns-Peters (01:06:04):  
What is our timeline on that? I'm trying to think. So this draft is going to CBT not to board yet, right? They will send it back to us and then it goes to board in the spring.
- T. Vasquez (01:06:37):  
Can I make a motion to table the approval of this document for the next meeting or for the next time we see the active document? Because I don't know if in the next meeting we'll have the final document.
- D. Burns-Peters (01:06:51):  
Yes. So you can let me make you make sure we're clear on what that means. What that means is that the draft with whatever feedback happened today, there's going to be a final between today, the seven, then this goes to CBT I believe on the 12th. It means that it will go to CBT without a motion of support from Senate and we wouldn't see it again until it comes back from CBT in the form of this is your strategic plan. Doesn't mean we can't change things but it will be in a final draft at that point. I guess that that would be the final draft. So that's what we're looking for. It would be coming back from CBT would be the final draft and we would need to see that before it goes to board of trustees. Does that make sense? Is everybody following me on that timeline? Does that make sense? We do need to go to a motion. So I am open to that. And are you asking to make a motion? Yeah, that was the motion I made. Okay. So the motion is to table it until we...
- T. Vasquez (01:08:23):  
Get a final draft.
- D. Burns-Peters (01:08:24):  
Until we receive a final draft back from C B T.
- T. Vasquez (01:08:27):  
Yes, for our approval.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (01:08:32): To then be brought to senate for support prior to a board of trustees.</li> <li>• C. Jones (01:08:54): I just wonder why some of the graphs, it looks like they go all the way up to a hundred percent and I just wonder because it just makes it hard to see some of the data when they do that. There is the one graph that they have the total number which seems to dwarf the information on ethnicity and stuff. I just kind of wonder why it's laid out that way just so it's easier to see the data.</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (01:09:21): So address some of the viewability and readability of the graph. That might be also from that report, but I can carry that forward as part of that invoice.</li> </ul> <p><b>Motion 3</b></p>	
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p><b>Information Items</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. Senator Attendance: Mid-Academic Year Update</b></li> <li><b>b. Student Services Reimagined: a Senate follow-up</b></li> <li><b>c. Guided Pathways: proposed committee change</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>a. Senator Attendance: Mid-Academic Year Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (01:12:13): Just a heads up about that while we have not missed quorum yet. Yay for that, and again, I gave a shout out to that. I appreciate that. Given that we are mid-semester, I have taken a look at what that attendance is looking like. I just wanted to remind senators that per bylaw, we are asking for five attendances per every nine meetings. There are a handful who are not meeting that bylaw expectation, if you will.</li> <li>• T. Allen (01:13:13): I'm going to take this. It's me. [Laughter] This is my second term, but I want to say this, just so you guys know, as much as I love you all and I do, my youngest child is finally finishing college. He graduates university. [Applause] So I am over the moon that I am down to the wire. So that's where I've been. It's carpooling with that kid because he decided he wasn't going to stay on campus this last semester, but my heart was here.</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (01:14:02): Trust me, we have some who haven't showed up at all. There you go. That being said an email will go out to each of those senators who haven't met that mark with an opportunity to provide a statement as to their desire to remain on Senate and how they foresee being able to maintain that commitment to being part of the senate body. This is not a punitive issue, this is an issue of it affects our quorum. If we have 50 people on the list, 26 need to show up. If we know that 15 of them are consistently just not coming because they don't come, right, then our quorum should be based on 35 people. I don't know if I did my mouth right there. Does that make sense? So it's not a punitive thing. It is about making sure that whatever's on the roster is reflective of those who are actively participating. If you get that email, don't freak out. It might not be people in this group. So I just want you to know, as division representatives, that will be going out.</li> </ul> <p><b>b. Student Services Reimagined: a Senate follow-up</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (01:15:40): If you'll notice, I did not put on the agenda that this would come back for any kind of second read or this is not a resolution, this is not any of those things. I think the transparency, I just need to</li> </ul>	

be very honest that this may not be the most traditional thing to do, but it's the path that I've chosen to take. First of all, I want to thank student services, Dr. Thayer, Dr. Rosas for bringing forward the Student Services Reimagined. The reimagined plan, and because of so much feedback that was received from faculty as well as other conversations that clearly we hear them as we're moving around campus, I felt like I needed to go on the record for the sake of faculty knowing that I hear you and that your voice is being carried forward. With that being said, the reason it's not coming back as a second read or a vote, those kinds of things, is after much consultation, much consideration, much looking at what it is and how it is connected, I could not make a direct line to 10 plus one. I couldn't make a strong case for adjacent.

