

**ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE**  
**Academic Senate**

Agenda for Tuesday May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2021, Zoom◇, 4:00-6:00 T  
◇<https://hancockcollege.zoom.us/j/8990785265>

**AS PRESIDENT:** G. Bierly

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** H. Alvarez, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, C. Diaz, Cl. Diaz, K. Dutra, H. Elliott, A. Fox, A. Gomez de Torres, M. Guido Brunét, C. Hite, M. Hull, A. Koch, M. McGill, B. Murtha, A. Omidasalar, A. Restrepo, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, . M. Segura, N. Ward, L. West

**STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:**

**GUESTS:** D. DeGroot, L. Manalo, R. Curry, P. Murphy, Y. Teniente, P. Murphy, M. Nelson, M. Lau, L. Lee, R. Rameriz, P. McGuire, A. Caddell, E. Murray, Jr., J Scarffe,

**1. Call to Order [2] (Bierly)**

**2. Public Comment [5-minute limit]**

K. Walthers recognizes that the Bookstore has not met our expectations and is looking for solutions. Their contract ends 6-30-21, and that ends the reimbursement aspect of the agreement. The soonest we could make changes would be January 2022 and is a very aggressive timeline. They have a new manager, Ashley Ortez, and has committed to meeting with the administration, faculty, and staff to work toward solutions. They propose guaranteeing \$175 in 22-22 and \$155m in 22-23 if we continue to work with them. If this is not working, we can look at another solution.

**CONSENT [10]**

**3. \*Approval of Minutes**

– *Review and the approval of the 4-02-21 minutes*

**Motion: R. Bryant / A. Omidasalar**

**Discussion:**

**Yes: 23** - H. Alvarez, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, C. Diaz, Cl. Diaz, K. Dutra, H. Elliott, A. Fox, A. Gomez de Torres, M. Guido Brunét, C. Hite, M. Hull, A. Koch, M. McGill, B. Murtha, A. Omidasalar, A. Restrepo, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, . M. Segura, N. Ward, L. West

**No: 0**

**Abstain: 0**

**4. AP&P Curriculum Summary Report**

– *Review and the approval of the Curriculum Summary Report*

**Motion: R. Bryant / L. Campos**

**Discussion:**

**Yes: 23** - H. Alvarez, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, C. Diaz, Cl. Diaz, K. Dutra, H. Elliott, A. Fox, A. Gomez de Torres, M. Guido Brunét, C. Hite, M. Hull, A. Koch, M. McGill, B. Murtha, A. Omidasalar, A. Restrepo, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, . M. Segura, N. Ward, L. West

**No: 0**

**Abstain: 0**

## **PRESENTATION**

### **5. DEI Taskforce [15] (Scarfe, Butler, Ramirez)**

– *Report from the DEI Taskforce*

R. Rameriz stated that the DEI taskforce does not have any items to bring to Senate for approval. He shared that the committee has developed website content and taskforce goals, tying their outcomes to the Ed Masterplan. S. Butler developed a DEI activity app that is available on the IE website to record events, resources, and activities to support admin, staff, and faculty as they organize and record work completed. J. Scarffe said they were motivated to institutionalize this work and share work that is a continued practice. R. Rameriz briefly shared the results of the DEI survey and that there was an “Anti-DEI” sentiment or fatigue on campus. DEI is interested in focused training, possibly through CORA Learning, developed as PD workshops. He acknowledged that there are times that having difficult conversations with respect in a Zoom environment is challenging. He is looking forward to the fall semester when the group can meet in person and schedule a retreat to focus the group and push them to the next level. The group has had some drop-off in participation, and they are looking to energize the committee and our community. J. Scarffe shared that the group has an unusual charge. They are trying to get things done through tough conversations and hopes to encourage faculty participation to do the hard but necessary work.

## **ACTION**

### **6. \*Program Review Update [15] (McGuire/Lee/Murphy)**

– *Approve the development of a program planning guide and a pilot for each area (academic, CTE, service, etc.)*

P. McGuire shared that the Program Review Committee has designed a new process to Program Review that is more directed to Program Planning and is looking for approval for several faculty to pilot this new process over the summer and report back to Senate in the fall. The basic concept is that faculty focus on addressing one of 5 core topics annually – Curriculum Design, Innovative Scheduling, Education and Industry Partnerships, Enrollments and Efficiency, and Academic and Services Support – instead of the previous general Annual Updates or comprehensive 6-year Program Review. He stated that which topic faculty focus on is a choice, as long as all five topics are addressed over five years and will be directed by each program's annual interests or challenges.

P. McGuire stated that the new process promotes integrated program planning through a cycle of analysis of program successes and challenges that ultimately lead to actions and requests for resources, resulting in comprehensive program management. Committee members have visited all departments and presented the basic concept of the new proposed process. He said that the way to think about it is that this is a living document, not a report that sits on a shelf on or on a hard drive for six years – faculty can address any topic at any time, depending on the program's needs. Eventually, SPOL, the District's integrated planning software, will house the document and facilitate resource requests. The goal of the pilot is to work through the kinks and document the process

