



SBVC Academic Senate

Meeting Minutes

October 16, 2019

AD/SS 207 3:00 – 4:30 P.M.

Topic	Discussion	Action
1. Call to Order and Roll Call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting called to order at 3:02 p.m. Roll call via sign-in sheet [see attachment: AS Documents, Sign-in Sheet]. 	
2. Public Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None. 	
3. Senate President's Report C. Huston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [see attachment: AS Documents, SBVC Academic Senate President's Report] See the back of the handout for the Academic Senate's standing committee assignments. The Area D Meeting Took place on Saturday at San Diego Mesa College. Our own J. Stankas reported on the three priorities established by the ASCCC: faculty diversification, the online college, and transfer. The ASCCC is planning to develop a screening tool that can be like a toolkit that can be applied to the diversity minimum qualification. They encourage local senates to adopt it as well, so there's a more standardized interpretation for screening for diversity throughout the state. Chancellor Oakley was also there. He spoke about faculty diversification a little bit as well. He spoke in favor of increasing diversity and equity in faculty in community colleges. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a big update on Calbright. You can visit www.asccc.org/president-update and click on J. Stankas' update from October 2019. I also forwarded this out again. He had a lot to say about Calbright, the fully online college. The Chancellor's office Curriculum Inventory shows their classes as noncredit. They're fully not accredited by the ACCJC. They cannot be accredited by the ASCCC unless they offer a credit degree. The Chancellor told us they were one of us and just like us. The Area D meeting also had some plans to focus on re-evaluation of Program Review processes to try to align them with initiatives we have right now. It's going to be a forthcoming topic at the state level. Reminders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 30th meeting. Sabbatical applications are due November 1, 2019. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>3. Senate President's Report, continued C. Huston</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see the reverse side of the President's report] Resolutions: These are the resolutions going out to Fall Plenary. I will email out the entire packet with the language of the resolutions. Voting will take place on Saturday, November 9, 2019. These items will come to us as an agenda item on November 5. I vote your will. If you have strong feelings about them, please let me know because I need that information to vote. If you know of anyone who might have concerns, please let them know. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a lot of resolutions that address the internal processes of the ASCCC. ○ There are also a lot that surround Diversity and Equity. ○ Under 19.0: Professional Standards, you'll find the Minimum Qualifications Toolkit to hire for CTE disciplines. I would like to ask the standing CTE committee to review this in depth so when you come back in November you'll be able to speak to it and have opinions on how to vote. K. Melancon had to step down as the CTE Committee chair, so I'll ask J. Milligan to fill the vacancy for now. 	
<p>4. Committee Reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ed Policy [J. Bjerke] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. b. Personnel Policy [J. Notarangelo] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. c. Student Services [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. d. CTE [K. Melancon] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see attachment: AS Documents, New proposed Applied Technology building planning concerns] • J. Milligan: With the Applied Technology building, they're moving to the planning stages of the CTE building. There are some clear concerns of transparency in that process. They're doing some user-group type meetings and several programs that are very successful are just not included in that building or significantly reduced. Then programs that are not successful are given big expansions in that building. Specifically, for welding, we have a lab right now that's about 3000 square feet and they want to give us about 1200 square feet. It's already at maximum efficiency and maximum capacity. It's already borderline unsafe as it is. In the back of the CTE building there is a little thin building; they're going to leave that, but they want to remove all the restrooms, all the classrooms and tool rooms, and they're going to leave Automotive and Auto Collision in that building. I've tried to set a meeting with our VPI and VP Admin Services but there's no response. I'm not sure what to do as far as having the conversation and having a transparent process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Huston: I'll take this to Exec and I'll talk to the VPI when I meet with her; she's out of 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>4. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<p>town right now so that's why she may not be responding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ J. Milligan: A quick note for Aeronautics, they were told there are talks about moving them to the San Bernardino Airport. They were told that they basically have three years to find their own facilities at the San Bernardino Airport because they're not going to be included in the new building. For Diesel, I haven't had a chance yet to talk to K. Melancon to get the exact numbers, but they're also talking about a substantial reduction for Diesel as well. Last year Aeronautics was the largest in our division, Welding was the second largest; I don't know where Diesel was, but it's been growing and doing very well. There are a few programs that were performing very poorly and they are being given the most amount of space in those new buildings as it stands right now. ○ M. Copeland: Do you know if there are any plans to have EDCT there in the new space? ○ J. Milligan: Not that I'm aware of. They would only show us plans for our specific areas. I've been talking to other faculty and comparing notes. Welding's FTES have grown by almost 120% in the last two years and our duplicated enrollment grew by 70%. So why are they trying to reduce us? ○ A. Avelar: Who is "they"? Who is only showing you <i>your</i> plans? ○ J. Milligan: The architects. ○ A. Avelar: So the architects are going to the faculty and saying I can only show you your plans and that's it? ○ J. Milligan: So there are user groups set up. They only had spacing for each department chair and one additional subject matter expert set up. They would only show us what was for our subject area/program. The architects are only doing what they were told. ○ A. Avelar: Who told them that? ○ J. Milligan: That I'm not sure. That's why I emailed the VPIs. ○ C. Huston: Thank you for bringing it to our attention because we can start working with it and reaching out to those we know. Also since we have two back-to-back meetings because of the October 30th meeting, should it be necessary we can read out a resolution and vote on it on November 5th. ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: What's the process? He's brought this to us, do we ask the VPIs to come to the next meeting? How do we go about this process? ○ C. Huston: Yes, start with the VPIs. S. Thayer is here and he can share this information with S.Stark and D. Humble. I hope you take this to the President's cabinet. ○ S. Thayer: If I can add, I know they're both out of town for context. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>4. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Copeland: Can we task the Senate President with asking S. Stark to come to the next meeting? ○ J. Buchanan: What are they doing with the old building? ○ C. Huston: It's going to be a parking lot eventually. ○ J. Milligan: They're saying it will take a couple of years and they can use it for classrooms while they wait for it to be demolished. ○ C. Huston: We will reach out. We'll invite S. Stark. Talk to others on campus. Depending on the response, a resolution might be appropriate. We need two readings to pass a resolution. ○ S. Lillard: I'm wondering where A. Maniaol is in this? Is he in the dark as well? ○ J. Milligan: He said he can't say too much without getting in trouble. ○ C. Huston: Thank you, this is something we need to follow up on quickly. <p>e. EEO [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No report. <p>f. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Huston: R. Hamdy isn't here today, but I know she would want to remind everyone of The Brown Act & Robert's Rules of Order & Sabbatical. • D. Burns-Peters: Also Great Teachers is on November 1st, and Can Innovate is on Friday, October 25th. She's been sending emails. <p>g. Elections [D. Burns-Peters]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C. Huston: Since our elections chair is also a nominee, I'll do the President part of the announcements, then I'll turn it over to the Elections chair. Elections nominations closed officially yesterday at 5:00 p.m. At 5:00 we had two active candidates who accepted nominations. [applause] We have two well-qualified, outstanding faculty running for Academic Senate President. I'm really excited about that. I dug through my emails and found D. Smith's email from many years ago; I'm going to update the language and put my name at the bottom because D. Burns-Peters should not run this election. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D. Burns-Peters: Before we go further with the process, I would like to say it's an honor to be nominated, I had a lot of conversations with people along the way and I seem to be on that list of names, but we have a very qualified nominee who is my first choice. With that and a lot of consideration and a lot of thought over the last 24 hours, I'm going to respectfully rescind my nomination unless there's some reason the group would not proceed with one nominee. ○ C. Huston: When we have one nominee the election goes forward with one nominee 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>4. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<p>and a write-in. That has been our process, and of course D. Burns-Peters has gone, but you can feel free to write her or anyone else in.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D. Burns-Peters: Understand it was a lot of personal consideration and I respect A. Avelar and what she does greatly. She does a tremendous amount of work. It doesn't mean I think I'm unqualified; I wrote a letter that I think really speaks to who I am and the skill-set I could bring [applause for D. Burns-Peters]. ○ C. Huston: I will get that email out today. ○ A. Avelar: Can I ask a question? I know there is still an election, but if elected, I am going on sabbatical next semester and it's past practice that the President-Elect shadow the President. Since I'm on sabbatical, I'm going to finish a lab manual, I can see coming in an actually shadowing, but I don't see .2 as necessary. I don't want to eliminate it because a future president-elect might need it. Is it possible for the body to consider giving it to the secretary so she can actually have time to update the website because it's a tremendous amount of work? That way