

# ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE

## Academic Senate Meeting

Minutes for Tuesday, May 17, 2022

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Zoom Meeting: <https://hancockcollege.zoom.us/j/95506515929>

**AS PRESIDENT:** A. Restrepo

**VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:** – H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, A. Gomez de Torres, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Koch, G. Marquez, M. McGill, T. Nuñez, C. Pavone, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, J. Scarffe, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

**STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:**

**GUESTS:** D. DeGroot, L. Manalo, R. Curry, M. Lau, P. Murphy, E. Murray, Jr., F. Patrick, K. Beckelhymer, Y. Teniente, J. Bergstrom Smith, C. Reed, E. Biely, C. Straub

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

**2. Rollcall.**

**3. Public Comments. [3-minute limit per individual]**

J. Jozwiak reported that she attended a webinar about AB 1705 and throughput data indicates that this bill is not serving our students well. Academic Senate presidents' from around the state aim to mobilize people and fight this legislation. She shared a link to watch the video for more information.

**4. Approval of Minutes from 4/19/2022. \* [5] (NJW)**

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

**Discussion:**

**Yes: 26** - H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, A. Gomez de Torres, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Koch, G. Marquez, M. McGill, T. Nuñez, C. Pavone, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, J. Scarffe, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

**Abstain: 0**

**No: 0**

**5. President's Remarks. [5] (AR)**

A. Restrepo shared his appreciation of faculty senators' attendance and engagement in 10+1 matters. Commencement is next week, and he thanked faculty for volunteering as name readers and speakers. A. Gomez de Torres will be presenting the class of 2022. He suggested a Council Co-chairs retreat during the week before the beginning of classes.

**CONSENT**

**6. Approval of Curriculum Summary Report. \* [5] (L. Manolo)**

H. Elliot expressed gratitude for the efforts to expedite the process for courses impacted by AB 705. L. Manalo shared that despite the simplified process, these course changes may need to have discussions within their department and with AP&P reps.

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

**Discussion:**

**Yes: 26** - H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, A. Gomez de Torres, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Koch, G. Marquez, M. McGill, T. Nuñez, C. Pavone, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, J. Scarffe, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

**Abstain: 0**

**No: 0**

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **7. Program Learning Outcomes Assessment Process. \*\* [10] (L. West/LOAC)**

*Approval of request for LOAC to update the existing Institutional Assessment Plan to reflect changes in the current Program Learning Outcomes process.*

A. Restrepo explained the ASE recommendation to LOAC after our last meeting that the Institutional Assessment Plan from 2017 be modified and updated to reflect the Senate-approved Learning Outcome and Assessment process changes. That document will come back in the fall for senate approval.

**Motion: R. Bryant / T. Nuñez**

**Discussion:**

**Yes: 26** - H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, A. Gomez de Torres, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Koch, G. Marquez, M. McGill, T. Nuñez, C. Pavone, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, J. Scarffe, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

**Abstain: 0**

**No: 0**

## **INFORMATION (FOR FUTURE ACTION/APPROVAL)**

None

## **REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)**

### **8. Results of the Campus Climate Survey. \* [30] (HE/P. Murphy)**

P. Murphy detailed the content and the results of the recent campus climate survey. The goal is to identify critical areas of success and opportunities for improvement by comparing the results from 2022 to 2018. The two most essential areas are enablement and engagement – effective employees score high on both domains; low levels can indicate frustration and detachment. There were three hundred and seventy-seven responses – an increase in participation from classified, administration, and full-time faculty and less participation from part-time faculty. The 14 domains of the survey represented the topics of Engagement & Enablement. An interesting discovery is that people feel motivated to do more than required but not motivated by the institution to do more than is required. Another finding is that a large % of people think that there are significant barriers at work to do their jobs. L. Manalo verified that there would be actionable dialog around the results. Murphy shared that there are improved areas of favorability in Collaboration and Confidence in Leaders, but the overall approval is low. He suggested that we look for improvement areas and drill down on what worked and whether it can be replicated or scaled up. He suggests minor changes may lead to significant differences in the top unfavorable areas. H. Elliot pointed out that statement “I have trust and confidence in AHC senior leadership” had low favorability in both full-time and part-time faculty. He asked Murphy why he thought that was happening. Both suggested that this be looked into at a deeper level. Another low favorability was in the performance management area “Poor performance is

