

## SBVC Academic Senate

### Meeting Minutes

August 19, 2020

[Zoom link](#), 3:00 – 4:30 P.M.

Topic	Discussion	Action
<b>1. Call to Order and Roll Call</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting called to order at 3:05 p.m. by A. Avelar [President]</li> <li>• Roll call by B. Tasaka [Secretary] [view the <a href="#">Attendance and Voting Record</a>]               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Quorum reached</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>2. Consent calendar</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Motion 1</b></li> <li>• <b>Motion 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Discussion</b></li> <li>○ A. Avelar: On the agenda we have “No report” for Personnel Policy, Accreditation and Outcomes, and Guided Pathways. Each will have a brief report. The minutes aren’t ready because we met last week. We want to hold off on the 8.12.20 minutes until they’re ready.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 1: Motion to pull the consent agenda.</b>            1<sup>st</sup>: R. Hamdy            2<sup>nd</sup>: D. Smith            25 Votes            Aye: 92% [23 votes]            Nay: 0%            Abstain: 8% [2 votes]  <b>Motion passes</b>  <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p> <p><b>Motion 2: Motion to modify the agenda and postpone voting on the minutes.</b>            1<sup>st</sup>: C. Huston            2<sup>nd</sup>: K. Lawler            26 Votes            Aye: 92.3% [24 votes]            Nay: 0%            Abstain: 7.7% [2 votes]  <b>Motion passes</b>  <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
3. Public Comments on Agenda Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	
4. Senate President's Report A. Avelar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [view the <a href="#">Academic Senate President's Report</a>]</li> </ul>	
5. Committee Reports	<p>a. <b>Ed. Policy</b> [L. Cuny]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> <p>b. <b>Personnel Policy</b> [D. Smith]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Last week we mentioned the new paradigm. We received a list of our entire faculty slate from HR. Those who are slated to be automatically updated. There was one glitch, but we'll have that narrowed down by the weekend. Those letters of congratulations will go to everyone who was upgraded. It's a very long and gratifying list.</li> </ul> <p>c. <b>Student Services</b> [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr &amp; M. Tinoco]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> <p>d. <b>CTE</b> [J. Milligan]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> <p>e. <b>EEO</b> [H. Johnson]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> <p>f. <b>Professional Development</b> [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> <p>g. <b>Elections</b> [A. Pave]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We finished with the sub-committee assignments. Those are on the website. The chairs probably want to take note so they can be in touch with their committees.</li> <li>• The faculty committees list also went out again. If you have change requests, send those to me. The committees are pretty set. If you're not getting emails from the chairs of your committees, reach out to me or them. We want to make sure you receive communications.</li> <li>• The adjunct senator call-out went out. I received quite a few interested adjunct senators. I replied to seven different people to give them more information. I received one official nomination. Hopefully we receive more. I'm sure we'll get some excellent adjunct representation on Senate.</li> </ul> <p>h. <b>Curriculum</b> [M. Copeland]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> <p>i. <b>Program Review</b> [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul> <p>j. <b>Accreditation and Outcomes</b> [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C. Huston: The ISER was mailed out on Friday. D. Humble did the mailing honors and she's been sending me the</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>5. Committee Reports</b>, continued</p>	<p>FedEx notifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The committee met yesterday. We're preparing for the visit in terms of what that will look like online, how to get information to the campus, gathering additional evidence for and addendum.</li> <li>• We discussed the by-laws at our meeting, but I'll hold that for the by-laws portion later.</li> <li>• B. Tasaka: K. Yarborough will be sending out program maps to department chairs. This will help us with accreditation. If you have any outstanding SLO submissions, let me know and you can upload old assessments.</li> <li>• <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: I know there's been a lot of conversation on preparing for the upcoming visit. From the faculty perspective, is there going to be some kind of announcement of what faculty can expect? Will they ask us to go to a meeting? Will they randomly email us? Is that coming?</li> <li>○ C. Huston: Yes, some of that is known. DE for example, certainly they will want to meet with you. They may ask for specific committee members or they might ask for a selection. We're going to start putting the schedule together. It's on my to-do list to schedule an accreditation launch where we go over the schedule, how you can participate in the public meetings, what meetings are going to be happening across campus.</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: Thank you.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: We have a 5<sup>th</sup> Wednesday as well. We might use that as an accreditation prep.</li> </ul> </li> <li>k. <b>Distance Education</b> [M. Worsley &amp; D. Burns-Peters] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D. Burns-Peters: You've heard DE talk about POCR ["Peer Online Course Review"] for some time now. We've nearly completed a beta testing process for our local review process on campus. We are nearly on target so we can become certified as a POCR campus, meaning we can review our courses locally in terms of getting a quality badge instead of sending it off to an outside source and hopefully avoiding some of the bottleneaking. We have five courses going through that now. So far, so good. Thanks to all the faculty who volunteered for that.