

SBVC Academic Senate Minutes-Special Meeting March 12, 2025 Wednesday, 3:00-4:30 pm Location: NH-218

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"	Senator Representation	Senate Exec
1. Curriculum, including	Applied Technology, Transportation, and Culinary Arts	🗹 President, A. Hecht
establishing prerequisites.	Samuel Valle (2026) 🗌 Vacant (2027) 🗌 Vacant (2027)	Vice President, T. Vasquez
2. Degree and certificate	Arts and Humanity	🗹 Secretary, J. Salyer
requirements. 3. Grading policies. 4. Educational program	✓ Amy Mills (2026) □ Carol Damgen (2026) ✓ Joe Notarangelo (2027) ✓ Judy Joshua (2027) □ Kevin Lyons (2027) □ Rangel Zarate (2026)	 Program Review, B. Tasaka & D. Graham Curriculum, T. Berry
development.	Academic Success	Accreditation and Outcomes, C.
5. Standards or policies regarding	U Vacant (2026)	Huston
student preparation and success.	Math, Business & Computer Tech	Professional Development, R. Hamdy
 College governance structures, as related to faculty roles. Faculty roles and involvement in 	✓ Samuel Addington (2025) ∨acant (2026) ∨acant (2027) ∨acant (2027) ∨acant (2027)	 Part-Time Senator at Large, C. Sarfo-Poku Academic, Senator at Large, Bethany
accreditation process.	Science	Tasaka
 Policies for faculty professional development activities. Processes for program review. 	✓ Carol Jones (2025) □ Jessy Lemieux (2025) ✓ Matt Robles (2026) ✓ Maria Valdez (2027) □ Melissa Romero (2026) ✓ Michael Torrez (2027) □ Tatiana Vasquez (2025) ✓ Value 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	 Student Services, Senator at Large, Vacant Past President, J. Gilbert
10. Processes for institutional	Social Sciences, Human Development & Physical Ed	Guests
planning and budget development. 11. (+1) Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon.	 Danielle Graham (2025) Lisa Henkle (2027) Debbie Orozco (2027) Erica Begg (2026) Jamie Salyer (2025) Pedro Gonzales (2027) Ulavale Matavao (2026) Vacant (2027) 	 Nori Sogomonian, proxy for Carol Damgen Gilbert Contreras Leticia Hector Yvonne Gutierrez Joanna Oxendine Vanessa Thomas Davena Burns-Peters
	 Christian Sarfo-Poku (2025) Brenda Orozco (2025) Loni Dennett(2025) Vacant 	Jesse Neimeyer-Romero



1.	Call to Order 1.1. Call to Order/Establish Quorum 1.2. Approval of Agenda	Called to order at 3:03pm. Agenda approved by consensus.
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) ◆ NOTES > D. Knight - expressed concern during the Senate meeting about the funding process for program review requests. She explained that faculty submit projects that go through multiple approval steps, including divisions, the Program Review Committee, and the Academic Senate, before being sent to the President for final funding decisions. However, the President's agenda might take precedence, and requests may not get funded, leading to frustration and low morale among faculty. D. Knight suggested that a specific dollar amount should be allocated for program review requests so that some projects can be funded each year, ensuring that faculty feel acknowledged and engaged. She emphasized that this would help maintain faculty morale, encourage buy-in, and support the Valley College brand.	
1.	Approval of Minutes - March 5, 2025 1.1. February 5, 2025	Motion to approve the February 5, February 19,



	February 19, 2025 March 5, 2025	and March 5, 2025 minutes. 1st: S. Valle 2nd: D. Knight Yay: 18 Nay: 0 Abstain: 3 (N. Sogomonian, R. Hamdy, and K. Barnette) (C. Sarfo-Poku, P. Gonzales, and R. Zarate were not here for the vote)
		Motion approved.
3.	 As President, Andrea Hecht (5 minutes) NOTES Began the meeting by emphasizing the need to stay on schedule and asked participants to wait for their turn to speak. For the chair's report, they mentioned that the Board of Trustees would be visiting on Thursday for a tour of the garden, museum, biology labs, and art department. The chair encouraged everyone to attend. At the next meeting on April 2, Jose Torres will present about Book Saver and its plans for the upcoming year, seeking feedback on student preferences regarding opting in or out of the program. The chair also mentioned 	



the upcoming Spring Plenary, where many had expressed interest but later dropped out; those still interested should reach out.

