SBVC ACADEMIC SENATE
Minutes
AS/SS 207 3:00 PM – DATE: 5.2.18

Topic	Discussion	Action
1. Call to Order and Roll Call	• Meeting called to order at 3:04 p.m. • Roll call via sign-in sheet	
2. Public Comments	• None.	
3. Senate President's Report C. Huston	*See attachment to these minutes for a copy of the president's written report. The president or other senators made additional comments about the following items: • **Committee Assignments List** • **District Assembly:** Two faculty are needed. This committee meets 4 times per semester. 1st Tuesday of the month from 3:00 – 4:30 p.m. at the District. • **CHC Academic Senate:** At the next Senate meeting we can do a motion of support for either of Crafton's two resolutions or the ASCCC's resolutions. We can also make our own resolutions; these will require first and second readings. Finally, we can do nothing for now and wait until the Fall 2018 semester to make a decision on a position. • **AB 705:** Great opportunity for us to hear about AB 705 from the perspective of the statewide Academic Senate as opposed to the perspective of the Chancellor's office. There will be food! Friday, May 11, at 11:00 a.m. • **FCC Auction Funds Proceeds** • **Academic Senate Retreat**	

4. Committee Reports	a. **Ed Policy** [vacant]
	  • Currently looking to fill this position
	b. **Personnel Policy** [J. Notarangelo]
	  • No report.
	c. **Student Services** [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr]
	  • No report.
	d. **Career/Tech** [S. Meyer]
	  • No report.
	e. **Equity/Diversity** [K. Melancon]
	  • No report.
	f. **Elections** [M. Worsley]	

Topic	Discussion	Action

4. Committee Reports, continued…	• No report
	g. Curriculum [M. Copeland]
	  • Placeholder to speak later.
	h. Program Review [P. Ferri-Milligan]
	  • No report.
	i. Accreditation & SLOs [C. Huston]
	  • We have been working on the draft of a SLO handbook. It is currently being proofread. The intent is to send a proofed draft to the Senate shortly. The vetting process will continue in Fall 2018.
	  • Note that Curriculum Committee is now the repository for all SLOs instead of sending them to directly to me. Changing an SLO will go through the Curriculum Committee. The curriculum specialist will upload them to the SLO cloud.
	  • The ASLO committee will also read your SLOs during the approval process as well to ensure that they are formatted correctly and are measurable.
	  • There are a number of campus representatives going to the ISER training tomorrow in Ontario.
	j. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]
	  • May 11th meeting on AB 705. It is really important for math and English faculty go. I know that the Math Department has a division meeting that day, but Dr. Briggs is rescheduling it, right?
	    o S. Briggs: Well we will start at 10:00 and be finished at 10:45 a.m., then walk over.
	    o Y. Beebe: Did you say we need to register?
	    o R. Hamdy: Yes. The link is in the email.
	  • The committee is almost done filling out flex reports. This is a huge win for us because this is early for us.
	  • Please submit the reports instead of saving them. You can submit reports for future events through June 30th, but they need to be submitted ASAP.
	  • I'm working on the Classified Connection week- not just for classified staff! There will be a CourseLeaf demo. I'll send out a finalized session really soon.	

5. Additional Reports	**a. SBCCD-CTA** [A. Avelar]
	  • No report.
	b. District Assembly [C. Huston]
	  • Denise Allen was elected District Assembly President again.
	  • AB 2410 & 2510 will be moving forward and taken to the Board next.
	  • Last meeting was yesterday. We are mostly preparing for next year.	

Topic	Discussion.	Action
6. Consent Agenda	**a. Minutes** • Approve minutes from ~~4/4/2018~~ 4/18/18.	**Motion to approve changing the date on the agenda to 4/18/18 and approve the minutes for 4/18/18.** 1st: J. Notarangelo 2nd: K. Barnett **Approved:** Unanimously **Abstentions:** A. Jennings
7. Old Business	• None	

8. New Business	**a. OEI Exchange** (4) [J. Notarangelo]
	• C. Huston: We were accepted to the OEI! Good work to Joe! [applause]
	• J. Notarangelo: I want to try to get the DE Initiatives and Objectives Document [see handout] through the Academic Senate. It's time we buy into the work that the committee is doing. I want to point out that this was very collaboratively created. This is an evolving document. I will attempt to modify this as I receive feedback from stakeholders over the 5-year period. I want your feedback and updates as they happen. [Motion]
	• I have a recommendation from the online program committee and the technology committee [see document]. We are 1 of 33 additional schools to join the original 6 that are in the Exchange. Recommendations of the OEI Exchange are listed in the handout.
	  o This is good for students. This will allow us to offer local classes more often. It will also help us develop our programs. There are several free resources that <u>all</u> of our online classes will be able to access: Cranium Café, NetTutor, Quest, and several others.
	  o This is good for faculty. We can serve more students and improve student success. Their training is really helpful. It is a faculty-driven and developed project that allows us to collaborate across campuses.
	  o We are currently a leader in this field. We could develop programs that wouldn't otherwise be available. We
	  o We have 8,722 online seats this semester. We want to protect our online seats. I want the online program to be agile. It's hard for us to do this without access to technologies.
	• Questions:
	  o A. Jennings: When would it start?
		Motion to accept the Online Committee's Master Plan for 2017-2022.
		1st: M. Copeland
		2nd: E.J. Jones
		Approved: Unanimously
		Abstentions: None [applause]