</li> <li>• There's also been discussion about our Level 3 training. It is coming. We are hoping to open that with information of what it looks like. It will have three components and it will look a little different from Levels 1 and 2. Hopefully that will open mid-fall.</li> <li>• Reminder to look at the four definitions of online instruction. Also look at recommendations for us going fully online in spring. That's on our agenda this Friday, August 21, from 1:00 – 2:30 p.m. Let me or M. Worsley know if you want to be part of that conversation.</li> <li>• <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M. Copeland: If the DE committee makes recommendations for spring, will those be formal that go to the Senate for approval?</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: Whatever we recommend we will bring to Senate. There was also a question about Pisces and NetTutor in the chat. NetTutor is still in place, that will continue through the fall. We don't have an ending date on that at this point. Pisces is unknown. It's really used for one-on-one training and it depends on budget.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: NetTutor is not our local tutors. J. Fehr also runs a separate tutoring center with our local tutors</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>5. Committee Reports</b>, continued</p>	<p>here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ V. Alvarez: Will we still have Proctorio?</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: Only through December at this oint.</li> <li>○ V. Alvarez: Is there any talk about the campus purchasing it?</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: That hasn't come through the committees. That would go to the District committee and it's not on the table yet. We're asking the CDC-OEI to give us leeway as a consortium campus to make decisions. So far they assure us they will give us leeway, so whatever that means</li> </ul> <p><b>l. Legislative</b> [T. Heibel]</p> <p><b>m. Financial Policy</b> [A. Castro]</p> <p><b>n. Guided Pathways</b> [T. Simpson, M. Robles, J. Stanskas]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● T. Simpson: The committee wanted to thank everyone for their participation last week.</li> <li>● We also want to encourage people to sign up for the Guided Pathways committee because that work is campus-wide. We want to hear from every department. If we can get more sign-ups we would appreciate that.</li> <li>● J. Stanskas: If the Senate has feedback about the event last week, we're open to hearing that.</li> <li>● A. Avelar: If you have feedback you can send it to the three chairs.</li> <li>● R. Hamdy: I'll send a survey for the week out soon.</li> <li>● D. Burns-Peters: I want to say I think it's one of the best weeks of training we've had in a long time. The information was helpful and I felt connected even though it was online. I appreciate how the Guided Pathways framework was laid out for the first half of the day and some of the questions that were posed to faculty. I look forward to seeing how that's integrated into where we go from now.</li> </ul> <p><b>o. Honors</b> [A. Blacksher]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">[view Honors Report]</a></li> <li>● I want to start with a simple statement: The failure to cultivate an intellectual and academically engaged community of scholars at a community college contributes to the inequality, particularly of lower socioeconomic students and students of color.</li> <li>● I started with that because at SBVC we've been in this cycle for longer than a decade where our Honors Program is negatively seen a lack of investment which has negatively impacted student participation, which caused a reduction in honors course offerings, which of course contributes to the lack of institutional investment and so on.</li> <li>● Over the past year I've really been monitoring and studying and interviewing not just our program and what's happening here, but also what other programs are struggling with and doing well. In this report I submitted to the VPSS and VPI, we have three goals that we need to improve our program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Improve the student experience</li> <li>○ Improve faculty compensation and community building</li> <li>○ Improve program and structural processes, both within the program and its relationship to folks outside the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>5. Committee Reports, continued</b></p>	<p>program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I really want to speak to two areas that the Honors Program is working on. Starting in Spring 2021, the Honors Program will host monthly workshop study sessions for students and an annual college signing day celebration for transfer students to reveal their campus to the community. We send students to some of the best universities in the state and in the country, and we want to celebrate that.</li> <li>• We also have good news – the Honors Faculty Lead position has been increased from 0.2 to 0.4. This puts us in some type of level playing field with the other community colleges, but with just one lead at 0.4, we're still not supporting faculty or employees to serve students in ways that are comparable to the rest of the state. We do have an honors counselor, but his position isn't really institutionalized. There's no clear language around what he's supposed to do or what he's responsible for. The position was really just hired as a counselor and told, by the way you'll have honors students. We'll work on clarifying that.</li> <li>• There's also some negotiations with the Union for better faculty compensation. I don't want to say too much until that's done. Rest assured that the honors committee will be vocal in supporting fair compensation.