I. **The meeting called to order at 2:10pm via Zoom.**

   **Announcement** – Senate President, Judith Bell, reminded senators to adhere to the time limits and recognition by the Chair before speaking. Raise your hand electronically. Senators have priority over guests in speaking order. She will call on those who have not spoken before those speaking again. Make your comments about swaying the vote when speaking for/against motions. Ask questions about items rather than making comments during question/answer periods.

II. **Approval of Agenda – Approved as amended w/o objection**

III. **Approval of Minutes – Approved w/o objection**

IV. **Public Comments**

   A. Dr. Edina Rutland announced on March 2, 9-10am, there is a system webinar about Universal Design Accessibility. The recording will be available for those unable to attend.

   B. Vice President, Elizabeth Pratt offered thanks to those writing the ISER (Institutional Self-Evaluation Report) and those who participated in last Friday/Saturday’s Accreditation Summit. She also thanked the faculty who have submitted their census and positive attendance reports. There are audit findings for those not turned in. Please reach out to your deans with questions.

   C. John Kaufmann, Chair of EVC Professional Development, briefly shared the Union’s New Faculty Mentoring Program agreement including an overview, AFT contract language, definitions, expectations of mentors and mentees, and suggested topics. He is working with EVC Senate President, Garry Johnson. The goal is have it live at the District.

V. **Committee Appointments**

   **Evaluation Committees – All approved w/o objection**

   A. Rufus Blair (Sign Language) evaluated by Michael Berke (French)

   B. Lisa Vasquez (Reading) evaluated by Noe Torres (English)

   C. Business Adjunct, Joshua Kas-Osoka evaluated by Linda Ferrell (Accounting)

   D. Dental Adjunct, Marisela Carranza evaluated by Edna Dolatre (Dental Assisting)

   E. Dental Adjunct, Liduvina Delfin-Icatar evaluated by Wendy Pio (Dental Assisting)

   **Screening Committees** (MSC needs 3, Classified needs 1)

   F. Dean of Counseling, Guidance & Matriculation, SJCC (Position #S2212) – Gina Ronzano (Counseling)

   Tuan Ngo (Counseling), Will Reyes (Counseling), Elena Dutra, Alex Lopez, Valentin Garcia

   **Elena (22), Valentin (18), and Alex (14) selected by vote.**

   Gina received no votes.

   Voting for Tuan (13): John, Shelley, Mark, Mary, Michelle, Dedrick, David, Kathy, Heather, Jagrup, Jennifer, Doug, Kidane

   Voting for Will (2): David, Heather.

   Voting for Elena (22): all senators

   Voting for Alex (14): Jose, Carlos, Elena, Julio, Jackie, Juan, Michelle, Rachel, David, Jagrup, Alex, Anita, Kidane, Yevgeniya

   Voting for Valentin (18): John, Shelley, Mark, Jose, Carlos, Mary, Elena, Julio, Jackie, Juan, Dedrick, Rachel, Kathy, Alex, Jennifer, Anita, Doug, Yevgeniya
G. College Web Services Specialist, SJCC (Position #S2214) – Mark Branom (CIS), Jonali Bhattacharyya – Approved w/o objection

H. Staff Assistant III (Esthetics), SJCC (Position #S2215) – Roxie Banks (Cosmetology), Yelena Lipilina (Esthetics), Gina del Rosario-Fontela (Cosmetology), Sandra Honesto (Cosmetology)

**Yelena (20) selected by vote.**

Voting for Sandra (3): Carlos, Elena and Rachel. All others voted for Yelena (20). Roxie and Gina received no votes.

I. Construction Tech Instructor (1 replacement) – Richard Harlan (Construction) – Approved w/o objection

VI. Action Items

A. ASCCC Spring Plenary, April 7-9, 2022 Attendees ($495 fee each) – Elena, Juan, Judith, Shelley, and Jennifer volunteered to attend virtually.

VII. Information items (6-minutes limit)

A. AB705 Validation of Practice and Improvement Plan – Dr. Pratt added this has been a group effort with Student Affairs and Math, including Noe Torres, Lisa Vasquez, and Dr. Rutland.

