

ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE
Academic Senate

Agenda for Tuesday, October 20th, 2020, Zoom, 4:00-6:00 T

<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/8990785265>

1. Call to Order [2] (Passage)

AS PRESIDENT: T Passage

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, Ana Gomez de Torres, M. Guido Brunét, M. Hull, A. Koch, M. Lehne, E. Mason, M. McGill, B. Murtha, A. Omidsalar, A. Restrepo, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:

GUESTS:

2. Public Comment [5-minute limit]

3. *Approval of Minutes [5] (Ward)

(Approval of the 09-15-20 minutes and the 06-16-20 minutes. Minutes were posted and were shared in the Zoom Session available.)

Motion: A. Restrepo / R. Bryant

Discussion:

Yes: 19 - H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, Ana Gomez de Torres, M. Guido Brunét, M. Hull, A. Koch, M. Lehne, E. Mason, M. McGill, B. Murtha, A. Omidsalar, A. Restrepo, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward

No: 0

Abstain: 5 - A. Omidsalar, Cl. Diaz, K. George, T. Aye, L. Campos,

ACTION

4. *ERT SGID Evaluation Process [20] (Curry)

—Feasibility/amending the District's Proposal for SGID Evaluations through remote modality.

Department Reports: The Business department approved the proposed SGID process. English department felt that any evaluations – FT or PT, are unfair under these circumstances because there are not technology set standards and the unusual context of the pandemic. Life & Physical Sciences had concerns about the process and if Zoom features like chat and breakout sessions could be randomized. The Fine Arts department did not support this proposal. Counseling shared that service faculty did not have to go through this SGID process. The Health Sciences department has not given feedback yet. The Social and Behavioral Sciences department voted it down. The Industrial Technology department stated that it is not appropriate for the current climate right now and voted it down. Applied Behavioral Sciences hasn't voted on this yet, and T. Roepke agrees with most of the Senate because students are under duress right now.

It was noted that there are only 11 SGID trained faculty, and 44 evaluations need to be performed within a very tight window of time. There could be an assigned external reviewer conducting the review in the ERT. R. Hall agreed that the timetable has been messed up and believes in the SGID process is a valuable evaluation process and is healthy for faculty to get this kind of feedback. Because the issues include equity on the use of platforms that students and faculty may not use, which might put them at a technological disadvantage, he recommends that we do not agree to the SGID. H. Elliot asked about the practicality of getting this done and asked how to accomplish this within the timeframe. Ed Code does not specify the process and states that we cannot delay tenure for tenure track faculty. M. Segura shared that the PT faculty contract can submit three names to participate in the evaluations, but they might not be trained in the SGID process. R. Curry acknowledged the issues and reflected that faculty are teaching in this new environment, students are graded in this environment, and those grades have meaning. He shared that the institution is interested in a successful evaluation process, supporting faculty - not get rid of them. He said that the District wants to assess teaching and is open to any recommendations for improvement. K. Walthers reiterated the Board of Trustees expects an evaluation process with the same or similar rigor as the SGID. Another option is a portfolio approach, but that would require changes to the document, and this needs to be wrapped up by February. H. Elliot shared that any new process would have to be approved by the Senate, which takes about a month. M. Guido Brunét stated her concerns about the timeframe and having a shortened timeframe to prepare for this process. T. Passage shared that an amendment could be made to the proposal now, but any new methods would need the two meeting cycle. T. Passage clarified that the Senate just looks at the process, the FA and the District negotiate the timeframe.

Motion: A. Restrepo / R. Bryant

Discussion:

Yes: 8 - R. Bryant, R. Chaudhari, A. Fox, K. George, M. Hull, A. Koch, M. Lehne,

No: 10 – E. Mason, A. Restrepo, A. Omidasalar, M. Guido Brunét, R. Murtha, A. Gomez de Torres, H. Alvarez, J. Tuan, H. Elliot, N. Ward

Abstain: 7 – T. Aye, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, L. Campos, Cl. Diaz, M. Segura, M. McGill,

INFORMATION

5. President's Remarks

T. Passage acknowledged the incredible work faculty are doing this semester.

6. Spring Semester '21 Modality [5] (Passage)

—*A report of how operations will be in the Spring Semester '21.*

College Council recently decided that the spring semester will be Emergency Remote Teaching - ERT.