Topic	Discussion	Action
	o J. Notarangelo: It will start when we choose to roll it out. We have to accept the online course rubric for Exchange courses and use it as a model for non-Exchange courses; this is a requirement. We have to join 5% of our online classes each semester. This has to integrate with Admissions, Financial Aid, etc. My fantasy is to roll it out in Spring 2019. Right now there is a rubric on what courses are acceptable: right now it's courses with a CID and transfer-level. o S. Briggs: For those classes that will be online but not part of the Exchange, they still have to use the rubric? That's what I'm hearing. o J. Notarangelo: That is our decision. We need a rubric for course design. o S. Briggs: I understand that OEI classes have to use the OEI rubric, but what about the other classes? o J. Notarangelo: They have to be modeled. Crafton's rubric is a 3-page checklist and they follow the model. o S. Briggs: That's local. I understand that. You said that the courses that aren't OEI have to use the rubric, so we don't really know what that means? o J. Notarangelo: We decide that. Crafton's rubric is 21 pages shorter than the OEI rubric. o D. Burns-Peters: If a student is our student primarily, and they take a course from somewhere else, do we still get credit for them? o J. Notarangelo: A student will register at a college- that is the host college. They'll take a class from somewhere else through the Exchange, that's the teaching college. The teaching college gets the FTES for that class. When a student gets a degree or credential we get that credit. All home college conditions apply- e.g. if they qualify for DSPS, etc. o D. Burns-Peters: If I have an online course that I think needs the rubric and has a CID and is transferrable, will just submit my willingness to do that? o J. Notarangelo: The basic process is a self-approval. You run your own class through the course approval. Then it goes through a peer course review. Every single course that gets approved by the Exchange has to go through a peer review and then another review. o A. Jennigns: I personally think this is fantastic news. I reached out to some others in my division. A lot of workload issues came up. They were concerned with compensation. If my course doesn't fit the rubric right now, do I get compensation for updating it, etc.? Also what about ADA	

Topic	Discussion	Action
	compliance? ○ J. Notarnangelo: Briefly, most of the rubric deals with that exactly. In terms of workload, I understand. I have ideas, but I haven't talked to anyone yet. ○ A. Jennings: Have you talked to the Union at all? ○ J. Notarangelo: I haven't talked to our Union yet. So far the Unions across seem to be very supportive. They have made recommendations against the Online College and requested that the money be put into the OEI Exchange. ○ A. Jennings: Would it be something that needs to go through the Union? ○ J. Notarangelo: There will be an MOU. ○ D. Burns-Petesr: The rubric does take care of the accessibility issue and several other things. I think it is a great idea as well as a great model for online classes. ○ J. Notarangelo: Did you find any academic freedom issues? ○ D. Burns-Petsrs: I didn't see a difference between that and revising my face-to-face classes. If I was being required to participate in the OEI Exchange that would be different. That's my perspective. ○ J. Notarangelo: I do plan to work with everyone: Dean Quach, Vice President Long, Vice President Thayer, Vice President Stark, and everyone. I think we can find a significant return on investment. ○ R. Pires: I think this is a good ideas as far as the rubric. As a faculty chair when I'm evaluating classes I see vast differences amongst online classes. I don't think it's fair that some faculty invest in redesigning their classes and some don't. It should be standardized ○ J. Notarangelo: I wholeheartedly agree. ○ R. Pires: My concern as far as the CTA is what happened with Canvas. The Senate voted because our contract with BlackBoard was ending. We decided to go along with the District because a decision needed to be made. The negotiating power was lost. ○ J. Notarangelo: I would say that we still need a course design rubric and check that they are approved for accreditation. I want to be clear that my goal today is to get into the rubric. There is a lot that still has to be developed. ○ R. Pires: The rubric does go along with accreditation, SLO, student services, accessibility, and other items. This rubric would force me to make my classes better. ○ R. Hamdy: I get emails from part timers who teach at other colleges. At	

