

The Academic Senate at SBVC is dedicated to empowering and strengthening the voices of our esteemed faculty members. We are committed to fostering active participation, while maintaining a positive and respectful atmosphere that ensures our perspectives resonate strongly throughout our institution. We are the official voice in accordance with, Title 5, section 53200, of the California Education Code §70902 (b)(7) "...the governing board of each community college district shall... ensure the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards,"

which is known as 10+1.

California Title V §53200 "10+1"			
1.	Curriculum, including		
	establishing prerequisites.		
2.	Degree and certificate		
	requirements.		
3.	Grading policies.		
4.	Educational program		
	development.		
5.	Standards or policies regarding		
	student preparation and success.		
6.	College governance structures,		
	as related to faculty roles.		
7.	Faculty roles and involvement in		
	accreditation process.		
8.	Policies for faculty professional		
	development activities.		
9.	Processes for program review.		
10.	Processes for institutional		
	planning and budget		
	development.		
11.	(+1) Other academic and		
	professional matters as mutually		
	agreed upon.		

Senator Representation								
Applied Technology, Transportation, and Culinary Arts								
Samuel Valle (2026)	☐ Vacant (2027)	☐ Vacant (2027)						
Arts and Humanity								
✓ Amy Mills (2026)	☑ Carol Damgen (2026)	☐ Joe Notarangelo (2027)						
✓ Judy Joshua (2027)	✓ Kevin Lyons (2027)	☑ Rangel Zarate (2026)						
	Academic Success	İ						
☐ Vacant (2026)								
Mat	h, Business & Computer Tech	ı						
☐ Samuel Addington (2025)	☐ Vacant (2026)	☐ Vacant (2027)						
☐ Vacant (2027)	☐ Vacant (2027)							
	Science	İ						
✓ Carol Jones (2025)	✓ Jessy Lemieux (2025)	✓ Matt Robles (2026)						
Maria Valdez (2027)	☐ Melissa Romero (2026)	✓ Michael Torrez (2027)						
✓ Tatiana Vasquez (2025)								
Social Science	es, Human Development & Pl	hysical Ed						
☑ Danielle Graham (2025)	☑ Denise Knight (2027)	☐ Kellie Barnett (2025)						
Lisa Henkle (2027)	☐ Melissa King (2027)							
Student Services								
Debbie Orozco (2027)	Erica Begg (2026)	☑ Jamie Salyer (2025)						
Keynasia Buffong (2025)	Pedro Gonzales (2027)	☐ Ulavale Matavao (2026						
	Post Time Counts and							
Part-Time Senator Reps								
✓ Christian Sarfo-Poku (2025)	✓ Brenda Orozco(2027)	✓ Loni Dennet (2027))						

	Senate Exec
\ \ \	President, A. Hecht Vice President, T. Vasquez Secretary, J. Salyer Program Review, D. Graham, B. Tasaka
	Curriculum, T. Berry Accreditation and Outcomes, C. Huston
\checkmark	Professional Development, R. Hamdy Part-Time Senator at Large, Christian Sarfo-Poku
	Instructional Senator at Large, B. Tasaka Non-InstructionalSenator at Large, Vacant
✓	Guests Yvette Lee
\checkmark	Melinda Fogle Nori Sagomonian Daihim Fozouni



Location: North Hall 218, NH-218

1.	Call to Order 1.1. Call to Order/Establish Quorum 1.2. Approval of Agenda	Call to order at 3:08
2.	Public Comments 2.1. General Public Comments - refers to the opportunity for members of the public to speak on both agenda and non-agenda items. (Reserved for Guests only and limited to 10 minute total time limit, 3 minute max per person)	
1.	Approval of Minutes - none 1.1. February 5, 2025 and February 19, 2025 minutes will be completed April 2, 2025	
3.	Reports 3.1. Reports 3.1.1. AS President -none 3.1.2. AS Vice President - none 3.1.3. Campus Committees - none 3.1.4. Academic Senate Subcommittees 3.1.4.1. Education Policy and Procedure (EPPS), New BP/AP & BP2510 Update, Jessy Lemieux ❖ NOTES ➤ J. Lemieux - focused on the review and feedback process for new policies and procedures, particularly related to the Education Policy and Procedures Subcommittee and PPAC meetings. Due to	