I have heard faculty say, but it does affect faculty. It does affect faculty. It affects who you report to. Absolutely it does, but it does not affect the structure of governance. If it doesn't affect the governance structure, that's where it breaks down. At the same time, I could not say nothing because that's my reach out to you that I hear you and I want to go on the record that we recognize. So again, thank you for bringing it here. We appreciate that. I did help clarify some things and so on the record, the recommendation and the conversation that I have had in feedback, not because it's our purview but because of, I'm going to say privilege of space or access to space maybe, is that we also ask that the faculty who are impacted by this be connected with and that there be an intention behind collegiality. Have there been maybe a bit more collegiality in the process? This would have been less, I don't want to put words in mouth. This is a hard position to be in, y'all. A hard position to be in. Collegiality would've helped support the process. Collegiality would've helped get faculty support behind the process. The feedback has been, and again for the record, is that really consider the reorganization and the breakout of specifically most of the feedback was around Puente and Umoja-Tumaini being under different deans while they're both student equity focused. Really thinking about the reason behind that split and is that student centered? Is it what's best for the students in terms of support for them?

And the other component is recognizing that LGBTQIA was called out and I had this conversation but LGBTQIA was called out under one dean and is supposed to be operation and student services, I should say we operationalize under the associate dean. But having the LGBTQIA community under a dean with a title of student health and Wellness, the harm that causes based on historical perspective about those who are part of the community. I don't think it's a secret, but if you don't know homosexuality used to be in the DSM, which is a diagnostic manual for mental health and wellness as a mental health disorder. That doesn't feel good if it is underneath the dean who is responsible for student health and wellness. This is not about people, this is about perception. This is about students, faculty and staff reading something and feeling like, wait, that takes me all the way back. It takes us way back into progress. And so those are the pieces that again, I wanted to go on the record. I hear you. That has been carried forward and there has been a request that be strongly considered, even though it's not our purview we do ask that you consider that. So thank you.

**c. Guided Pathways: proposed committee change**

- D. Burns-Peters (01:21:24):

Keenan is going to with Guided Pathways is going to share with us an idea that Guided Pathways



is beginning to travel with maybe. Converse about and think about.

- K. Giles (01:22:09):

I've been jotting down notes as other people have spoken. Some of the things that I've heard is from planning to implementation. What comes to mind when I heard that was the fact that Guided Pathways is evolving and being graded into the work that we're doing. For those of you who have been involved with the equity plan, you understand that Guided Pathways plays a major role in that document. There are other committees that meet that are moving with and moving towards the spirit of Guided Pathways. So as we talk about the institutionalization of certain ideas and the way that we do things, as far as the institution is concerned, Guided Pathways is evolving in that sense. You talked about essentially upon consent and being transparent and involved in the process. If you've been a part of Guided Pathways for the past few years, you understand that at times the committee was very student services headed, specifically counselors.

As we evolve, we're moving more towards a collaborative spirit. And with that, that's going to take the cooperation of both sides of the house. So what we don't want is as a committee, if we are student services heavy to make any decisions that are going to affect the changes that need to occur and the things that need to happen as far as the institutionalization of Guided Pathways. So what we are in discussion phases with as far as the steering committee is concerned is more of moving towards an ad hoc sort of function with the committee. The reason being, short version, is we're past the phase of talking about the maps. We are very near to implementing the overhaul of the website, and the next phase in terms of what we're planning is to function more in the spirit of the career and academic pathways.

So again, short version is if we're going to be functioning with the career and academic pathways in mind, there'll be instances and times in which there'll be more need for a department chair or faculty to be involved in the planning. So that as we do specific events, it is a non-situation to where individuals feel as though they're being told this is what's going to happen. No. If you function as an ad hoc sort of committee, which revolves, so to speak, it lends the opportunity for the people that are most affected by the event or activities or changes or whatever the case may be, to provide their input and be informed and contribute to what is to come from that particular meeting. So again, it'll be rotational in the discussion phases to determine that power would look like but in theory more rotational because the emphasis would shift as priorities shift, as the time of year shifts, and in some instances the target audience shifts. So that's all we're looking at doing, and the purpose of this conversation is to be transparent and be more informative as we look at that evolution. That's it.