</li> <li>• Another step we're taking is to generate honors contracts. This is important. Students can receive honors credits for classes that aren't being offered. This means if I teach Sociology of Race, but we don't offer an honors section, with the committee's approval the faculty and students can work out a contract and the student can receive honors credit. Other colleges are doing it. We are decreasing honors offerings and not giving students the opportunity to earn those 15 units of transfer- that will negatively impact them, particularly in the STEM fields. We need options for our students to be the best and transfer to the best. We'll be working over the next week and month; hopefully we'll have the logistics and processes ready for those contracts. Share with your departments that this is coming down the line – students will be asking!</li> <li>• Please be cheerleaders, advocates, we need human escalators that want to help others move forward and not just exist as another checkbox. We aren't unique in the bureaucracy frustrations. When you've got a community college in our geography, that's with our population, when we have the best of the best and they look like me, we need to support and celebrate and honor that. Those are the folks who come back and change our community.</li> <li>• <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M. Worsley: I'm a cheerleader. I want to be on this honors bandwagon. We only have one honors class in the Music Department. It's a late start and we only have one student enrolled, so I'm desperate for a good pitch, not just for music students, but to get them interested in honors. I know it can have a dramatic effect on a grade point average and transferability when they're looking for a nuanced academic resume. So I'm assuming their workload will be adjusted if it's a regular class, but then is approved for honors credit?</li> <li>○ A. Blacksher: Absolutely. The requirement is that it's an enhanced learning opportunity; that's kind of the phrase I roll with. I want to dispel the misconception that you have to do extra work. It's not about quantity, it really is about quality and faculty engagement is critical. We want to add performance and oral presentation requirements. For example, simply performing in public meets the requirement of honors if it's done in a high-</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>5. Committee Reports, continued</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ level, engaging way. If you can identify a student within the first couple weeks who is amazing or if you know someone coming in, that's when the contract is really great.</li> <li>○ M. Worsley: I'm thinking of students who take an honors class, in Music it's Music History &amp; Literature, but if they take that class and other honors classes, we can get them across campus in an ambitious way.</li> <li>○ A. Blacksher: That's definitely part of our community. That's what our students have been frustrated about and that's what we see. What I've seen good programs do and bad programs not be able to do, which is to get students who are amazing in one area into other areas.</li> <li>○ L. Cuny: What was the process to get an honors class approved? Is it typical Curriculum Committee setup or how would you do that? Because when you said performance when you were talking to M. Worsley, my ears perked up.</li> <li>○ A. Blacksher: To get the class set up it does go through Curriculum. That's all I can say about that. I'll defer to my colleagues to better walk through the process.</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: Meet with the Curriculum Committee to talk about courses you want approved. We're happy to do that. It's a pretty simple process.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: I'm wondering about classes students could take at an honors level. I'm thinking like a college prep class or honors class in high school. Is that something that would have to go through Curriculum to be improved for that enhanced learning? I'm thinking a lot of faculty want to jump on that. I'm wondering before it gets really widespread, is that something that would have to go through Curriculum?</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: That's a great question; I'm not 100% sure. I haven't heard much about enhanced learning. I think it sounds super interesting. My question would be if it's not technically an honors class does it actually go on a student's transcripts as honors? How does that information get transcribed to a transcript?</li> <li>○ A. Blacksher: We have a meeting set up to iron out details next week. I don't mind being bluntly honest – our hope is it doesn't have to go through Curriculum, some colleges don't go through it. The UCs still honor it. If that works, then that works. If we find it's beneficial for our program, we're more than happy to do it that way.</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: Can you invite me to that meeting?</li> <li>○ A. Blacksher: More than happy to.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>6. Additional Reports</b></p>	<p>a. <b>SBCCD-CTA</b> [S. Lillard]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● So even though we're in the virtual world, the Union is going to start up its lunches again. Crafton had its first lunch today by Zoom. Ours will be next Wednesday, August 26, from 12 – 1 p.m. I believe J. Herrera will send out the Zoom link in the next few days. This is basically an opportunity to ask questions. They'll have some topics that they cover. It's not the same as going to the Sunroom by any stretch, but it's a way to continue those monthly informal meetings where people have the opportunity to ask questions.</li> <li>● We had negotiations today where we were trying to tie up some of the summer work we've been doing. So we have a couple of proposals that are sitting with the district. One is for some additional part-time professional development compensation to help with the work they've been doing to prepare for online teaching, attending</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>6. Additional Reports</b>, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• training, those sorts of things. Then there's a second proposal we passed this morning regarding a small stipend for all faculty to assist with expense that people have had by having to work from home. Again these are proposals- they were not settled. The District is doing a financial check on their CARES money to see what might be available to support those proposals and they'll come back with counterproposals on the 28<sup>th</sup>. We'll get those posted to the Union's website next week or so. You can look at them if you want.