- 3.1.2. AS Vice President none
- 3.1.3. Campus Committees
- 3.1.4. Academic Senate Subcommittees
 - 3.1.4.1. Personnel Policy Subcommittee, Matt Robles and Jamie Salyer (5 minutes)
 - ✤ NOTES
 - The Personnel Policy Subcommittee has sent out the academic advancement in rank information and timeline. They informed everyone that to access the system, individuals need to log into the SharePoint. A reminder will likely be sent out, and at least five members from the committee are needed to review the applications.
 - 3.1.4.2. Education Policy and Procedure (EPPS), Jessy Lemieux (5 minutes)
 - NOTES
 - ➤ J. Joshua The March 20 PPAC meeting was canceled due to spring break, and the next meeting will be on April 10, where feedback on the 2510 EP and participatory governance will be discussed. A meeting took place on February 26, and the Academic Senate body was reminded that feedback can still be added to any policies. Final feedback will be reviewed for a draft report to PPAC, which will be presented to the Academic Senate for approval on April 2. The suggested deadline for submitting feedback is March 28, giving time for review before the April 2 meeting.
 - 3.1.4.3. Curriculum, Thomas Berry (5 minutes)
 - NOTES



 T. Berry - The Common Course Numbering project is progressing, and workshop dates have been set. These times will be presented to the faculty chairs for feedback. Some further additions to the schedule are still needed. 6 hours total per course worked on at non-instructional pay rate. CCN Template/COR Workshop dates –These workshops require room confirmation before they are valid. April 1: 1 pm - 4 pm April 3: 1 pm - 4 pm April 9: 10 am - 1 pm April 10: 1 pm - 4 pm April 12: - Full Curriculum Committee Tech Review April 21 - Full Curriculum Committee Meeting 3.1.5. San Bernardino Community College District Teachers Association - none 3.1.6. Associated Student Government - none 3.1.7. Classified Senate - none
3.1.7. Classified Senate - none
3.1.8. President, Gil Contreras (5 minutes)
NOTES
 G. Contreras provided an update on several key topics: Program Review Funding: The district has set aside \$5 million, which earns interest each year to fund program reviews. However, due to market conditions, the amount available may be lower next year. He emphasized the importance of ensuring unspent funds are directed to instructional and student support needs.



 Red Dress Event: The event was a success, with strong student attendance. It highlighted the role of students in social change and featured a performance by the Pacifica group, which is becoming a signature act for the college. Board of Trustees: Students are expected to present public comments at tomorrow's meeting, particularly regarding a potential resolution for the college to become a sanctuary college. Book Saver Update: The Book Saver program's new model, which excludes OER and ZTC, would increase the cost per student to \$29 per unit. However, only about 25-34% of students have opted into the program, suggesting that it may not be meeting their needs. Feedback on this shift is encouraged. Men's Basketball: The Wolverines are advancing in the state tournament, and G. Contreras praised the campus for supporting the team. College Council: The Council is working on a draft to define its charge and membership, aiming for an inclusive participatory governance structure. BSI Convening: The college is organizing a Black Story Institution convening to review and improve efforts related to African American studies. 	
American Studies.	



Unfinished Business 4.1. None	
 New Business 5.1. Academic Senate Committee - Service Hours to District, Andrea Hecht (15 minutes) ◆ NOTES > A. Hecht addressed the topic of academic senate committee service hours to the district. Currently, academic senate hours count toward district hours, but senators also have to participate in subcommittees, which adds extra responsibility. A. Hecht suggested a possible change to streamline this process: instead of assigning senators directly to committees through their departments, the Academic Senate President could assign senators to committees after elections are completed. This would maintain the election process through departments while ensuring proper assignment to committees. Hecht invited feedback and discussion on this idea. 	Motion to offer the PG evaluates the viability of making senate an official committee to come back to Senate with the recommendation on how it fits into the larger PG structure. 1st: R. Hamdy 2nd: S. Valle Yay: 20 Nay: 0 Abstain: 1 (R. Zarate) Motion approved.