Location: North Hall 218, NH-218

scheduling conflicts, including spring break, there was a need to better coordinate timelines for policy review to ensure adequate time for evaluation. The process involves multiple stages: a first read, feedback collection, a second read, and finalizing a report to PPAC. The committee reviewed several policies, including those on student trustee rights and harassment, with feedback being incorporated into the final report. The goal is to streamline coordination and allow sufficient time for feedback and collaboration.

- Feedback process click on the link in the <u>Education Policy</u> and Procedure (EPPS) document then click on EPPS AS PPAC Feedback Due 2025 03 20.xlsx
- 3.1.4.2. Elections, Spring 2025 activities Update, Tatiana Vasquez
 - **❖** NOTES
 - > T. Vasquez AS Elections Subcommittee are looking at which divisions have senate seats coming up.
 - Planning for the upcoming year.
 - Senator Roster
- 3.1.5. San Bernardino Community College District Teachers Association - none
- Associated Student Government none 3.1.6.
- 3.1.7. Classified Senate - none
- 3.1.8. President, Gil Contreras - none

Unfinished Business

- Resolution SP25.01, Conferring Professor Emeritus for Dr. John Stanskas 2nd 4.1. Read
 - **❖** NOTES

Motion to support the resolution of professor emeritus.

1st: T. Vasquez



Location. North Hall 216, NH-216

➤ C. Jones - <u>2nd read for conferring professor Emeritus</u>.

4.2. Participatory Governance Task Force Update and Feedback request, Erica Begg and Tatiana Vasquez

❖ NOTES

> T. Vasquez - The college-wide task force is working on improving participatory governance by cleaning up processes and timelines. One focus is on committee terminology, ensuring clarity around who is involved in committees, the goals, and their structure. There's also a consideration of which roles—faculty, classified professionals, and others—should be involved in decision-making and governance. The task force is looking into committees that are faculty-only and whether they should fall under the Academic Senate's purview, especially when administrative assistance, such as a classified professional for minutes, is needed. The goal is for the Senate body to decide on the recommendations based on the analysis provided. The participatory governance task force is asking the Senate to review and potentially reorganize existing committees. For example, they suggest considering new committees, like one for AI, and evaluating whether committees like Scholarships or Campus Life should be permanent. The task force is focusing on understanding the functions, charges, and membership of committees, and is gathering information through surveys to help guide this process. The goal is to refine how participatory governance works, ensuring committees are effectively structured and aligned with the needs of the college. The task force is focusing on improving governance by ensuring all four key constituencies—classified staff, faculty, management, and students—are properly included in

2nd: M. Valdez

Yay: 22 Nay: 0 Abstain: 0

Motion approved.



decision-making processes. Currently, governance is not functioning this way, so the task force is evaluating which committees need improvement to incorporate all these groups. They're also considering committee selection, proposing a one-year assignment for upcoming committees with plans to make larger infrastructure changes in Fall 2026 to minimize disruption. Additionally, there's a push to have the Senate assign committees rather than elect them, to ensure better participation and more manageable workloads. This will be discussed further and could lead to changes in how committees are structured and filled.