</li> <li>• I want to comment on the honors compensation. That's a proposal that was also left with the District. We made a proposal based on the interviews we did with honors faculty. We gave that to the District in the spring. That's ongoing. Our contention was that it's extra work to run an honors course because they're stacked. I want to clarify- we don't get extra load when we teach honors classes. They're stacked and we are expected to do the honors work at the same time we're doing non-honors work. If it's an honors-only section, then it's different work. As of the spring there were no honors-only sections at either campus; every honors class was stacked.</li> </ul> <p><b>b. District Assembly</b> [B. Tasaka]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report; first meeting is 9/1/2020</li> </ul>	
<p><b>7. SBVC President's Report</b> D. Rodriguez</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First is our strategic plan. As many of you know, our strategic plan has sunset. The new process we're hoping to do is have our strategic plan align with the District and across the district. In District Assembly coming up in a few weeks the District will be putting together a proposal of a process to develop the strategic plans across the district. They're bringing it there to get input because District Assembly has representation from all constituency groups from all campuses across the district. The idea is, we all know the Board sets policy and vision, if you will, for the District. From that the institutions would develop their strategic plans and the District would develop their strategic plan in support and how they would support the colleges. There's a lot more layers to that, but I want to put it on our radar so we're aware when it comes up. I don't want our faculty to be caught off guard when it comes up. I think between me and the faculty representatives we will keep everyone informed of the process.</li> <li>• I want to ask faculty if you're coming to campus please notify your deans. Please provide an approximate time of when you're on campus. It's a safety mechanism so we know who is on campus and in what buildings. I don't want to make any "rules" about who can be on campus and when. We're all professional and we all want to be safe and keep others safe. If you can just let your dean know that would be great. Just a quick reminder also about wearing masks.</li> <li>• We had a meeting with the Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) Committee which is housed at the District. One thing that came up was the lack of faculty representation on that committee. I get that there are times when that meeting was not convenient for faculty. There will be a request coming from the chair of that committee to see if SBVC has anyone who wants to be a representative. It has the potential to be a very dynamic committee.</li> <li>• Finally, I want to talk about the Census. The city of San Bernardino has just below a 55% rate on the Census. The statewide average is upwards of 65% - 70%. Folks from the Census Bureau have reached out to see if they can do a push. I offered that, instead of putting a table on campus, make a presentation to the college. I would take it to College Council, our managers meeting, I would ask the Senate if they're willing to put it on the agenda. I said probably no more than a 20-minute presentation would be sufficient. I also want to reach out to Student Life to</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>6. Additional Reports,</b> continued</p>	<p>connect with students. I also believe it's important to reach out to our communities and it's important to get as many people registered as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ R. Hamdy: An idea we had last fall, we had Angel Rodriguez come to the all-faculty meeting and he brought a student. Now that we're all online we can probably put a video on Canvas. It's important to have student voices available. I think it would reach practically all if not all of our students.</li> <li>○ D. Rodriguez: I'll put that on A. Rodriguez and the Census folks' radar to see if that's something they're interested in.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: I don't know if students know that filling out the Census increases the representation they have.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: I'm seeing in the chat that faculty would love to have it in Canvas and putting it on the website. KVCR also.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>8. Action Agenda</b></p>	<p><b>a. Adoption of Senate 2020 – 21 Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We had several that we looked at during the retreat and the last meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adoption of Anti-Racism/No-Hate Education: the work to implement Resolution SU.20.01</li> <li>○ Accreditation</li> <li>○ Guided Pathways</li> <li>○ Distance Education/Format of Instruction</li> <li>○ Professional Development Themes at Senate</li> <li>○ Student Career exploration and Networking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Motion 3</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>b. Anti-Racism</b></p> <p><b>i. Working definition:</b> We know the work is a campus-wide effort and it involves campus-wide dialogue. Part of that dialogue means we are working under the same definitions or similar definitions. Otherwise there can be too many tangents. One of the things we saw at our retreat was a working definition of what is anti-racism? One definition of <i>anti-racist</i> is <i>opposed to racism; opposed to the unfair treatment of people who belong to other races. A person who identifies and challenges the values, structures, and behaviors that perpetuate systemic racism.