addressed effectively in AHC.” L. Campos commented on the relationship of the low favorability in “adequate time to take advantage of on-the-job training. “When changes are made when I work, communications are handled well” was also unfavorable for full-time faculty.

Possible next steps include following up with some open-ended questions on areas where there can be an improvement, determining if there are opportunities to build off of supportive practices, identifying lingering issues that continue to be recognized as problems, and looking at steps to improve. A. Restrepo recommended focus groups rather than larger group forums to tease out clarity and the next steps. L. Manalo suggested we look at our process from the last efforts. A. Koch asked about this being part of all staff days using an SGID structure. C. Reed spoke about the cross-pollination on all staff days and the value of each faculty group having targeted voices and departments having targeted voices.

#### **9. Accreditation update. [30] (ASE)**

- *Themes for the Quality Focus Essay. (ASE/P. Murphy)*

A. Restrepo spoke about his concern and suggestions for technology in the classroom for enrichment and equity through diverse instructional and service modalities.

T. Passage spoke about his suggestions on aligning student-level assessment and apparatuses at the College.

N. Ward shared ideas to clarify, document, and refine shared governance decision processes and culture across campus to support student success, persistence, and retention.

K. Runkle appreciated these suggested topics and asked about incorporating “universal design” as an action item in item #1.

- *Timeline. (P. Murphy)*

P. Murphy shared the timeline for the Accreditation process.

#### **10. Technology Masterplan. [10] (AR/F. Patrick)**

A. Restrepo updated members on the status of the Technology Masterplan and stated that the council decided to delay decisions around the goals until the fall semester.

N. Ward shared equipment recommendations for Digital Classroom Technology, Hybrid Equipment Recommendations from members of EdTAC, and Computer Standards that came out of the Technology Council. Technology Council will officially make these recommendations and be presented to College Council for approval in the fall.

#### **11. Fall 2022 Academic Senate meetings and the Brown Act. [10] (AR)**

A. Restrepo shared that faculty are asking about our meetings in the fall – if they will be by teleconferencing or in person. This decision is governed by the Brown Act, the state of CA, and the Chancellor’s office. We do not know if we will be legally allowed to continue our meetings on Zoom, and believes that this discussion will come up at the summer leadership institute with the ASCCC. He appreciates our senators’ work and hopes that regardless of the modalities.

#### **12. CCPD councils and committees’ reports. [5 min. each unless otherwise indicated.]**

- *Faculty Innovation Fund Grants update. (T. Roepke/NJW)*

**9 proposals requesting \$59,904**

- 2 proposals to support student learning through interaction and collaboration - 1 thru an app and 1 thru an event
- 1 proposal to support a skills competition
- 3 proposals for instructional support for at-risk students
- 2 proposals for library services - 1 for digitized textbooks and 1 for embedded librarian partnerships
- 1 proposal for orientation, intervention and SEP development for non-credit students

**13. Future Agenda Items and Department Suggestions.**

- *Interim/Acting administrative appointments.*
- *BP/AP 7810 Faculty Emeritus Status.*
- *Faculty appointments to committees and councils.*
- *Agenda items should be sent to the Academic Senate Executive Committee by noon on the Tuesday prior to the next Academic Senate meeting.*

**14. Adjourn.**

*Next Academic Senate Meeting: September 6, 2022. Agenda Items due by August 30, 2022 @ noon.*

*\* Documents available on Senate SharePoint.*

*\*\*Documents available in previous Senate meeting's SharePoint folder*