- D. Burns-Peters (01:26:15):

That actually helps me understand what you all have been talking about. So it's not really a dissolution of a committee but it is functioning, maybe not as a scanning committee but like you say ad hoc. Maybe people make ad hoc just as is but it is that right? It's still committee driven but it would be based on whoever is the stakeholder at the moment. That's a good one. Good one. So think about that because that will need to come to Senate if there's a structured change in committee cause it is a standing academic senate committee at this course, or a committee that falls under academic senate.

<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>a. AP: 4020-Program Curriculum and Course Development: Level 3 Review (10+1, extensive feedback expected, final feedback due by January 18<sup>th</sup> meeting)</b></p> <p><b>b. AP: 2510-Participation in Local Decision Making (opened by A.S. at PPAC, first round of suggested language to be added)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (01:27:02): I will just leave you with the two APs that are still on here. I have not heard any feedback but as I let you know they wanted something by 12/31, that won't happen. So if you could please give any feedback on the red line version of 4020, that would be great, and any feedback on what you might want to see in 2510 outside of a whole list of all of our committees and our committee membership, because that isn't going to go back into 2510. We've got plenty of time on 2510, 4020 is the one that's on schedule but we can work with that.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B. Tasaka (01:27:51): I reached out to Anthony Blacksher because this was sent to the curriculum committee and we haven't had a chance to fully meet to actually talk about it. Our question was where does that change come from? Is that a legal thing that was put in there? Are we married to that language? How much recommendation freedom do we have? And also was any Ethnic Studies person consulted in the structuring of that?</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (01:28:25): Thank you for bringing that up and I will clarify. So understand the process of how APs and BPs go through for program review. Chapter owners open them and 4000s live at district. That being said, they were directed by legal to open it up with recommended additional language. The district could have just left it alone or they could say, okay, you're recommending something. Yes, this sounds good, let's add it. The recommended language, they literally take from whatever's provided from legal and put it in there. So nobody did anything without consultation. This is the consultation. They opened it and said this is what legal gave us to look at. It is an option. So at the top of it, it is labeled optional legal language. It is non verbatim. Sometimes we get verbatim. In this case we did not get verbatim. We got here's optional and they pulled the verbatim that was given meaning we get to give feedback, which is why it's a level three. The expectation was that we look at it and we say yeah, what the state offered is great. I'm going to disagree, but if it was great we could say that. Right? But this is the consultation. So nobody did anything without somebody. This is a process, which is why it was recommended to go to ethnic studies, go to curriculum and all the constituent bodies need to look at that, give feedback that will go back to the chapter owner, which will be in PPAC, our policy and procedures advisory committee. When that is gone to the processor, it will come back to Senate for a vote of support.</li> <li>• B. Tasaka (01:30:26): So there has to be something about ethnic studies because legal says there has to be something...</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (01:30:31): No legal opened it as recommended, optional period. We could ignore it.</li> <li>• B. Tasaka (01:30:36):</li> </ul>	

		<p>If it comes to Senate and also to curriculum and we're consulting with ethnic studies faculty and the decision or recommendation is we don't need this at all cause it doesn't actually mean anything or do anything that that's something we can bring back?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (01:30:50): Yes, you absolutely could.</li> <li>• B. Tasaka (01:30:51): And we can tweak the language around.</li> <li>• D. Burns-Peters (01:30:53): Yes, in this case you can. And that is what this process should be about. So I'm glad they're all looking at it. That's what we should be doing. So does that help? Understand that when it comes back that once it goes to PPAC it will come back to Senate for another round because it always says before it goes to Chancellor's Counsel, does that make sense.</li> </ul>	
<b>11.</b>	<b>Announcements</b>	<b>The winter festival is still happening.</b>	
<b>12.</b>	<b>Adjournment: Next Meeting: January 18, 2023, in B100</b>	<b>Meeting Adjourned at 4:32 pm</b>	