</i> Dr. Ibram X Kendi states: <i>To be an antiracist is to think nothing is behaviorally wrong or right-inferior or superior-with any of the racial groups. Whenever the antiracist sees individuals behaving positively or negatively, the antiracist sees exactly that: individuals behaving positively or negatively, not representatives of whole races. To be an antiracist is to deracialize behavior, to remove the tattooed stereotype from every racialized body. Behavior is something humans do, not races do.</i> Do we want to entertain adopting the working definition or maybe change it? What says the body?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A. Avelar: In the chat we have, "What about unconscious beliefs?" That's part of professional development. If you look at our resolution, it's looking at our unconscious bias and learning about them and being able to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 3: Motion to adopt the prioritized goals of the Senate as identified at the retreat for this academic year 2020 – 2021.</b></p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr 2<sup>nd</sup>: T. Allen 26 Votes Aye: 100% [26 votes] Nay: 0% Abstain: 0%</p> <p><b>Motion passes</b> <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p>



Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. Action Agenda, continued</p>	<p>address them. We all have some biases – what are they and how do they affect how we treat others?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J. Stankas: I just want to say that the definition we used for the retreat is coming out of the diversity, equity, and inclusion work for the Chancellor’s Office. It has many, many pages and includes defections for many things. It was, I think, an attempt to say when we’re talking about anti-racism, this is what we’re talking about right now. I’m happy to share when the draft is finally approved next month.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: That would be helpful because Crafton is working on their resolution. They have been looking at ours and looking at what they’re going to do based on the needs of their institution and their students. They are also looking at other definitions like white supremacy. It could potentially be an ever-evolving topic. We have to start these dialogues with our campus-wide colleagues, not just within our own Senate.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: For our own dialogue I think it’s really important because the district dialogues are happening. We’re doing so much cross-district stuff that we would really work towards a list district-wide with all of those definitions that mean the same thing to everyone. Could we think about adopting it as a working definition? Could we have something more along the lines of this being something we work towards as a district definition? And then we continue to add to the list as more of the vernacular begins to be used across the district? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Motion 4</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ R. Hamdy: This is step 1.</li> <li>▪ D. Burns-Peters: This can be a slightly fluid definition. We want to partner with the district and the state.</li> <li>▪ A. Blacksher: Where it says, “unfair treatment of people who belong to other races.” Other schools are finding minority groups are filing suit because of affirmative action policies and admission policies. The preferential treatment or recruitment of minority groups is inherently negative treatment toward the members of the majority group. Obviously we aren’t in the business of admission and such, but that language right there looks sticky and potentially opens us for legal things. I don’t know if someone can comment who has more experience, but we know what’s been going on for the past 20 years in education, that phrase might be problematic.</li> <li>▪ A. Avelar: Do we have a friendly amendment?</li> <li>▪ M. Copeland: I think it’s difficult to wordsmith like this on the spot. Can we make it a working definition and work towards getting it defined more appropriately in further conversations?</li> <li>▪ R. Hamdy: I agree. As J. Stankas mentioned, the state is coming with refined definitions. If everyone is okay, I suggest we think about what A. Blacksher said and move forward with this. Then we’ll revisit it often. Certainly we are only at the beginning.</li> <li>▪ L. Cuny: I’d like to concur. It seems like it can be a work-in-progress definition. We can start looking at actions to move the campus forward. I think back to the retreat and not to put Joe on the spot, but they mentioned developing a home-team atmosphere for students here on campus. It seems we can come up with actions moving forward.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 4: Move to use this as a starting point for shared meaning as we work towards district-wide definitions and add to this understanding.</b></p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>: R. Hamdy 2<sup>nd</sup>: D. Burns-Peters</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> None 25 Responses Aye: 96.2% [25 votes] Nay: 0% [0 votes] Abstain: 3.8% [1 vote]</p> <p><b>Motion passes</b> <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. Action Agenda, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ T. Vasquez: I was going to bring up the idea that Dr. Kendi brought this up as racism against Blacks, Latinx, and other people of color. The idea is it is specifically white against other races of color. I wonder if that's something we need to keep in mind of putting it out there in a more concrete way. Whether it is our definition or not right now, right? I think that's something I've been learning.</li> <li>▪ D. Burns-Peters: I would add if this is a start in definition, we need to be clear on what actions we will take to make sure we want to keep everybody updated on that definition, or is there a process we will maintain to make sure those contributions come in a way that shared with everybody so we aren't operating behind the scenes. I don't know that having a starting point for this is a good way to go, but we need to think about how we will make sure this either remains on our agenda until we have a set definition or we update on a regular basis.