the new president can start off with everything updated. ○ C. Huston: I can't answer that because the reassign comes from the President's office. How much reassign [is B. Tasaka] already on? ○ B. Tasaka: I have a full load plus overload and .3 reassign, so I'm maxed out right now, but in the spring I will have .3 plus the rest of my course load. ○ C. Huston: So it's not possible for her to do it now, but possibly in the spring. ○ M. Copeland: That's already a great start [applause]. ○ C. Huston: Of course A. Avelar and I already talked about shadowing. The major committees that the President serves on, she has served on as recently as last year. District Assembly, College Council, she's been on the District Budget Committee, she's presented to the Board of Trustees. There's the plenary session in the spring that will be good to go to; she's already expressed interest in the ASCCC Faculty Leadership Institute next summer whether she wins or not. The by-laws say that the Senate moves forward two candidates, or one candidate and a write-in. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Motion 1 ● D. Burns-Peters: Give a big welcome to the two adjunct faculty senators joining us: Mary Lawler and Jamie Buchanan [applause]. We had two very qualified and interested faculty come forward. We're really excited to have them on board and have the adjunct faculty voice present at the table. ● The other election that was running is Program Review. We had one candidate submit a letter, C. Huston [applause]. I guess we proceed as usual. I don't think that requires a 	<p>Motion 1: Move to forward Amy Avelar as the Academic Senate President candidate along with a write-in position. 1st: P. Ferri-Milligan 2nd: M. Copeland Discussion: None Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: D. Burns-Peters</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>4. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<p>write-in. That being said, we need to run a vote.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M. Copeland: So next year we start accreditation. How do you do accreditation and program review? ○ C. Huston: The same way I currently do accreditation and Academic Senate president. ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: Would you still be Accreditation Chair? ○ C. Huston: I would be through fall, but not necessarily afterwards. My current contract as faculty lead for accreditation runs through fall 2020. I have 4+ years of experience as Program Review co-chair in the past before I moved to accreditation. Had [P. Ferri-Milligan] served [her] full term, I would have applied then. This just moved up my timeline. ○ P. Ferri-Milligan: It's not you. It's not program review or accreditation. It's just that we have so many people pulling double duty and eventually they quit. That's something we haven't addressed as a senate and it needs to be addressed at some point. We have a lot of faculty and it's good to have faculty doing different things. When we have people pulling double duty it can be a conflict of interest. ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: At the moment though, there is one person who would like to serve. Perhaps as we go along in our discussion with the Senate, then that can be brought up. At this point the nomination and application closed already, right? ○ D. Burns-Peters: That's correct. ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: So we will have to move along and consider any changes you would like to have for the future. We have to respect the process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vote 1 <p>h. Curriculum [M. Copeland]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [see attachment: AS Documents, CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND VOTING] • This was something the Curriculum Committee came to a decision on. We were talking about voting and membership. Our membership is in an AP and Senate and by-laws. We never established our voting members or quorum. We wanted that to be very clear. We want it included in the Curriculum Handbook and in the Senate by-laws. The committee voted that every standing position including faculty are voting members. We established a quorum of 50% + 1. This means because we have many faculty on the committee, even though there are non-faculty voting members of the committee, the faculty voice is strongest when it comes to curriculum. Because we are a subcommittee of the Senate, I'm asking for the Senate's support and for this to be placed in the Senate by-laws and 	<p>Vote 1: All in favor of Celia Huston as the Program Review Chair.</p> <p>In favor: 22</p> <p>Opposed: 0</p> <p>Abstentions: P. Ferri-Milligan, M. Jacobo, C. Jones</p> <p>Vote passes.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>4. Committee Reports, continued</p>	<p>Curriculum Handbook.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Huston: Can you tell me the number of the by-law? ○ M. Copeland: Oh, that I don't know. ○ C. Huston: We need to make a motion to open the by-law, bring the change officially, then adopt it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Motion 2 <p>i. Program Review [P. Ferri-Milligan]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The last needs assessment workshop is this Friday. They're due next Wednesday the 23rd. I told the committee that it's doom and gloom with money, but always put in for needs assessment because you never know. If you have them come to the workshop. Our members will be there to help you. Bring your EMP and past efficacy report. Please make sure you meet the deadline by noon on Wednesday. I'm posting directly by the end of the week because the committee needs to review these before they're ranked. We'll have them ranked by the end of the term, but I'm putting them directly on the website. • Also, I'm updating the website, so it should be done by the end of October or early November. I'm getting help from K. Weiss and J. Lamore. <p>j. Accreditation & SLOs [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had a very small group due to a lot of management being out in training. At our previous meeting, we had started talking about the topic for the Quality Focus Essay where we pick a few topics that the campus wants to focus on over the next 3.5 years. One way that we went after topics was we went over the Program Review onesheets from all divisions, identifying common themes in program goals, program challenges, and opportunities. We looked for overarching themes across the campus. We identified many themes, not surprising that staffing was one. We identified the themes as student outreach, student access, student support, budget, online, and partnerships and outreach. We had some very robust conversations about this. We'll put some ideas on paper and bring them to the next meeting. We didn't feel comfortable making a decision with so few people there, especially without the ALO and VPI. • We have been receiving feedback from committee members on the sections of the committee report that they're responsible for. I also sent out Standards IIIA (HR) and IIID (budget) to the District. I have heard back from K. Hannon, thank you. I haven't heard back on Standard IIID. I also sent two of the standard IV (the Chancellor and Board of Directors) to J. Gilbert to coordinate a review of that at the district level. I haven't received that response either. We'll put that together and bring it to the campus by the end of the month. That way you can have a first read and the whole campus can provide feedback. 	<p>Motion 2: Move to open the Senate by-laws for the Curriculum Committee.</p> <p>1st: D. Foozuni 2nd: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Avelar: The second-to-last bullet says "A Dean/Manager ..." • M. Copeland: I will fix that before we bring it back to the Senate at the next meeting. <p>Approved: Unanimously</p> <p>Abstentions: None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Action
4. Committee Reports, continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new SLO Faculty Lead is B. Tasaka [applause]. That was something that went through the VPI's office, not the Senate. B. Tasaka is coming on board mostly focused on learning the SLO process this semester, and next semester when her load shifts she will starting to work with faculty and groups individually and moving our SLO processes forward. 	
5. Additional Reports	<p>a. SBCCD-CTA [S. Lillard]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [see handout: AS Documents, SBCCDTA Negotiations Highlights] I sent a link to all faculty on Monday; there's a printed copy of the same post that's on the website as well. One thing I did want to comment on, it's on the second page, we did sign an MOU regarding seniority. It outlines the procedure we are already following for how the seniority lists are put together for full-time tenure track, and tenured faculty, and part-time faculty. The part that was missing was full-time temporary. We have that written now. The MOU went into effect on Friday. When we ratify articles and such at the end of the year in an election, that will move to Article 13. The other hot topic is the online training. As you may know, CHC and SBVC have different processes and we're trying to sort through it all. The final paragraph on page 2 says to give us a bit of time to sort it out. We'll get back to you on that. M. Lawler: So you're suggesting to hold off? S. Lillard: I'm not saying that, but CHC has had a process for years and it's different from SBVC. We're trying to sort it out before we make recommendations. We need more information. <p>b. Guided Pathways [T. Simpson]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [see handout: AS Documents, Guided Pathways at SBVC] I'm going to report on both our campus' Guided Pathways and the ASCCC's. For us, we did finalize our career fields. I have the wheel here. They are: Arts, Communication & Design (ACD), Business, Information Tech. & Hospitality (BIH), Health, Wellness & Athletics (HWA), Manufacturing, Industry & Transportation (MIT), Public Service, Culture & Society (PCS), and Science, Technology, Engineering & Math (STEM). We'll have a mapping workshop on the 25th in PS-199. The invitation went to all the department chairs. If department chairs cannot make it, please send someone on your behalf. That will be from 10 – 2. We will provide lunch. The committee along with some key people on campus will be going to the regional at Victorville Community College. It's an all-day event. We'll also be meeting in this room next week Tuesday for our regular meeting. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
5. Additional Reports, continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the ASCCC, we got our goals done for Guided Pathways. They are: Exemplify equity work, Program Review-related processes, College onboarding processes, Professional development and governance structure, and also working on weekly webinars. I'll be sending out an invitation for some voices on campus. The next webinar is on bridging the gap between instruction and student services. We want to see how we're doing that on our campus. I want to point out that the resolution 13 on the President's Report. Number 13 under general is the resolution that I submitted. The request is that Guided Pathways remain under the Senate's purview and that there is always collegial consultation throughout the process. 	