- T. Berry If it is determined that a committee is not part of the Academic Senate, will we need to review and possibly adjust our bylaws?
 - T. Vasquez correct. If it is determined that a committee is not part of the Academic Senate, I would bring it to the Senate.
 - A. Hecht During our last meeting, under "Reports and Floor Items," accreditation was discussed. However, Celia was not present, so it was not included in the agenda. We need to bring it back on the agenda and either get a motion to address it or decide whether to proceed. It's important to go over this, especially since it falls under our purview. For example, if DE isn't under our purview, we need to understand what that means.
- Existing Committees and Reporting



Location: North Hall 218, NH-218

New Business

5.1. Common Course Numbering Task Force, Thomas Berry

❖ NOTES

> T. Berry - The Common Course Numbering Task Force, created by the Curriculum Committee, includes key members such as the VPI, VPA, the articulation officer, and the curriculum coordinator. The task force has allocated six hours of faculty work to develop course templates, which includes a three-hour workshop, an hour of technical work, and an hour for course core adjustments. After meeting with department chairs, faculty will be identified to complete the process. The task force is not changing course content but working with the current faculty-approved core. Specialized faculty will review the work later for accuracy. Additionally, faculty are being sought for a state-level workgroup to review the templates. The task force aims to complete the work before May, with workshops beginning after spring break and finalizing the work in two weeks for the last curriculum meeting. Timelines and dates will be provided as soon as he speaks with the team. (motion came out of Agenda order, vote was completed after Program Review spoke)

5.2. Faculty Prioritization List Program Review, Bethany Tasaka and Danielle Graham **❖** NOTES

> > B. Tasaka and D. Graham - The Program Review Committee has been working on the request ranking process, which was done differently this year compared to last year. Requests were organized by division and sent back for prioritization. The committee decided not to re-rank the requests but allowed divisions to prioritize themselves,

Motion of support for the curriculum task force.

Motion approved by acclamation.

(C. Jones and L. Dennet left before vote)

Motion to extend the meeting until 5:00 pm.

1st: T. Berry

2nd: S. Valle

Yay: 21

Nay: 1 (C. Jones) Abstain: 1 (K. Lyons)

Motion approved.



resulting in multiple requests receiving the same ranking. This includes categories like equipment, budget, classified professionals, technology, and facilities. The faculty prioritization process, in particular, falls under the Academic Senate's purview. A new issue arose in the faculty prioritization process when one division submitted all their faculty positions as number one, leading to uncertainty about how to proceed. The committee felt this decision should not be made unilaterally and decided to bring it to the Senate for discussion. The committee is seeking direction from the Senate on how to handle the multiple number ones and whether they should adjust their approach. The conversation about faculty prioritization, especially concerning replacement positions, is ongoing, and there are plans to discuss the issue further with President Contreras to clarify the process. The Program Review co-chairs are looking for action and direction on how to proceed.

■ D. Fozouni - The discussion centers around the faculty prioritization process, specifically the exclusion of replacement positions, which are handled separately. The division in question decided to rank all faculty positions as number one based on extensive discussions and data analysis. They highlighted the dissatisfaction with the current process, particularly the lack of progress on requested growth positions. Many departments, especially those with only one faculty member, are under significant pressure, managing multiple roles such as being a department chair and handling additional responsibilities like dual enrollment. Despite repeatedly asking for growth positions over the years, these



requests have not been addressed. The division feels that the process needs to better reflect the actual needs of departments and is advocating for a more transparent and effective prioritization system.

- T. Vasquez raised several concerns about the current faculty hiring and ranking process. They question why a process that doesn't seem to be working is still in place, asking if any feedback has been gathered, especially in light of the new Aspire process. They reflect on their experience within the science division, noting that compromises were made during ranking, and they feel the process may not be equitable. The speaker emphasizes that while the ranking process is what they were instructed to follow, it still requires careful evaluation. They also call for a review of the history of hiring, especially differentiating between replacement and growth positions, and bringing back the 2015 Senate-approved process document. They suggest the need for a clearer timeline and a streamlined process for evaluating faculty hiring and prioritization.
- D. Fozouni recommends that the college council seek more clarity and transparency from decision-makers regarding the metrics used to make faculty hiring decisions. They emphasize the need for understanding how FTEs (Full-Time Equivalents) factor into these decisions. By gaining this clarity, divisions can better align their requests with the criteria, avoiding the need to create their own metrics. The speaker also highlights the potential for politics or other factors to influence the



decision-making process, which should not be part of the official process.