7. *Annual Curriculum Approval Certification Form [5] (Passage)

—*Request for Senate approval to sign the certification form for the CCCCCO.*

Please share this document with your department for approval.

8. *Education Master Plan [15] (Murphy)

—*Review the draft of the Education Master Plan.*

P. Murphy shared that three shared governance councils are working on this document. A clean draft will be sent to Senate and College Council. The mission statement was revised since last

spring's presentation to Senate. He noted the difference between the Mission statement and the Mission of the College and pointed out that there is a substantial change to the Vision statement. The distinguishing features leverage the student journey framework, recognizes strategies versus tactics, and embrace the facilities and technology masterplans. There is an aspect of actions and timelines for accountability. The faculty remarked that the vision statement looks good. P. Murphy would appreciate hearing back from departments if anything is unclear and recommends that reporting mechanisms like program review link to Goals, Strategies and align with Integrated Planning. H. Elliot advised that faculty look at the additional strategies to see if things they need or plan for are reflected in this document.

9. *Assessment Data Management and Stewardship: eLumen to SPOL [10] (Murphy)

—*Background on the acquisition of SPOL and a proposal to discontinue eLumen.*

Strategic Planning Online – SPOL is a new tool supporting and integrating planning processes by tracking and aligning resources pulled from Program Reviews and Annual Updates. The Program Review committee assessed different platforms and surveyed other community colleges. Various products were reviewed, and it was determined that we needed a flexible, robust database. SPOL has an assessment module, and it integrates with Program Review and resource requests. Faculty shared the need for ease of access, ease of reporting, and integration.

T. Passage shared that last spring Senate approved changing the focus of assessment from CSLOs to PSLOs and asked if this system is flexible for changes like that. P. Murphy responded positively and shared that whatever platform we use will take a learning curve. H. Elliot asked how this would affect faculty who are currently in program review cycles. P. Murphy stated that there needs to be clarification on that, and changes made will impact the assessment cycle. Several programs are in the process now. P. Murphy shared that faculty will be inputting the data and that SPOL can work with CSV and Excel files. The next steps are to redevelop the assessment process and integrate SPOL. P. Murphy will come back with to Senate with a demo on the assessment process in SPOL.

10. *BP/AP 4235 Credit for Prior Learning [10] (Curry)

—*Review of updates to our Credit by Examination policy with changes due to Title 5.*

B. Curry shared that this BP/AP is required by the state and calls for the college to adopt Credit for Prior Learning. It will include credit by examination, evaluation of Joint Services Transcripts, evaluation of student portfolios, industry-recognized credential documentation, and standardized exams. T. Passage will send the annotated document to Senators. Decisions to offer Credit for Prior Learning is up to faculty. This AP just outlines the process.

Motion to table items 11 & 12: A. Restrepo / R. Bryant

Discussion:

Yes: 24 - H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, Ana Gomez de Torres, M. Guido Brunét, M. Hull, A. Koch, M. Lehne, E. Mason, M. McGill, B. Murtha, A. Omidsalar, A. Restrepo, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward

No: 0

Abstain: 0

11. *ASCCC Fall Plenary Resolutions [10] (Passage)

—*A look at the proposed resolutions for the state senate.*

12. *ACCJC Midterm Report [10] (Murphy)
—*Information regarding our Midterm Accreditation Report.*

COUNCIL REPORTS [15]

13. Student Services, Human Resources, Technology
—*Reports from 3 councils' faculty co-chairs.*

T. Roepke shared that Human Resources Council is looking at BP/AP 7120. It will be modified to include all hiring groups. They have been exploring how to make the hiring process more equitable, including “Blind-Screening.” They are also looking at BP/AP 3120.

A. Restrepo reported from the Technology Council that all full-time faculty have lifetime access to MS Office. Faculty should go to the myHancock page and log into the 365 icon on the top right to install the software. They are preparing to work on the Technology Masterplan and hopes that the Senate will provide input on the goals. Lastly, he wanted to share that Adobe Flash is no longer being supported.

* documents on Senate Sharepoint: