SBVC Academic Senate

Meeting Minutes September 5, 2018 AS/SS 207 3:00 – 4:30 P.M.

Topic	Discussion	Action
1. Call to Order	Meeting called to order at 3:03 p.m.	
	Roll call via sign-in sheet [see attachment: AS Documents, Sign-in Sheet].	
and Roll Call 2. Public Comments 3. Senate		Motion 1: Motion to change the date on the minutes and to put J. Notarangelo on the agenda under New Business. 1st. E. Jones 2nd: A. Aguilar-Kitibutr Discussion: L. Lopez: I don't know if we can because of the notice requirement. C. Huston: You can according to the Brown Act if there is new and urgent business. L. Lopez: Then I agree. Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None
President's Report [C. Huston]	 Please note that the date on my AS President's Report is incorrect; it is supposed to say today's date, September 5, 2018. I forwarded an email from our State Senate President, J. Stanskas, yesterday. I 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
3. Senate President's Report, continued [C. Huston]	 emailed him to see what our legal options for changing equivalency are; of course we will have to work closely with Crafton Hills to make any of those changes. I have several vacancies: District Assembly [meets at the District Office], Ed Policy Chair [subcommittee of our Senate], and District Enrollment Management. Meeting dates and times are listed in the handout. There are also ways to get involved with the statewide Academic Senate. We had 3 applications for Adjunct Senators and there are 2 spaces, so we will have an election. Those who are on the elections committee please come see me. At the last Board Study session the budget for the 2018 – 2019 budget with the new funding model was presented. It did not reflect the resource allocation model. They want to look at those numbers before making those allocations. Congratulations to our new faculty leads: D. Burns-Peters and M. Worsley, will be our Distance Education faculty leads. T. Al-Sherif, R. Metu, and M. Robles will be our Guided Pathways leads. The Senate Retreat was great. We may do something similar on the 5th Wednesday in future months. I gave an update on BP 2410 We discussed how faculty join Senate and how to get more faculty involvement. Additional benefits and challenges of the Senate are provided [see attachment: AS Documents, AS President's Report]. The Chancellor is coming to give an update at our next meeting. Would you like to see a presentation from J. Torres or S. Stark regarding the state funding model and how it impacts our funding? Or possibly a presentation from A. Rodriguez regarding the district-wide rebranding process? Yes? Okay. We might host a regional meeting on either Guided Pathways or AB 705 at SBVC later this month. I'll know soon. 	
4. Committee	a. Ed Policy [vacant]	
Reports	 No report. b. Legislative [vacant] No report. c. Financial Policy [vacant] No report. d. Personnel Policy [J. Notarangelo] No report. e. Student Services [A. Aguilar-Kitibutr] We had a second charge to work on. District Assembly is asking us to examine some APs/BPs regarding graduation and overlapping classes. I have informed our members and hopefully we will report back in the next meeting. 	

Topic	Discussion.	Action
4. Committee	f. Vocational [K. Melancon]	
Reports,	Information will come during the regular agenda.	
continued	g. EEO [R. Hamdy]	
	No report.	
	h. Elections [vacant]	
	No report.	
	i. Curriculum [L Hector]	
	 First full curriculum meeting on Monday. We will have some training for new 	
	members as well as discussion on AB 705.	
	We are looking at the final direction that English/math are going to take in the	
	future so that other areas will know how that affects their courses.	
	 Don't forget about the October 1st deadline! 	
	j. Program Review [P. Ferri-Milligan]	
	We rolled out Needs Assessment phase a week earlier than usual because you	
	need to get the data requests in to the research office earlier.	
	We are very serious about the deadline this semester. If it comes in at 12:01	
	p.m. it will not be accepted because of issues we've had in the past.	
	 Due date: October 22nd at noon. 	
	Workshops for us to look at documents: October 5 th and October 15 th (both	
	Fridays) at 9:30 – 11:00 a.m.	
	k. Accreditation & SLOs [C. Huston]	
	We will meet next week for the first time.	
	Myself, K. Weiss, and R. Warren-Marlat are all on accreditation teams for other	
	campuses this October. Hopefully we will get great feedback that we can bring	
	back to our campuses. I will be working with the ACCJC Vice President who is	
	assigned to us, so I hope to get feedback from someone who directly impacts our accreditation process.	
	We are 25 months away from our accreditation deadline.	
	I. Professional Development [R. Hamdy]	
	o R. Hamdy is not here, but she is trying to get a speaker on Flex Day to	
	speak to Guided Pathways.	
5. Additional	a. SBCCD-CTA [L. Lopez]	
Reports	Hello, I'm the CTA grievance representative.	
'	• [see attachment: AS Documents, The "on campus" Requirement: Article 13	
	Overview]. Please note that this is a draft.	
	There was some confusion about when we are required to be on campus. The	
	answer is that the scope of this requirement depends on your individual	

Topic	Discussion.	Action
Topic	schedule. It's flexible because we are professionals and that's a legal exemption to overtime pay. To meet that exemption 2 things have to be true: 1. Since we are salaried we paid more than the state minimum. 2. The District recognizes us as professionals because we perform work "that is predominately intellectual and varied in character and is of such character that the output produced or the result accomplished cannot be standardized in relation to a given period of time." • There are 3 basic assignments [last page of handout] • The bold print is what the contact says. The non-bold print is my attempt to explanation. 1. Instructional faculty: For example, I meet my load by 5 classes. If I teach all of that online, my on-campus requirement is 25 hours, however that's distributed throughout the week. This leaves a balance of possible hours off-campus or on-campus. • Please acknowledge the parenthesis that is not in the contract-prepping for your lecture. That's in another part of the contract, under student contact and responsibility. 2. Non-instructional faculty with student contact hours: They have to be on campus more. The minimum balance is 5 hours off campus. 3. Non-instructional faculty without student contact hours: This is the only assignment where you have to be on campus for all your work. • There was some confusion on the amount of hours you're required to be here. Our answer is your requirement to be on campus depends on your assignment. • Questions: • D. Burns-Peters: How is this affected by administration's right of assignment? • L. Lopez: The contract uses weird language- The work week is Mon- Friday. You have to be available to be scheduled for something on those days (meeting, class, etc.). Their right of assignment is they can tell us how those 15 hours are distributed.	Action
	b. District Assembly [C. Huston]	
	 We primarily went over the schedule for reviewing APs and BPs this year. We will plan with our Ed Policy chair to hopefully keep them off of all our agendas. Thanks to G. Owens-Perry and B. Tasaka for joining. There is still one vacancy if you're interested in joining. They only meet once a month, 8 times a year, and you already missed the first one. We covered legal updates to policies. 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
6. Consent Agenda	 a. Minutes • [friendly amendment to the date] Approve minutes from 8/15/18 • Motion 2 	Motion 2: Approve the minutes for 8/15/18. 1st: J. Notorangelo 2nd: T. Allen Discussion: None Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None
7. Old Business	 BP/AP 2410 Update [C. Huston] Where are we right now? The Chancellor is working with the Board of Trustees, various people on both campuses including both AS presidents, the District Assembly president (who is also faculty), CTA, campus presidents, and others. They are working on the language to smooth out areas that caused concern. The Chancellor will also be meeting with Board members individually. It will go to the Board Policy Committee for an update. The current policy says that we don't have a part in this right now. If the Board does not take any action to clarify and change BP/AP 2410, then the Senates will need to sit down and work out a plan about how we both want to respond. The next meeting is next Thursday. The Chancellor has been strongly advocating to change 2410 to include more collegial consultation. Questions: M. Worsley: Is that a meeting we should attend? C. Huston: The Board Policy Committee is a subcommittee meeting. I'm not sure if it is under the Brown Act. I think at this point it is more strategic if we let the Chancellor work with it privately and not fight it. If we are unable to accomplish our goal, then we can start attending Board meetings. Strategically, working with them quietly might be best right now. Remember that we are 25 months away from accreditation and we are trying to attract a new VPI and faculty/staff to our campus. If we can move forward without this being made public, I think that's our best course of action. D. Rodriguez: I think that the Chancellor heard very clearly what the recommendations are from the Senates, that they want language changed so that it is more representative of what they need. C. Huston: New language we want is that we want- 4 consecutive Academic Senate meetings not 60 days. The 60 days worries me because we are dark in the summer. It also changes the language where the Chancellor oversees academic and professional matters. There was some 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
7. Old Business, continued	concern at the District Assembly level that the policy approved gave them full power over the 2000s and many of the 2000s go beyond just the Board Policies and extend to all constituencies or impact other policies on record. There is now language that although District Assembly will not approve the policies, but they will provide feedback. This way changes will not affect the way that other policies are handled and we have a check-and-balance system.	
8. New Business	 a. Academic Senate Scholarship [C. Huston] One of my roles as Academic Senate President is to be on the Foundation Board. We had a planning retreat and discussed ways to increase scholarship giving. One idea was to match a scholarship donation. I would love to see the Senate tie back into students again. We work a lot with policies and collegial consultation and we don't get impact students as much as we would in the classroom. K. Childers and I met. It takes \$5000 to endow a scholarship. Based on a \$5000 figure and the interest earned, generally there is \$250 in perpetuity to fund a student scholarship. If contributions continue and the fund builds, you have the opportunity to offer more or larger scholarships. Contributions would not be mandatory, but if we earn \$2500 then the Foundation would match. Motion 3 We have to determine selection criteria. We also have salary reduction forms [see attachment: AS Documents, Payroll Deduction Authorization]. J. Notarangelo: I was wondering if we could let this percolate and let committees come up with some suggestions. K. Childers: I have some salary reduction forms. If you choose, the foundation gets whatever number you place from your paycheck. The donations are tax deductible. You designate where it goes. It will keep building in there. Once you hit the \$2500, the Foundation said we will match it. Usually we get a good return, but, full disclosure, it depends on the market. 5% is a good average; as it wields more, it earns more. C. Huston: It is not mandatory; it's purely what you want to do. There are 32 members of Academic Senate this year, and if you donate 2 Starbucks a month, then we will be good. Once we get this together we can talk to faculty and look for ways for people to donate. I want to get a table at Opening Day. Maybe we can get some community members to donate. M. Worsley: I have a question about the form- if we want to do deductions for multiple groups do we need multip	Motion 3: Move for the Academic Senate to adopt a scholarship. 1st: J. Notarangelo 2nd: E. Jones Discussion: None Approved: Unanimously Abstentions: None