A. Fox stated that their program is scheduled for program review in the fall and asked if they are expected to do the whole thing at once. P. McGuire shared that this is why we want to look at the process. Cl. Diaz asked if faculty were required to participate in this new process or if it was optional. His opinion is that faculty should finish what they have already started. H. Elliot asked P. Murphy and R. Curry if they have any concerns that this new process will provide the information needed for accreditation and how it affects DL course validation. P. Murphy shared that the DL Policies will have to be revised based on new DL Guidelines, and the committee will have to revisit

that language to "monitor" engagement in courses. PR planning and Resource allocation processes are not so proscriptive – what we have to demonstrate is that what we are doing is supporting the College mission and how we are moving forward. P. Murphy stated that he believes the new process aligns with supporting the college's mission and our students. R. Curry said that this process's resource allocation process looks to be served and will continue based on what is outlined in this proposal. H. Elliot asked about the depth of the prompts in this new process and the wide variation of the responses. P. Murphy said that the new process allows an inquiry-based approach and work on issues in a meaningful way. The pilot will clarify the prompts and provide examples to be used in developing a planning guide. P. Murphy stated that IE would provide the data will inform faculty if issues of equity need to be addressed. A. Koch commented that it might be challenging to assess projects entirely in a year and worried about the cycle and time length. P. McGuire said to think of the five core topics as a prompt or an idea wheel and that circumstances may warrant looking at multiple areas.

**Motion: A. Koch / M. Brunet**

**Discussion:**

**Yes: Yes: 20** - R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, C. Diaz, K. Dutra, H. Elliott, A. Fox, M. Guido Brunét, C. Hite, M. Hull, A. Koch, M. McGill, B. Murtha, A. Omidshar, A. Restrepo, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, . M. Segura, N. Ward, L. West

**No: 0**

**Abstain: 3** - A. Gomes, H. Alvarez, Cl. Diaz,

## **INFORMATION**

7. **Senate Exec's Remarks** H. Elliot shared that Senate Exec has been in communication with the administration about the clarity of the function and roles of co-chairs and that they are looking for ways to provide more support to them. He expressed appreciation of G. Bierly stepping up as president for the remainder of the semester.
8. **Senate Representation on Councils & Committees [15] (Senate Exec)**
  - *Discussion regarding faculty participation in councils and committees.*A. Restrepo shared that he has been participating in Senate Exec meetings since his election this spring. He pointed to the Senate goals established last year that included an assessment of shared governance at the college which has been a long-standing goal. He said that it is crucial to understand our participation in shared governance outside of the Senate body. Each of those councils is co-chaired by an appointed faculty member. The CCPD defines the roles and responsibilities of appointees who act as the voice of the Senate. Senate Exec should address any changes in the clarity of the role of co-chairs and the equity of power within those councils. A. Gomez shared that Senate Exec needs to support our co-chairs and have regular meetings throughout the year to support shared governance across the campus.
9. **\*BP/AP 7218 Selection of Department Chair [15] (Roepke)**
  - *Alteration to the AP allowing for the part-time representative to vote for department chair.*T. Roepke shared a proposed change on AP 7218 that adds language regarding the eligibility to vote that would allow one PT faculty member appointed by the PTFA the opportunity to vote for department chair. R. Bryant offered a response from a Business faculty that outlined the differences in hiring, responsibilities, and expectations. A. Omidshar spoke up from the English and said that his department did not see how this would affect elections. M. Segura said that they

are looking for inclusion in the decisions made at the college. R. Bryant asked the extent of this request – and was concerned that this might become a more significant request in the future.

**10. \*AP 5055 Enrollment Priorities [10] (Tuan)**

– *Updates to the administrative procedure for student enrollment.*

J. Tuan was unable to attend, and G. Bierly gave the report. He reported that the counselors are continuing to discuss the revisions and consequences of moving priority groups around. N. Ward shared that the revisions pushed adult learners to the back of the line, impacting our ability to serve employers and our community. L. West wanted to address the high-unit majors getting pushed to the later dates. H. Alvarez said that this is important for conditional feedback. A taskforce has been created to review all possible unintended consequences. A revised document will come back in the fall and go through the Senate discussion and voting process.

**COUNCIL/COMMITTEE REPORTS [15]**

**11. CTE Liaison report; Technology Council & EdTAC Committee report**

– *Reports from councils'/committees' faculty co-chairs/chairs or faculty representatives.*

- N. Ward reported that the Perkins V funding would decline based on unduplicated headcounts by economically disadvantaged categories. The regional consortium will distribute \$20m to each of the colleges in the region.
- A. Restrepo encouraged faculty to respond to the Technology Council technology survey, especially Apple users. He also reported that the EdTAC committee has been meeting to establish the technology needed in the classroom that allows hybrid learning and teaching equitably. Challenges are – supply chain issues and support from ITS in vetting what equipment is placed in what classrooms. The committee has been working hard to make recommendations to support classrooms for hybrid learning in the fall. C. Hite verified the issues with installation and individual needs for each classroom. Elliot asked about the timeline and if the funding covers contracting support technicians to help with the delays. A. Fox shared that there has been movement, but actual decision-making and purchasing are still an issue. L. West asked if faculty will be able to teach hybrid in the fall. H. Elliot asked, “what happens if the room is not equipped for hybrid teaching.” R. Curry said that because there are so many unknowns, we will have to develop a plan C (remote?) for fall. A. Gomez asked how the college will communicate this information over the summer – and stated that ITS should be reporting to admin and communicating with faculty who have specific requests. A. Restrepo shared that some of the equipment is here, but not all. He acknowledged the disconnect with faculty who have not physically been on campus and encouraged their participation in conversations and opportunities to test the hybrid teaching technology currently set up in his classroom. A. Fox shared that many faculty need help to comprehend what teaching hybrid entails and what is involved, such as arranging the technology so that the teacher sees and engages with the students. A. Restrepo asked faculty to reach out to him to visit his classroom and see the technology recommended. A. Restrepo invited all faculty to edTAC meetings and will continue to meet on Tuesdays from 1-2 pm.

\* documents on Senate Sharepoint