- B. Tasaka mentioned that division/dean's leadership should come into play because the metrics might differ.
- T. Berry mentioned that 2 faculty members in Curriculum emphasized the importance of holding administration accountable by making them respond to each request made by the faculty. By requiring answers to each request, they hope to convey the seriousness of the faculty's needs. While the ranking process itself helps prioritize, the goal is to show that these needs are real and need to be addressed by administration.
- A. Hecht Gil and A. Hecht have observed ongoing issues with hiring processes since the fall, particularly with hires happening in the middle of the year instead of being completed before July 1, as they believe should be the case. They've noticed many positions still need to be filled, even after seeing a list of openings from the College Council. They are concerned about the lack of growth positions and the temporary nature of full-time staff, which has been an ongoing issue for the past five to six years. The speaker plans to meet with others to discuss these concerns and improve the processes.
- Prioritization List
- 5.3. Chair/Co-Chair Election Process for spring 2025, Tatiana Vasquez, *Elections Subcommittee*
 - **❖** NOTES

Motion to send the program review prioritization list forward as is.

1st: T. Berry

2nd: J. Joshua

Yay: 6 (A. Mills, J. Joshua, C. Damgen, K. Lyons, R. Zarate, and T. Berry)

Nay: 12

Abstain: 2 (B. Tasaka and D.

Graham)

(C. Jones and L. Dennet left

before vote)

Motion did not pass.



- > T. Vasquez the discussion centered around the absence of a midterm vacancy process in the bylaws, necessitating the implementation of special elections. The committee realized that there was no clear timeline or procedure for filling midterm vacancies, especially during transitional periods like between semesters. A proposal for an expedited process was shared, with nominations opening on March 3 and closing on March 26, followed by candidate presentations and voting at the April 2 meeting. Additionally, there was a conversation about the lack of a clear process for appointing interim positions, particularly for roles like program review chairs. It was also suggested that the participatory governance handbook should include clear guidelines on how vacancies are filled and define roles like reassigned time to ensure consistency and transparency. The committee is seeking approval for the special elections process and will incorporate feedback from the senate. (out of order from the agenda, accidentally gave this update during reports)
 - B. Tasaka is wondering why D.E. is not a senate committee. Would like a future conversation surrounding this.
 - J. Salyer mentioned that the process and time, etc. should be in the handbook.
 - Election Process
- 5.4. Special Meeting, Andrea Hecht
- 5.5. Promoting Goals & Collegiality: Discussion on Senate Conduct Standards, Andrea Hecht
 - 5.5.1. <u>Existing Academic Senate Meeting Norms & ASCCC Executive Comm.</u>
 <u>Meeting Norms</u>

Motion to do a special election for the program review lead(s).

1st: T. Berry

2nd: D. Knight

Yay: 22 Nay: 0

Abstain: 1 (T. Vasquez)

Motion approved.

Motion to hold a special meeting March 12, 2025.

1st: T. Berry

2nd: D. Knight

Yay: 18 Nay: 0

Abstain: 2 (K. Lyons, R.

Zarate)

(C. Jones and L. Dennet left

before vote)

Motion approved.



Location: Nort	h Hall	218,	NH-218
-----------------------	--------	------	--------

6. Floor Items - Reserved to raise concerns within the Academic will hear your concerns/questions, but may not respond. If re be included on a future agenda. (5 minute total time limit, 2	equested, the concern can
7. Announcements Def. To share brief information or updates that don't require discuss	sion or action.
8. Adjournment 8.1. Next meeting - TBD ❖ NOTES ➤ Approval for a special meeting on March pm. Meeting space to be determined. Approval Date: March 12, 2025 Academic Secretary: Jamie Salyer (2024-2025) Academic Secretary Initials:	Meeting adjourned at 4:57 pm. 12, 2025 from 3:00 - 4:30