Topic	Discussion	Action
	Deduction Authorization]. We will deduct until you tell us to stop. One more full	
	disclosure, if you're right at \$5000 on the dot we won't award anything because that's what we want to leave there forever.	
	 C. Huston: If you want to do a one-time donation where do you go? 	
	 K. Childers: I would suggest contacting me or donating online. 	
	 C. Huston: We will look at this in Executive Senate and bring that back to you. 	
8. New Business,	b. Program Review Member Change (AP 2510) [P. Ferri-Milligan]	Motion 4: Approve the
continued	Program Review has been growing. We discussed the importance of having	change of membership
	the grant director on the committee. It makes a lot of sense since we are going	for the Program
	for more and more money that is outside of the college. If we have the grants	Review committee.
	director as a voting member on the committee, they can see where our needs	1 st : T. Vasquez
	are. I'm asking for a vote that they be made a voting member of the committee.	2 nd : D. Smith
	Questions:	Discussion: none
	 T. Vasquez: Why a voting member and not just a visitor? 	Approved: Unanimously
	 P. Ferri-Milligan: I think it gives more stability to the committee. We could 	Abstentions: none
	invite them every week, but that doesn't guarantee they come.	
	 K. Weiss: It was the motion from the Program Review committee and a shared from College Council 	
	charge from College Council.	
	 P. Ferri-Milligan: It also gives us the chance to go for grants that we need. I remember in the past grants came up and we didn't know about 	Motion 5: Change our
	it.	bylaw language [with
	 K. Weiss: It also provides the grants director with a global view of the 	friendly amendment].
	needs of the college. By being a voting member, reading documents,	1 st : A. Aguilar-Kitibutr
	and participating in the discussion, it gives them more of a role.	2 nd : J. Notarangelo
	Motion 4	Discussion: D. Smith:
	 P. Ferri-Milligan: How do we proceed? 	can we take out the
	 C. Huston: It will go into 2510 eventually. We will want to get it in the 	education after "CTE"
	governance handbook and see if we need to run it through the administrative	since that E stands for education already?
	procedure process. I'll run it by Crafton that we want to make this change. Then	[friendly amendment]
	it will go to District Assembly, then the Board of Trustees.	Approved: Unanimously
	c. Bylaws Section 336 Committee on Vocational Education [K. Melancon]	Abstentions: none
	• [see attachment: AS Documents, Original Terminology]. • The terminology "vecetional" is a bit dated. We are now Career Technical.	
	 The terminology "vocational" is a bit dated. We are now Career Technical Education. We want to change the terminology in the bylaw. Current and 	
	proposed languages are at the bottom of the handout.	
	C. Huston: We opened our bylaws last spring. We have to have at least 1	
	meeting pass before we make or pass changes. Motion 5	
	and the second s	I .