6. Consent Agenda	<p>a. Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10/2/19 	
8. Old Business	<p>a. Campus Committees [C. Huston]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I distributed some drafts. There is a draft committee FAQ. There's a draft of best practices for committee assignments. I'm going to charge the Elections Committee with reviewing those two documents and bringing that to the Senate in final format at our next business meeting on November 5th. Please review those documents. Send any feedback to D. Burns-Peters or talk to your division representative on that committee. We talked briefly at the last meeting of having student equity as a separate committee. We didn't come to any conclusions. But as I looked at the ASCCC resolutions and as I listened to Area D report on diversification of faculty. I would like to charge the EEO committee with reviewing the materials and deciding whether or not we should have an Equity and Diversity committee on campus. Rather than being reactive and catching up, we can be proactive. Bring a recommendation. The full senate is welcome to vote it up or down, but having a conversation and charge in the full senate will take a long time. Let's task Ed Policy with how many people should be on the scholarship committee. 	
8. New Business	<p>a. Budget Update [J. Torres]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rescheduled <p>b. Screening Committee Guide [K. Hannon]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> [see attachment: AS Documents, Screening Committee Guide] This is still in draft form, but we are moving forward with hopefully being able to go live with the document in January. I'm hoping for a motion of support from the senates; I'll be presenting at CHC's senate soon. I did get feedback from the last time I was before you. We had a district-wide EEO committee meeting last week. From multiple areas, we've been asked to develop a best 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>practices for adjunct hiring (IIE). I was initially going to put that in this document, that's why it's highlighted. After several conversations it became clear that adjunct hiring has evolved into its own special type of hiring that's inclusive of chairs and managers and sometimes others in the department. At that point when I realized that adjunct hiring was different and it doesn't go through a formalized committee process, I was wary about adding it in here. I can refer to Adjunct Hiring Practices or Guides here, but I'm creating a separate document. It will probably be about two pages long. It will include some foundational legal requirements, such as who is making the job offer, how to get members into the candidacy pool, checking Minimum Qualifications, things like that and legal language. The best practices language will be more of a guideline for individual departments. Depending on discipline and large or small adjunct pool, we don't want to limit you by putting some impossible requirements that smaller areas or emergency hires will have to abide by. It will be foundational as to what the law and what our local policies state, but with some slight alterations that each department can use based on the unique circumstance. I'll send it to this body once it's complete. We're currently moving today and tomorrow, but I will send it. I'm planning to send it in the next week. It will be a separate document, but it will be referenced here along with any other handouts that are in creation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only other area is equivalency now that we're using the district equivalency process. That part has changed. • Also, we aren't using ADP for applicants. It's not getting used for employees at all. We are using NEOGOV. This is a program for California public education institutes. City and county use it as well, but because California is unique in having Ed Code, Title 5, all other types of regulations, NEOGOV was created for our uniqueness. I've used it in other agencies. ADP wasn't able to meet needs in recruitment. One change you'll see as a screener is the flexibility of the program. There will no longer be downloading files to your hard drive. It's like 21st century [laughter]. Now you'll get a link to each application document. We are currently doing training internally for HR. There is no change for the district unless you're applying for a job. You'll have better access to adjunct pools. • And we're going to start doing testing on blind screening. You won't get to know their name or personal identifiers unless it's relevant. We'll test it out and see. It's something that's in talks at the state level in terms of equity and diversity. NEOGOV allows us to do that. As part of my role I have to run an analysis of every single applicant pool to look for trends. It would be nice to have a tool instead of Excel. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K. Weiss: What's the transition time? 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ K. Hannon: Anything currently housed in ADP will be housed in NEOGOV. Then those that need access to it will be given a link and, if need be, a training. It's much easier than what we were doing. ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: Going back to your document, question and clarification regarding your confidentiality statement. It doesn't state how long the confidentiality lasts and when it starts. There are always conversations about the matter. ○ K. Hannon: Confidentiality, as far as the committee role, starts before you get the application materials. Depending on committee positions, the committee makeup remains confidential. The actual committee makeup may not need to be confidential. The information- the questions and anything with the candidates- needs to remain confidential. We recently had an experience where we were hiring someone in our own department and there were both internal and external candidates. The person who got the job sent an email to the committee and said thank you. Someone came to me and said, so-and-so got the job. I wondered how they knew that. I thought there was a breach in HR or on the committee. The candidate breached it by sharing with the committee- we can't control that, but we can control the information we're sharing. ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: I understand these things. I have a license that says confidentiality remains even until death, but that isn't the business code of most of us. What I'm saying is perhaps a statement that says when and where confidentiality starts, and what needs to be observed. Just so we don't have an observation. It's tricky so a guide would be helpful. That's my suggestion. ○ A. Avelar: If we need to find applicants now, are we still going through ADP? ○ K. Hannon: Yes, we'll do a soft transition on November 1st. Everything will be in NEOGOV by mid-November. We'll notify managers. ○ J. Milligan: All possible faculty applying now will apply on the ADP system? ○ K. Hannon: Correct. ○ D. Fozouni: You said you were considering a blind process. Is that just for the first level? ○ K. Hannon: It would be just for the screening component. Once the committee decides who they are going to interview, then at that time the names will be rebuilt. We do that for two reasons. You need to know if you know anyone. ○ D. Fozouni: So just names? ○ K. Hannon: Names and other identifies like gender, birthdate, high school graduation date. The transcript sometimes can help you find out their age. It's just for screening. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Huston: How long will you be accepting feedback? ○ K. Hannon: Until December 1st. I'm not going to Crafton in the next month, so I'll always accept feedback and recommendations. My question is would you like to see final document or are you comfortable with a motion of support based on the collaboration with District and managers? ○ P. Wall: I would like to see the final document. ○ L. Gregory: So you move forward with the screening. I happen to know an advocate. Does the screening still move forward? ○ K. Hannon: We would have the conversation about whether you're comfortable knowing them. Just knowing them isn't enough. ○ D. Burns-Peters: I think you mentioned it in passing, but I'm not sure how clear it is campus wide- the equivalency process has moved to a district approach. ○ C. Huston: And we approved it. ○ D. Burns-Peters: It went through all the right processes, but it's been some time between approval and establishment. That's where our awareness is lacking. That being said, I think it's important for everyone to know, particularly with adjunct hiring, it's happening bi-monthly and not on an as-needed basis. I want to start to spread that word. ○ C. Huston: The people on the equivalency committee will pick some dates prior to the semesters to meet for the emergency situations. Please remember equivalency is done before the job offer, not after. Thank you, K. Hannon. We'll see you again in December. <p>c. Scheduling Tool [D. Humble]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● D. Kalantarov: Some of you have seen this. So we are going to the 17 week: 16 weeks plus a final. So there's a new schedule, everything will change in terms of the hours, the blocks and stuff. So we are working together to get different blocks for different types of meetings. Whether it's a 1.0 lecture, these are just the standard ones, there's more for the .5 and everything up to .9. Let's say it's a 1-unit lecture and the target contact hours are 18 hours, it can only meet once a week if it's over the full term because you cannot go below 1 contact hour as per the chancellor's guidelines as to what is allowed for contact hours. You can have a 1 a 1.3, but you cannot a 1.1 for instance. ● You know there's the range, so for a 3.0 unit it's 48 – 54, 48 is on the lower end. So you cannot ever be below 88% of your target or above 105% in hours. That 100% is considered those target contact hours. This does every possibility, for instance say we go to twice a week for a 3- unit lecture or a 1-unit lab, it gives 80 minutes or 1 hour 20 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>minutes and there are no breaks. It gives you every possibility you could have from the 1-unit lecture to the 6-unit lecture, 2-unit lab combination.