- J. Salyer clarified that while senators can still serve on other committees they are interested in, those committees would also count as part of their service to the district.
- R. Hamdy clarified that the discussion is about adding the Academic Senate to the rotation of committees that faculty could potentially serve on, but it would still count as part of the faculty's required service hours to the district. Committee service and service to the district are distinct, with faculty obligated to serve on at least one committee, and the Academic Senate would become an official part of that rotation. The issue of term length was raised, as most committees have a two-year commitment, while the proposed term for the Academic Senate might be three years. Adjustments could be made if necessary.
 - A. Hecht pointed out that when leading a committee with reassigned time, that time doesn't count toward the service hours. She emphasized that committees like curriculum require a significant amount of work, and balancing that with Senate duties can be a large workload.
- R. Hamdy can you tell me what the pros and cons are.
 - A. Hecht and J. Salyer The discussion highlighted the pros and cons of adding an additional committee to the workload. Crafton, facing a similar challenge with fewer faculty, responded by reducing the number of their committees to avoid spreading faculty too thin. Their approach was to combine some committees to ensure there were enough people for all committees. They also



faced issues like absenteeism and lack of engagement with committee documents, which is common across many committees. Additionally, they are reviewing committees like enrollment management, basic skills, and guided pathways, with plans to consolidate and rename some of them. They are also looking at the scholarship committee and student life, such as commencement, to determine if any further changes are necessary.	
5.2. Distance Education Committee - 10 + 1, Andrea Hecht (10 minutes)	Motion that we task the
✤ NOTES	PG committee to explore
A. Hecht - addressed the topic of Distance Education (DE) being under	where the reporting
the Academic Senate's purview, which was raised during public	recommendation on how it
comment. They wanted to bring it up for further discussion to gauge	fits into the larger PG
the group's feelings on whether DE should be under Senate review or	structure back to senate.
not.	1st: J. Salyer
 N. Sogomonian - The Distance Education (DE) Committee at San 	2nd: B. Tasaka
Bernardino Valley College should not fall under the purview of	Yay: 16
the Academic Senate because its primary function is	Nay: 5 (N. Sogomonian, R.
administrative rather than academic. Here's why:	Hamdy, R. Zarate, A. Mills,
 Operational and Technological Focus – The DE Committee 	and T. Berry)
primarily deals with the implementation, management,	Abstain: 0
and support of online learning platforms, technology	
tools, and compliance with state and federal regulations.	Motion approved.
These responsibilities align more with administrative	
functions than academic policy.	



- Compliance and Accreditation Distance education must meet external regulations, such as those set by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and accreditation bodies. Ensuring compliance is an administrative duty, not a matter of academic curriculum oversight.
- Faculty, Staff, and Student Involvement While faculty input is essential, DE also involves IT staff, student services, and administrative personnel. The Academic Senate focuses on faculty and academic policies, whereas DE's scope is broader, requiring multi-departmental coordination.
- Curriculum vs. Delivery Method The Academic Senate has authority over curriculum, but distance education is a method of delivering instruction, not the content itself. Course approval already goes through the Curriculum Committee, making separate Senate oversight unnecessary.
- Administrative Oversight Many DE-related decisions, such as selecting a Learning Management System (LMS), managing online infrastructure, and providing technical support, are handled by administration rather than faculty governance.
- Because the DE Committee primarily focuses on implementation, compliance, and technology rather than academic curriculum decisions, it logically belongs under administrative oversight, not the Academic Senate.



- T. Berry DE leads are selected by the VPI in consultation with the Senate
- R. Hamdy shared a conversation with VP Hector regarding Distance Education (DE), explaining that the DE faculty lead, like the accreditation officer, should report directly to the VP due to accreditation, compliance, and regulatory issues. They also discussed the distinction between DE training and curriculum, noting that the DE addendum is overseen by the curriculum committee, which is part of the Senate.
- J. Salyer emphasized the importance of having processes documented in the participatory governance handbook to avoid constant confusion and changes from year to year. She pointed out that the process should be clear, transparent, and consistent, and stressed the need to get everything written down, as it would make a significant difference.
- B. Tasaka expressed concerns about the involvement of faculty in decisions related to distance education (DE), highlighting the need for faculty to have a say in matters directly affecting their classrooms. She emphasized the importance of maintaining faculty input in the selection process for DE leadership, as this has historically been the case. While acknowledging the role of administrative oversight, they stressed that the Senate should not completely remove faculty influence over DE, especially given its close connection to curriculum. B. Tasaka urged caution in deferring too much authority to administration without faculty input, as past experiences have shown the importance of protecting faculty interests. She acknowledged



that while the VPI ultimately makes decisions, the Senate remains a key recommending body in DE matters.