Dean Shusaku Horibe said that AB705 Equitable Placement and Completion is a California law-requiring community colleges maximize the probability that students will enter and complete transfer-level coursework in English and Math within a one-year timeframe. Students cannot be denied entry into transfer-level English and Math unless the college can prove that they are highly unlikely to succeed. He gave the background starting with the plan rollout in 2019. Full implementation plans must start by fall 2022. SJCC English and Math validation of practices and improvement plans are now due to the chancellor’s office on April 2. The state chancellor’s office found students more likely to complete transfer requirements in Math and English when they start at transfer-level. Non-compliance subjects colleges to potential decreases in categorical funds.

Michael Divinia added that Math generated transfer-level support courses, i.e., Math 20X, Math 63X, and Math 21X. He listed their other activities in adopting AB705 including participating in the AB705 Taskforce and the self-placement tool, implementing multiple measures, conducted curriculum development, and held best practice retreats. Both SJCC and EVC are not offering any pre-transfer courses in the fall. The chancellor’s data showed that 61.5% of students complete transfer-level Math within a year.

Noe Torres listed the Language Arts AB705 activities including attending CAP (Career & Academic Pathways) Teacher Trainings, establishing textbook loans, providing supplemental instruction and imbedded-tutoring, as well as, the activities listed for Math. The Reading department developed the transfer-level course Reading 10, and Reading 120, a support course to Composition 1A. Reading 567 will be a non-credit course this fall. Reading 101 will continue as a non-transferable course. The English department developed English 120 that supports composition 1A skills. In the fall, Reading 301 and English 335 deactivate by fall.

Dr. Rutland added English and SAS (Student Accessibility Services) collaborated to establish an English 1A section for students with disabilities. They are highly encouraged to take this section but not limited to it. SAS AB705 activities included participating in the development of the self-guided placement tool, developing/revising DSPS 106, 107, 108, and 109 in collaboration with English and Math, providing one-on-one English/Math tutoring for SAS students, and surveying SAS students to create/modify best practices.

Shusaku said the next steps are to complete the implementation plan, revise the self-guided tool, use data to ensure student’s needs are met, and look for innovative ways to better support students and bolster services.

Rachel wants to see more data especially in Math. She hopes Math will develop support resources to for students who need to review elementary and intermediate Algebra. Beth said there is more dense data that can be provided and she thanked Math, English and SAS departments for their work on behalf of our students.

Carlos has concerns for students who want to be engineers but haven’t been in college for 5-6 years and go right into Math 21. He hopes the support classes will prepare students to be successful in Pre-Calculus. He wants to see the data also.
Chris Frazier said no one in the Math department wants to under-prepare students. They are challenged by a difficult set of laws. He has very few students in his Math 20 class that supports beginning and intermediate Algebra. The Math department aligns with Rachel and the counselors.

Jose asked what discussion is there with faculty professional development to better align with culturally responsive pedagogy to support students to succeed in our STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) courses.

B. Cultural Curriculum Audit Review (CCAR) – Madhavi Sudarsana said six faculty selected from various departments will participate in two events, the Ventura virtual 5-week spring training starting April 4 and our college summer planning between July 1 and August 15. The spring training will adapt their curriculum to SJCC requirements. The first in-house cohort will begin in the fall. She invited full-time and adjunct faculty to apply.

C. Results from Student Preference Survey – Dean Shusaku Horibe said the point of the survey was to understand the overall student preference about class modality to inform fall 2022 scheduling. The Qualtrics survey sent to enrolled SJCC students 18 and over, ran February 14-25, 2022. Twenty $25 gift card incentives were given to complete the survey. Non-respondents were emailed two survey reminders. There were 1711 responses from the 6238 surveyed, yielding a 27% response rate. The results for the key question of fall class meeting modality preference was 48% wanted all online classes and about 50% are considering some in-person classes. Results showed students who are working full-time, Asian, women, and credit (as opposed to non-credit students) were slightly more likely to prefer all or mostly online classes. It listed the order of the highest likelihood to the least likelihood modality preference as: (1) completely online, (2) hyflex (used the Academic Senate’s definition), (3) hybrid, and (4) completely in-person. Within online courses, students preferred a mix of asynchronous and synchronous (40%), followed by asynchronous (35%), and lastly synchronous (24%) modalities. He gave some other scheduling considerations like, in-person lab requirements, variables by program or course (Career Technology Education, Athletics, ESL), possible Distance Education instructors and hyflex room limitations. Dean Horibe provided the link to the District’s fall 2021 survey.