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a couple of things being brought to you. The first one is right now we have the finals week. Finals week really only applies to a small percentage of students. Crafton has a finals week, but they don't have finals like we do here. They don't have that 2.5-hour block, but that block only applies to day students. Anyone up to that 4pm time or on the weekend just has their finals on the last day of class. The question D. Humble wanted to ask is to move to a standardized system where we are the same as Crafton, weekend, and evening students in terms of equity. We would still have a finals week in the last week, but it would not be a finals block like we have now. For instance, in the sciences you have the lab/lecture, so you have that time set aside so you figure out where your exams are, or you give a part 1 and part 2. • The other thing is the standard scheduling blocks. Standard block length is 85 minutes. The transition between class is 10 minutes. I've never seen so many overlapping petitions, and apparently that's a new thing. So you either start at a standard start time or you end at a standard end time, and the standard end time is always 10 minutes before the following standard start time. The rules are you either start at one or end at the other. Again, no classes fit perfectly in that 85 minute. If a class meets prior to 8:00 a.m., you should follow principle 1b, meaning you want to end at a standard end time. You could have a 1.0-unit class from 7 - 7:50 a.m., ending 10 minutes before the next class. I made a calculator to help with this process. • Full-term calculator: All the holidays have been programed in, and it will update. So let's say you choose fall. You can only edit green cells. Pick fall 2020, and it updates the dates. You choose a lecture or lab. Say it's a lecture- you'll have every single option here. These are the standard ones. The .5 doesn't work because it doesn't fit in that. Let's say we choose a 3.0-unit lecture. It gives targeted contact hours. Then you choose the days the class meets. It will tell you the number of meetings/week and meetings/semester and number of minutes each section is. You can choose your start time or your end time. This makes it a very student-centered schedule. We won't have to sign those forms. If you see for instance a Monday/Wednesday, it has 31 meetings, versus Tuesday/Thursday with 32 meetings because the holidays are already built in. If you do something unacceptable it will turn red. • Non-traditional term calculator: It's not just for short term because some of the CTE for example have different schedules. You choose the start/end date. You cannot do weird things- it will give you an error. The weeks have to be whole positive numbers. Again, 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>choose lecture/lab and other options. It gives the start and end times as well as break allotments. One of the rules is you cannot save your breaks for the end of class and let them out early. That's not the purpose of a break. Then you get into these options. For instance, say you want to meet Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. Say it's a 1.5 –unit lab over 3 weeks. Say you have exact hours needed per session as 6.23. You cannot have a 6.23. You can have a 6 or a 6.3. That will only pay out based on the rules given to us. You'll need to round up or round down. If you go too far over, it will tell you there's an error. Once you decide it, will give you the amount of contact hours.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hybrid class calculator: You choose the total number of weeks you're going to meet. Remember even if it meets one time, just for a final, that's a hybrid class. You have to choose the in-person range, and report how much you're meeting online. It gives you a percentage of how many hours are in person and how many are online. When we publish the schedules we have to say how many hours per week. Similarly, you can choose what time you want to start or stop. • Online class calculator: Choose a start and end date and number of weeks. You choose lab or lecture. It gives you the hours you have. • Questions/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: I am from student services. I would like to see how it would mean from the point of view for students. ○ D. Kalantarov: The whole purpose is this. There are standard blocks. You have to choose. These are your standard blocks and all classes either start or end at a certain time. There is no overlap anymore. ○ A. Aguilar-Kitibutr: It's not just the start and end time, it's how it works with bus and work schedules. ○ D. Kalantarov: By doing this we were able to add in an extra evening section. Classes after 4 are considered evening. You can take a class from 4 – 5:25, then a class from 5:35 – 7 and be done. Or you can take a class from 6 – 7:25 p.m. and still