Topic	Discussion	Action
8. New Business, continued	other schools many of them have to go through rigorous trainings and we don't offer comparable training. We are doing our faculty and students a disservice. I hope we can get to that level. ○ M. Copeland: As someone who teaches online I welcome a rubric as well. It is a good reminder as well. ○ R. Hamdy: It's all peer evaluations. ○ J. Notarangelo: My goal is to try to get it right as a group.	**Motion to accept OEI's invitation to become part of the Statewide Exchange Cohort and accept the OEI Course Design rubric for all SBVC classes entering into the Exchange and as the model for courses not in the Exchange.** 1st: M. Copeland 2nd: K. Barnett **Approved:** Unanimously **Abstentions:** None
	b. AB 798 Plan [R. Pires] • You all voted on the AB 798 grant a few meetings ago. The plan is written; I just need your support so it can go to College Council. • We have enough sections to be able to resubmit. • Goals: Continue to increase the use of OER, continue to facilitate and support OER professional development opportunities to assist faculty with OER materials, institutionalize the textbook affordability plan as a permanent working document. **c. Guided Pathways Coordinator/Faculty Lead** (4) [R. Hmady] • First of all I'm not the Guided Pathways coordinator. • I noticed that the plan includes 50% release time for an instructional faculty and 50% for a counselor. We hadn't really made any movement on this, but I think we should. This needs to be faculty led & faculty driven. I want to help that happen by putting a work group together to create a job description. I want to put that out in the next few weeks. We have a structure of a plan and we desperately need the 2 faculty coordinators to lead this initiative and help other faculty to create pathways. [Motion] **d. College Promise** (4) [S. Thayer] • C. Huston: There was never a formal announcement, but it went to Board that Dr. Scott Thayer is our permanent Vice President of Student Services. [applause]	**Motion to accept.** 1st: J. Notarangelo 2nd: M. Copeland **Discussion:** Rania: We used OER funding to fund Great Teachers this year and I think it went really well. This is great. A. Maniaol: Through all the CTE programs, we have raised $5000 to OER for CTE disciplines that is still available until December 2019. **Approved:** Unanimously **Abstentions:** None **Motion to form the Guided Pathways workgroup.**

Topic	Discussion	Action

8. New Business, continued	S. Thayer: [see handout] Valley Bound is our version of a promise program. The conversation has been going around about Valley Bound and Promise Programs. We want to support the program an expand access to it. Currently the incoming Valley Bound group will be about 182 students; the number is lower than in the past because we received less money from San Manuel. The idea is if you have successful models that already exists how do you bring them to scale? The more students we can encourage to be full time will create efficiency for the institution. We are looking for the opportunity to scale it up. We received over 500 applications and were unfortunately only able to provide funding for 182.
	
	• Questions:
	  o K. Melancon: Did you explain to those who didn't qualify why they didn't qualify? The reason is because several of the students I talked to at a local high school didn't know what steps to take if they didn't get into Valley Bound.
	  o S. Thayer: They can contact S. Williams, the director of the First Year Experience. They may not have qualified based on their application or the essay. It is a last-dollar scholarship, so they need to apply for FAFSA, the Dream Act, etc.
	  o K. Melancon: Is that information in the brochure? For example, look in these other places if you didn't get in.
	  o S. Thayer: Students who aren't accepted into Valley Bound are referred to other programs like First Year Experience, etc.
	  o R. Pires: Are those students also being referred to the ZTC?
	  o S. Thayer: We are going to continue to make those connections, perhaps a cohort of ZTC students who didn't get into Valley Bound.
	  o J. Notarangelo: What can an instructor do in the classroom do to support this?
	  o S. Thayer: Well it's based on incoming first-year students. It will be based on the funding model. We want to make sure that our program is beneficial. The last sheet is a list of some things that already occur [cells highlighted in tan]. These things bring students to the campus and strengthen our relationships with the high school campus.
	  o A. Maniaol: Valley Bound is more focused on transfer students, right?
	  o S. Thayer: Yes, college promise really focuses on that first year. Ideally there would be only one group of students. It would be all incoming students.
		1st: A. Jennings
		2nd: B. Tasaka
		Approved: Unanimously
		Abstentions: None

Topic	Discussion	Action

	○ T. Long: I think that the other thing we have had a discussion about is having a multi-year program. We may want a 2 year program. I think we need to have those kinds of discussions. We could be unique and offer a 2-year program because most places only offer a 1-year program.
	    ○ R. Pires: Does anyone know what the state is doing?
	    ○ S. Thayer: The BOGG is now called the CA Promise Grant. There is also a CA Promise Program where full-time students can go to school for free. There is criteria that the colleges have to follow to be eligible for that. We would have to join the loan program. Historically that was not a good fit for the institution. If the default rates go above 25% then you can lose your federal funding. Schools will have to meet criteria to offer that program to students.
	    ○ K. Melancon: With the concurrent/dual enrollment programs, some students could finish in a year.
	e. **2018/2018 Committee of the Senate** (6) [C. Huston]
	    • Our bylaws say that we should review our committees annually. Several need to be updated.
	    • I would like to propose that we form all of our standing committees next year. At the beginning of next year, we open our bylaws and update descriptions.
	    • Questions/Comments:
	        ○ M. Copeland: You mentioned that Program Review isn't listed?
	        ○ C. Huston: It isn't listed as a committee of the Senate right now. This can be examined when we open the bylaws.
		Motion of support.
		1st: R. Hamdy
		2nd: D. Fozouni
		Approved: Unanimously
		Abstentions: None

9. SBVC President's Report D. Rodriguez	• No report.	
10. Announcements	• T. Heibel: Spotlighting is Friday, May 11. It will be a beautiful celebration. • A. Maniaol: Norco College has been implementing Guided Pathways for about 3 years now. We will have a keynote speaker from their college on Tuesday, May 8 in B-100 from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	
Topic	**Discussion**	**Action**
11. Adjournment	• Meeting adjourned at 4:28 p.m.	