</li> <li>▪ A. Avelar: The Senate did indicate that our anti-racism work was always going to be an agenda item. If the Senate directs we can also make sure the definition stays on our agenda as we develop it based on what we see happening on our campus.</li> <li>▪ M. Copeland: We already have the resolution. There might be several definitions we look at from several different areas. Makes sense, who's to say there's only one definition. Is having a definition the biggest thing we want to do? Let's say we're all saying let's get in and actually change our curriculum. Let's do something that has meat to it. We could have a website that says here are several definitions of antiracist that have come from all over the world. Just a thought.</li> <li>▪ A. Avelar: Is that a friendly amendment? That is really the initiative: go back to the original intent. It's the body's choice. We can move forward to action items of how to actually start infusing it, but it's just when we work with other groups we want to be able to communicate a similar definition and not be in really different fields when we're talking about what we want to do. It's to have consistency across the campus. But again we don't have to go in that direction.</li> <li>▪ R. Hamdy: Can we change "definition" for "shared understanding"?</li> </ul> <p>ii. <b>Direction to committees:</b> Hearing M. Copeland loud and clear, what are we doing? We want to maybe provide some guidance to committees. What direction do we give committees if this is a campus-wide item?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ T. Vasquez: You brought up that the Senate has this on the agenda constantly as just a working goal and objective for all of us as we do our everyday thing. We actually say we need to address this. Making it part of a permanent agenda until maybe we don't need it anymore because it's a habit. I can see how a committee does this once and it doesn't come back again until someone brings it back up.</li> <li>○ A. Avelar: To clarify, if we ask committees to put this on their agendas across campus, do we just tell them that? Or do we give guidance as a Senate? For example, for Curriculum, is there a way to assist faculty on how to write culturally responsive curriculum?</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: I think it's a starting point to ask committees to put it on the agenda and then come back with their specific discussions. As far as Curriculum goes, we are going to talk about moving forward with that lens on curriculum and how we go about that, and we'll start having those conversations. I guess I don't want to see</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>8. Action Agenda, continued</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the Senate be super prescriptive unless we feel like the individual committees aren't doing anything, then maybe jump in? But let's give them a chance to put it on their agendas and then bring that information back to Senate as to what they came up with.</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: I will support what M. Copeland is saying. Maybe a starting point could be to ask committees to put it on their agenda and identify what that committee can do or where their work can occur. For DE we've already starting putting some stuff on the website. We've got some work to do. We know some very specific things we can do, but ask us to report that out. That could turn into further recommendatison or requests or guidance. At least start with having them identify where they see their orle and what things they can do to move this resolution forward. We are a very active Senate. This is different work. I can sense it in the silence. It's hard to voice our opinions, thoughts, or contributions on these topics. We don't want to say something that's taken the wrong way. It's important that our voice is heard on this issue. That's the whole point of us being here. We've been very quiet on both anti-racism issues. It's okay.</li> <li>○ T. Vasquez: I understand. I wonder if having some recommendations for committees in terms of communication for their membership, for example. We create rubrics for students, so we can give some guidance as we move into this territory. Having recommendations might be a good start.</li> <li>○ A. Blacksher: The bureaucracy is the problem. The institutions are the problem. We call it institutional racism for a reason. We are the institution. We are the bureaucracy. I'm a sociologist. I don't necessarily think bureaucracies are bad. They are very good, but they also come with a lot of problems and challenges. We are talking about this specific issue. We are the problem. So I understand that there are formalities and processes and things we need to do. I'm not suggesting we bypass them, but I appreciate D. Burns-Peters comment because I don't know how these meetings work. If people are more silent than normal that is the problem. The Senate has to take a stance and that is going to disrupt some people. It's going to make some people uncomfortable, but that is the challenge. The Senate must decide what type of senate it is going to be. Is it going to be the institution that continues and does the institutional things and there's absolutely nothing wrong with that. I can say folks who I know come to expect that from our institutions. Or is the institution going to do something radically different? And is it radically different by sheer virtue of making change? It is not a small change. It is absolutely radical because the institution of higher education was not designed for people who look like me and other people on this Zoom call. So it's by nature radical. This isn't a lecture. This isn't my sociology class. I guess the question I'm struggling to hear is, is the Senate really serious? That's something faculty members are struggling with and questioning. Are y'all serious or is this just talk. There is no going about business as usual unless it's going about racism as usual.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: I think you know we've talked about this before. We talked about this last year and we did nothing. We need to do something. Program Review hasn't met yet. I'm really hoping they're going to do something. They should have the opportunity to do that. Or maybe we should be directed. I'm on the fence about what's best.