give you enough time to take 7:35 – 9. ○ T. Simpson: They can be full-time in the evening. ○ D. Kalantarov: Yes, that's the whole point. They can take three technically, or two if they have to be home by 7. This was all looked at in terms of bus scheduling, that's why the end time is what it is. ○ A. Avelar: I think what management is trying to ask is would the body be willing to move towards more standardization what is offered as opposed to working in departmental silos? I believe if we support this model when we already have a new calendar anyways 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>8. New Business, continued</p>	<p>and the chairs are trying to figure out what we are going to do anyways. We can have some guidance to schedule classes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ D. Kalantarov: If we all adhere to this it works as a student-centered point of view. The other question is just one person can't say they're not going to do it. The other question is about finals week. It's not a question of having finals week or not, but it's to move to a standardized way. Substantially less than 30% of the student population falls into the special category where they get that 2.5-hour block. You won't lose instruction time with students, actually you'll gain time because you can use one of those days as review. Or you can give them an exam in parts. ○ B. Tasaka: I worked at Crafton when they did that. I have some thoughts. One issue I had was I had to give a Calculus final for 1 hour across a whole week. That was hard. It seems like this might fix it. ○ D. Kalantarov: It does. ○ B. Tasaka: The other thing I saw was, with full-timers especially, everyone's finals were Monday and Tuesday. That isn't beneficial to students taking intense classes and their finals are all Monday or all Tuesday because it's when we felt like giving our finals so we could be done grading. I saw it happen all the time. ○ D. Kalantarov: Right. I think it would be a conversation that needs to be had. ○ B. Tasaka: I just saw it happen all the time. Instructors wanted to be done earlier. One massive advantage was it worked well for adjuncts who had other schedules at other schools. They were working within the schedule they already had. ○ D. Kalantarov: Even if you give your final, say your class is Monday/Wednesday, and you give your final on Monday, you still have to meet with students on Wednesday. ○ B. Tasaka: As long as that's enforced, or discussed. ○ D. Kalantarov: We get our funded, so if we go below the 85% we don't funding. ○ B. Tasaka: When I was a part-timer, it wasn't discussed at all. We need to be really clear about that. I hope that the departments can have discussions, especially for those with similar students like math and sciences. It can be really hard for students if we aren't talking. ○ D. Kalantarov: This should bring some equity. Evening and weekend students are already dealing with that. ○ A. Avelar: I think we all experience having back-to-back difficult finals, but maybe we can minimize that. ○ B. Tasaka: Right. I just saw a lot of it, and it was more to make our lives easier, not theirs. If we can minimize it, I think it would help. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
8. New Business, continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ C. Huston: We need to move on with our agenda. I do want to point out that in reference to what we were talking about last year with scheduling blocks of only offering 12-, 9-, or 16-week classes, that restriction is not here. You are setting the number of weeks and it's just a tool to help you figure out meeting times. ○ D. Kalantarov: And there's no restriction, you're content experts, it's just to make sure students can make their schedule. <p>d. Class Caps [M. Copeland]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We'll continue mine later. It's going to be an ongoing discussion for a while. 	
9. SBVC President's Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● S. Thayer: This past May, it's official now, we awarded the largest number of awards: 1,895. That's great work [applause]. ● The Promise students have community service hours and they've completed over 1200 hours so far [applause]. ● At the Hispanic Association for Colleges and Universities, our students placed second in a competition and were recognized in Chicago [applause] 	
10. Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● C. Jones: [see attachments: AS Documents] The MESA small schedule is available. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tomorrow is the presentation of the pipeline program for UCR's for medical school. ○ If you have students interested in NASA or JPL, we have a speaker coming on October 22nd. ○ Then J. Lemieux will present on how to read a scientific paper on November 5th. ○ LA coroner is November 7th, 4 - 5 pm. ● C. Huston: Final reminder that the Brown Act and Robert's Rules of Order is October 30th. 	
11. Adjournment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m. ● Next meeting: November 6, 2019, at 3:00 p.m. in AD/SS 207. 	