- N. Sogomonian initial hesitation about using the term "purview" correctly, seeking confirmation from a colleague. She shared that when she accepted the interim position, they were told part of their responsibilities would include handling curriculum, training, and attending Senate meetings. She emphasized their commitment to transparency by attending Senate and making reports, in contrast to holding secret meetings within the DE committee. Reflected on a past experience where they submitted a comprehensive report to Senate about DE achievements, highlighting their openness and involvement with the Senate process.
- 5.3. Promoting Goals & Collegiality: Discussion on Senate Conduct Standards, Andrea Hecht (15 minutes)
 - ✤ NOTES
 - ≻ A. Hecht
 - Equitable Dialogue
 - Quick Guide: When Can You Make a Motion
 - Key Parts of an Academic Senate (AS) Agenda & When to Make Motions
 - R. Hamdy noted that public comments are being misused and emphasized the importance of the Senate not continuing this practice in the future.
 - J. Salyer suggested that the Senate set a standard to address public comments as a floor item and move discussions to the



appropriate areas later, to maintain order and avoid misuse of public comments.

- K. Buffong asked about floor items.
 - A. Hecht senators should bring up topics during the appropriate sections of the meeting, such as public comments, if they are not already on the agenda.
- A. Mills fine with potential changes as long as we were running on time.
 - J. Salyer explained that the new agenda format assigns specific times to individuals rather than general areas like new or old business. This change is intended to better manage time and ensure all topics are addressed within the allotted 90 minutes, while respecting everyone's time. She acknowledged cutting short some topics but emphasized the goal of making the meetings more efficient.
 - C. Jones expressed appreciation for the new time management system, noting that it helps keep meetings on track. She initially worried it might feel too rigid but found it to be effective. However, she raised a concern about the future, wondering how the system might be handled by someone else when the current chair is no longer in charge, as it allows some flexibility when needed.
- R. Hamdy agreed with the new system but expressed concern that the protocol for handling items was not followed. They referenced a specific instance where a topic, the DE issue, was



 brought up as a floor item during the meeting instead of following the established process, where questions would be heard and possibly addressed in a future agenda. Concern about a recent issue being brought up, which was added to the agenda without prior discussion in the executive committee. Issues raised as floor items should be discussed in the executive committee first, where members with historical knowledge can weigh in, rather than rushing to action. A. Hecht - acknowledged the challenge of scheduling but stressed the importance of proactive planning over reactive decision-making. J. Salyer - noted we are over time and there needs to be a motion to extend the time or we need to move on. K. Buffong - suggested that the conversation had gone on for too long and the issue being discussed couldn't be addressed at the moment. They asked to move on to the next item. 5.3.1. Existing Academic Senate Meeting Norms & ASCCC Executive Comm. Meeting Norms A. Hecht went over documents. 	
6. Floor Items - Reserved to raise concerns within the Academic Senate scope. The Senate will hear your concerns/questions, but may not respond. If requested, the concern can be included on a future agenda. (5 minute total time limit, 2 minute max per person)	



7. Announcements

Def. To share brief information or updates that don't require discussion or action.

- NOTES
 - ➤ J. Salyer GE event March 25th, please make sure to post and share it with your students. The event will feature two workshops with a change in timing. One workshop will focus on a career interest inventory for students who are unsure about their major, and it will take place in a designated room in the library. The other workshop, led by Kenisha, will cover transfer readiness.
 - K. Buffong Transfer Trade and Tacos on April 2, from 10:00 am 1:00 pm.
 - B. Tasaka STEM, pi day on 3.14. There's a 3D printing workshop at 11 AM, a guest speaker at noon, and pie and pizza available all day. In the evening, at 7 PM, there will be a free planetarium show themed around Pie Day. It's a great opportunity to bring your family and students for a fun and nerdy time!
 - P. Gonzales Adult Ed open house, April 8. The event is aimed at inviting adult students transitioning from adult schools to the college. The event is a partnership with DEEP, focusing on graduate students seeking programs and services. It's a great opportunity for departments to recruit students for their programs.
 - ➤ Thomas The Board of Trustees will be meeting here at 4 PM.
 - ≻ R. Hamdy -
 - Tenure reception for faculty members will be held on April 25
 - Spotlighting event. The VPI office will send out an invite for this informal cocktail hour (minus the cocktails). Spotlighting will be free to all employees this year.



 Additionally, the new Tech Building is highlighted as a nice space. Al Academy has officially launched. It will take place over two Fridays, May 2 and May 9, each lasting four hours, for a total of eight hours. Participants are encouraged to register and provide feedback. 	
 8. Adjournment 8.1. Next meeting - April 2, 2025, room B - 100 Approval Date: April 2, 2025 Academic Secretary: Jamie Salyer (2024-2025) Academic Secretary Initials: 	Motion to adjourn the meeting. 1st: J. Notarangelo 2nd: C. Jones Approved by consensus.