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. Action Agenda, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: We issued a very powerful resolution. It was not all talk. I don't see any difficulty where we remind our committees across campus to look at the resolution and see how it can be articulated in each committee. Hopefully we can get some kind of reflection or response. We might ask our colleagues to handle this anti-racism discussion. We can then go from there.</li> <li>• R. Hamdy: I want to offer a tangible solution. When you're a committee chair, it's really difficult to start an anti-racism conversation. I want to propose my chairs committee. If everyone can support my idea of chairs getting together and talking about how to get this out to our committees. We can provide guidance about how to get this out to our members. This is coming from the Senate, but it's going to take everyone to change the landscape of our institution.</li> <li>• M. Copeland: I'm not opposed to a chairs meeting. Perhaps I have tunnel vision because I already have a plan for my committee.</li> <li>• R. Hamdy: Maybe you can mentor others who are unsure of where to go.</li> <li>• M. Copeland: I'm antsy about having another meeting to talk about what we're going to talk about. Let's get something done. Can the Senate simply task the chairs to put anti-racism on the agenda? They're tasked to have a discussion about what specific things those committees can do that are concrete action-items.</li> <li>• J. Stankas: I was going to remind folks that at the retreat last week there was discussion about what role the Senate wishes to play. That sounds like the discussion that's happening now. The Senate can be very directive, and some may not appreciate that but others might. For example, you could ask Enrollment Management to compare the population served of enrolled students and the population of the committee and how to fix any disparities, then report back to the Senate. You could ask the committees to discuss cultural relativism of curriculum and report back to the Senate. It could be just asking them to report back and reach out to the Senate if they need help facilitating the conversation. There's no right answer. It takes some thought of what's the culture of our campus currently.</li> <li>• B. Tasaka: C. Huston had a motion in the chat. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Motion 5</b></li> <li>○ <b>Discussion:</b></li> <li>○ M. Copeland: We need a starting point. Ask committees to come back with concrete ideas. If there's no fruit, I like J. Stankas' ideas. We can ask them for specifics. This is independent of the chair meeting.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: Can I pull my motion? I'm happy to move forward with M. Copeland's idea of giving chairs autonomy.</li> <li>○ C. Huston: Where are chairs going to go for guidance?</li> <li>○ B. Tasaka: C. Huston made the motion.</li> <li>○ R. Hamdy: Right. I can't pull it then. I do want to respect chairs who have been at it for a long time.</li> <li>○ M. Copeland: It's possible that a committee will say, we don't know.</li> <li>○ D. Burns-Peters: C. Huston, would you consider a revision that we follow M. Copeland's suggestion where</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 5: Move that the committee chairs will meet with their own committees and put anti-racism on their own agendas first. Then, Professional Development will support them in their conversations on anti-racism and move forward.</b></p> <p>1<sup>st</sup>: C. Huston 2<sup>nd</sup>: K. Lawler</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> None 24 Responses Aye: 91.7% [22 votes] Nay: 0% [0 votes] Abstain: 8.3% [2 votes]</p> <p><b>Motion passes</b> <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p><b>8. Action Agenda,</b> continued</p>	<p>we give them a date to get a response as well as support. R. Hamdy can offer a meeting for chairs if they want to come together.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A. Avelar: In the chat, justice delayed is justice denied. A committee does have a gauge of what it will be. We have amendments.</li> </ul> <p>iii. <b>Curricular design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Motion 6</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion 6: Move to bring curricular design back on the next agenda.</b>  1<sup>st</sup>: M. Copeland  2<sup>nd</sup>: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr  <b>Discussion:</b> None  21 Responses  Aye: 100% [21 votes]  Nay: 0% [0 votes]  Abstain: 0% [0 votes]  <b>Motion passes</b>  <a href="#">[Voting Record]</a></p>
<p><b>9. Discussion Items,</b> continued</p>	<p><b>a. Scheduling Process and Timeline</b> [D. Humble]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [view <a href="#">presentation</a>]</li> <li>• Thank you for inquiring about the scheduling timeline. I'm happy to go through our current processes and answer any questions you have.</li> <li>• Overall, we usually sit down once a year and talk through timelines. We start with registration dates and go backwards. We plan according to published registration dates. Step 1 is we prepare and distribute the schedule for divisions. Academic Deans receive a packet with a number of reports and forms to distribute to faculty chairs, including schedule rollovers. A lot of steps happen before that process involving K. Yarborough and J. Wilkerson and the Curriculum Committee. Once courses are approved at the state we have articulation and K. Yarborough builds them into Colleague. Then we can do a rollover. The first step is the schedule rollover. That's sent to deans and deans send it off to faculty chairs. Faculty chairs consult with faculty and review data. That can be enrollment data or other types of student success data, retention, persistence, etc. They return their schedule recommendations to the dean. This is about four months before registration that this process begins. The process from rollover to return to deans takes about six weeks.