Mark asked if this survey was presented to the Board of Trustees (BOT) or time scheduled with them to review it. VP Pratt answered that this survey directed by the Chancellor for both SJCC/EVC, will go back to him to share with the BOT at their upcoming meeting.

Elena asked if this survey was segregated by program, department, subject matter, or whether they preferred certain courses in-person or online. Dean Horibe answered that this year’s survey focused on overall preference, but last fall’s survey reviewed all of those details.

Rachel stressed that 70% of students (48+22%) said they prefer mostly online classes. She asked when the District became the schedule decider. With this knowledge, she hopes we can move forward with our student’s needs. She suggested a follow-up more specific survey.

Judith reminded them that the Board does not dictate scheduling to the colleges.

John asked if the results between this survey and last year’s survey were close. Dean Horibe answered that they were very close. They tried to keep the question format. The February survey asked about Omicron and how public health affects student’s perception but there was not much change.

Robert Andrade (student) said there are certain subjects that are easier to handle in-person. It would be best to ask for preference subject by subject.

Alex said some students for whom online did not work did not come back. He is concerned for these students. Some were from the tech and H-VAC area. He asked if there a higher response in that area. He also asked if students were afraid to be face-to-face because of the pandemic. Dean Horibe answered this survey was about overall class modality in general with the information we have now. The best data is in the fall 2021 survey that goes into this detail.

Jose asked requested this data sent to the senate. Dean Horibe said he would supply both links to the February 2022 and the fall 2021 surveys.

Michelle added that faculty knows best about course specific scheduling preferences.

Mary asked if 27% is a large enough sampling. Dean Horibe answered that he analyzed the respondent demographics that most resembles the student population. He said there could be student bias but that 27% is a robust response rate.
Chris Frazier said we may have bias against students prior to 2019 who were happy with face-to-face classes by surveying only current students with more online structure. Dean Horibe agreed and added we need to continue to ask our students about this so that we have multiple snapshots of time.

D. Budget Process – VP Chris Hawken said they are working through the budget baselines. The fiscal staff and deans met with the areas starting in October to review three years of budgets to develop their baselines. The baseline budgets will roll over within eLumen when it is established. The fiscal team is reviewing the requests for missing or double requested items. The fiscal team has received few augmentation requests this year (44) and will continue to reach out to areas to capture everything. The baseline budget lists and separate lists of the mission critical NIAs (Non-Instructional Assignment), campus technology (software, licenses), and the augmentations, will show us the true discretionary leftover. We are waiting for the outcome of the RAM (Resource Allocation Model) discussions. Augmentations will go back out for area prioritization to the Academic Senate (faculty positions), the Classified Senate (classified positions), Tech and Facilities & Safety Committees, area budget mangers deans, and Vice Presidents. The prioritized list will be sent to the senates, the College Advisory Council, the Finance Committee, and the President. The fiscal team will share the rubric for items not funded.

Judith said it would be good for the Academic Senate to work on guidelines for involving faculty in the discussions. VP Hawken added the Finance Committee will assist in getting the message out to all constituency groups to be involved in the prioritization sessions.

E. Program Review Process in eLumen – Judith Bell said we are in the process of developing eLumen as our program review/budget software. She and Huimin have developed rubrics for administrative services, academic affairs, and student services. The Senate needs to approve this new format. The college and program’s missions will align within the program review process. Budget Justification Request forms are not needed with eLumen. The action plan’s resources request will contain the budget request. Every program with a budget will see it in eLumen. Augmentations will go in the general fund 10. eLumen is a planning tool and does not allocate funds. This will make the process more transparent. She will bring back program review in chunks later this semester.

F. Fully online degrees and certificates – Andres Rodriguez explained the modalities: fully online degrees and certificates are asynchronous based on research, Zoom/remote are synchronous, Hyflex includes in-person and online synchronous via video conference, and hybrid includes at least one in-person meeting and or one synchronous meeting. The CVC-OEI (California Virtual Campus-Online Education Initiative) states online courses may not be hybrid or remote. This is a campus-wide collaboration of faculty, administration, the DE (Distance Education) committee, IPCC (Institutional Policies & Curriculum Committee) and articulation. Thuy Cao reviewed the IPCC roles as providing guidance on curriculum, degrees, and certificates; and approving courses, DE addendums, degrees and certificates. IPCC does not designate whether degrees or certificates are fully online, does not determine modality, and does not create courses, degrees, or certificates. Gabriel Santiago reviewed the degree requirements with an AA Art degree sample. Thuy asked several questions of the Senate: Will we adopt the CVC-OEI definition of fully online degrees/certificates? What are the accreditation needs? What is the Academic Senate’s role? Which courses will be identified as online and how often will they be taught? Who will be responsible for the webpage with student information? What DE training, support, and continued education will be provided? 