Topic	Discussion	Action
8. New Business, continued	 d. Senate Retreat Report [C. Huston] See AS President's Report. e. California Virtual College/OEI Grant [J. Notarangelo] J. Notarangleo: Before I get started I want to verify with management- has the SBCCD actually received the California Virtual College/OEI grant (CVC/OEI)? L. Hector: No, that's with the state. J. Notarangelo: Right, but it's a grant working on the CVC/OEI project? K. Weiss: I think we had some conversations at the end of the spring. J. Notarangelo: I was under the impression that a grant was received. L. Hector: No, I was asking about our involvement in the OEI project and where we are with an MOU. I'm on a steering committee for a CVC/OEI grant with the state, advising the chancellor's office. J. Notarangelo: That's where the grant application came from. Okay. All 114 CA Community Colleges are part of the CVC/OEI. The CVC/OEI is not the exchange portion, that's the 3rd step. We are involved and managers can verify that the MOU was signed? Yes. Good. My concern was that money was received on campus without us being able to direct it. My concerns have been 	Action
9. SBVC President's Report, D. Rodriguez	 Welcome back, it's my first senate meeting of the school year. Last semester we talked about enrollment and about how proud we were of our numbers. As of this past week, we are running about 240 FTES behind our goal. The executive team has been working with deans and chairs on a plan. We are projecting about 90 FTES in positive attendance (tutorial centers, etc.). We are working with faculty to capture late start, hopefully capturing about 40 FTES there. We are still short of our goal, but I'm optimistic. Our efficiency is up, so kudos to all of you in the classroom. I know that many of you receive the EIS daily snapshot. It comes out at 4:00 and again at midnight. I just wanted to share with folks that it is only a snapshot and the data is not always accurate. For example, the snapshot shows that as of last night we are up on seats and the number of active students on campus, but the FTES shows that we are short. The District offices are working on it to see if there is something skewed in the programming or if there is a better tool. You've heard me talk about the promise program that will be District-wide for our students. We can cover 2 years for our students. It is still looking very promising. We are hoping to get it in place by this upcoming fall. It will be a huge help in our community. We are looking for major donors who can also match the District's money. This is for both Crafton and us. We want students to not only come to 	

Topic	Discussion	Action
9. SBVC President's Report, continued D. Rodriguez	 school, but also to stay in school. New funding formula- currently our funding is driven by enrollment. The more students means the more FTES means the more dollars we get. Some folks call the new formula student-based and others call it performance-based. They will include the amount of students who receive the Pell Grant & those who fill out the BOGG/Promise. We get more money for those who have associates degrees and slightly more for those who get associates degrees that transfer. There is a good 15 – 20 different metrics for funding. I will share that with you all. It may also guide the conversations. Right now we have ideas for what this means as a District and it looks like we will get 8% more. The District is also looking at a different allocation model. Right now it is roughly 70%-30% based on current FTES between us and Crafton. I think that the new funding formula may drive our new allocation model, but that remains to be seen. J. Notarangelo: I think that as we explore the OEI more we will find that it a great way to capture some of that data. D. Rodriguez: The state is promising that we are not going to go below our current funding for 2 years. M. Worsley: Is there a way to use those 2 years to find any holes in the system? D. Rodriguez: Currently, not directly. Indirectly, they are relying on individual campuses. What they have here is much better than what was proposed a year ago. D. Rodriguez: I'm going to be sitting on the state board for the student food and housing insecurities. Also Regional Arrowhead United Way. I'm hoping to have the united way see that education at Valley College and the District as a whole as a means. 	
10.	K. Weiss: I want to invite all of you to the Faculty Concert on Friday night at 7:00	
Announcements	p.m.	
11. Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.	