</li> <li>• Step 2 involves the division office and dean. After the chairs return their schedules, the dean and admin secretaries review those schedule and create FTES projections. They ensure they get a first look at faculty loads and start looking at limits of faculty loads and other data like rooms, student contact hours, and delivery methods. Then divisions submit schedules to the office of instruction to our two schedulers. That process takes approximately one to two weeks. We're already at the halfway mark, a little over two months.</li> <li>• Step 3 is the actual input of the courses and schedulers put each class individually into Colleague for the schedule so they're build according to what's submitted by the deans. This process takes about six weeks and there are a number of aspects I'll cover in a moment.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>9. Discussion Items, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Step 4 is the schedulers return the first draft to the chairs and deans to review for accuracy. They make any adjustments to the schedule, then the confirm staffing. We confirm faculty ID numbers, loads, and they return that to the office of instruction for final processing.</li> <li>• One important aspect that we monitor along the way is class hours. We look at meeting patterns, attendance, accounting methods, student contact hours, and much more. We have checkpoints along the way to ensure accuracy in reporting apportionment with the state chancellors office and abiding by Title 5 and Ed Code. We also look at the scheduling time blocks using our new tool. We also look at class notes to make sure they're there and arranged hours, etc. We check petitions on the class, class caps, section caps, waitlists, and other special coding that needs to be on the class before the schedule is published.</li> <li>• Finally, we look at faculty info. Faculty IDs, making sure they're hired, are they hourly, contract, etc.? These are the data aspects we check constantly and thoroughly along the way.</li> <li>• The final steps are publishing and processing. If adjustments are made, we run reports. After they're made, we run reports again. These include several Colleague reports. If there are discrepancies in meeting times or patterns, it would show up on reports. We continue until there are no errors. After that, we prep and run R25. That process takes about three weeks.</li> <li>• The first step, collaboration with faculty, deans, division offices, and the office of instruction takes the longest. We also work hand-in-hand with TESS.</li> <li>• Our goals are always to get the schedule published for students as soon as possible before registration so they can plan. We've been having talks with faculty chairs over the last year and a half about working toward that year-long scheduling process. Especially as we go towards Guided Pathways, students know what's going to be offered and when. And our counselors know and are able to work with student ed plans.</li> <li>• The entire process is about 18 weeks start to finish.</li> <li>• <b>Questions/Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ L. Cuny: I've been dealing with making scheduling changes as terms start in terms of late-start classes. I'm trying to understand our process here. It's confusing for students. Students say it's confusing. A class was cancelled, do they pay again? Can we be flexible in how that's changed? Maybe get students involved with advisors. As it is now we can't make them take a new class even though it's the same with slightly different dates.</li> <li>○ D. Humble: You're talking about a class that was changed because of an issue?</li> <li>○ L. Cuny: We just moved it to a late start.</li> <li>○ D. Humble: Our system unfortunately has limitations and that's one of them. If we have one in the system that's ready to go, and I would equate it to say you're making a substantive change to curriculum. If you change the time or day it triggers a change and that's how Colleague works. Sometimes we make those changes ourselves behind the scenes. They're always communicated with along the way and given options. I can't say the process is without flaws, but if there's something specific I can help with I would certainly be more than</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<b>9. Discussion Items, continued</b>	<p>willing to do that. We try not to make substantive changes once the schedule goes live.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ B. Tasaka: There was a comment in the chat about students not being notified when their classes are cancelled and that causes problems when they're supposed to be full-time and enrolled in specific programs.</li> <li>○ D. Humble: Students are notified. We have standard messaging. Deans work hard with faculty chairs to notify students and it's been our practice to notify students of other available sections. We try to automate the process as much as possible. But again, the process isn't without flaws, especially right now in this pandemic environment.</li> </ul> <p><b>b. Bylaws revisions</b> [A. Avelar]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Continue looking at them. We will continue the discussion at our next meeting. Take it to your groups, especially the ones that are in our by-laws.</li> </ul>	
<b>10. Information Items</b>	<p><b>a. Hiring Model – ASCCC Modules</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● One of our resolutions points was the hiring of faculty and staff throughout the campus and district that represents our student population. The ASCCC came up with a model for hiring. It's a campus-based module set. I already shared it with our administration and our EEO faculty chair, H. Johnson.</li> </ul> <p><b>b. Senate: Campus Wide Committee Assignments for Faculty</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This was already sent out.</li> </ul>	
<b>11. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● None</li> </ul>	
<b>12. Announcements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● None.</li> </ul>	
<b>13. Adjournment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.</li> <li>● Next meeting: September 2, 2020, at 3:00 p.m. via <a href="#">Zoom</a> (link will also be shared on our webpage).</li> </ul>	