Michelle asked if Hyflex fits into the fully online definition. Gabe asked whether we are adopting the CVC-OEI definition of fully online is the question.

VIII. Information Items/Possible Action (6-minute limit)

A. Appointment of Evaluators for Associate Faculty – Judith Bell shared that Title V says that the Academic Senate appoints faculty to committees and she see no difference between associate faculty and full-time in terms of academic excellence and that’s why we have the policy for peer evaluators. She is okay with the executive committee or the senate president viewing these appointments. She will bring this back.

B. Overview of the SJCC Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Accessibility, Anti-Racism (DEIAA) Plan – Jennifer Nestojko said this 5-year plan was sent out to the campus community and based on much feedback. The state is adding accessibility and we have added anti-racism to the plan. She reviewed the four strategic priorities: (1) Strengthening Student Success with targeted areas of learning communities, library
resources, basic needs and retention, mental health services, technology equity, and assessment equity, (2) Advancing Anti-Racism with the taskforce and the equity dashboard, (3) Amplifying Accessibility to better support and enhance services to our students with disabilities, and (4) Improving Campus Climate.

Jennifer/Heather) **Motion: For Academic Senate to support the DEIAA – Approved w/o objections**

C. Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Report – Mark said they met with President Tomaneng who shared the earlier data. She supports the increase of faculty involvement in course creation, allocations, and making decisions. She asked them to think about students who bypass community colleges and the decrease of high-school students.

John added that some of the classes were cancelled in Guided Pathways, which meant that students in those pathways could not complete.

Judith added that the faculty voice in enrollment management needed to be more permanent.

D. Revitalization of Enrollment Management Advisory Group – Alex said in the past, the former Dean of Social Science started the enrollment management advisory committee with managers, faculty and with help from the counselors.

(Alex/Jose) **Motion: For the Senate President to ask the CAC (College Advisory Council) to revive the Enrollment Management Advisory Group – Approved w/o objection**

Mark suggested this group should be under the Academic Senate. Alex said enrollment is part of the college itself so we had managers, classified, and faculty. That is why it was under the CAC. Beth commended the senate for restarting this committee. The CAC is developing its agenda for Friday’s meeting and this could be presented if the vote is yes.

**IX. Committee Reports**

A. President Report: Judith reported speaking at the last Board meeting and made the point about opening the semester with 70% in-person.

B. District Academic Senate: Alex reported meeting with the Chancellor, his executives, and both college presidents from November to Veteran’s Day discussing the priorities of increasing enrollment and improving technology. They discussed the stress between the colleges and the District. We want these talks to continue to rebuild the trust. The Chancellor wants the RAM done as soon as possible.

C. Anita asked if a senator would serve as proxy at the Accessibility Committee meeting on Friday, March 11, 9-10:30am. Her class is on set filming all day. Email Anita directly.

D. Mark reported that he faxed the letter to Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) asking them to drop its Supreme Court appeal of the lawsuit between it and two of their students who are blind. The LACCD Board of Trustees are meeting tomorrow at one pm. Contact Mark for the meeting details.

E. Classified Senate: Andrea shared the California Community College Senate’s working resolution about the 9+1 to help get classified recognition into Ed Code. This will return as an information item.

F. SLOAC (Student Learning Outcomes & Assessment): Judith reported they are working on the final version of the Institutional SLOs. They will send them out again because there is one more revision to add. Please look for the final vetting.

G. DE (Distance Education): Audrey reported from last week’s consortium meeting. The state will no longer fund Canvas Studio next fiscal year, but reduced pricing is available through College Buys. The CVC is removing Proctorio because of concerns for student privacy and equity. The Chancellor is coordinating with the California State Universities and the University of California system on the acceptance of online labs. Faculty should contact Aaron Larsen at the chancellor’s office with issues of transferring online labs. She listed the top class searches of the CVC’s (California Virtual College) exchange.

**X. The chair adjourned the meeting at 4:41pm.**