

ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE

Academic Senate

Agenda for Tuesday April 20th, 2021, Zoom◇, 4:00-6:00 T

◇<https://hancockcollege.zoom.us/j/8990785265>

1. Call to Order [2] (Bierly)
2. Public Comment [5 minute limit)

AS PRESIDENT: G Bierly

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

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:

GUESTS: D. DeGroot, L. Manalo, R. Curry, P. Murphy, Y. Teniente, M Dominguez, S. Crosby, M. Quaid-Matigliatti, V. Dominguez, E. Murray, Jr., L. Lee, P. McGuire, R. Andres

CONSENT [10]

3. ***Approval of Minutes from 03-02-21**

Motion: R. Bryant / A. Omidasalar

Discussion:

Yes: 24 - H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, CH. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, Ana Gomez de Torres, A. Koch, M. Lehne, E. Mason, M. McGill, B. Murtha, K. Musev, A. Omidasalar, A. Restrepo, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

No: 0

Abstain: 2 - C. Diaz, Cl. Diaz

4. ***College Council Resolutions**

—*Anti- Asian-American and Pacific Islander Hate Resolution (AAAPIH)*

—*CCC Diversity Equity & Inclusion Awareness Month*

Motion to approve AAAPIH with an introductory paragraph added: R. Bryant / G. Bierly

Discussion: A. Fox recommended that the AAAPIH resolution have an introduction added.

Yes: 25 - H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, C. Diaz, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, Ana Gomez de Torres, A. Koch, M. Lehne, E. Mason, M. McGill, B. Murtha, K. Musev, A. Omidasalar, A. Restrepo, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward,

No: 0

Abstain: 1 L. West

Motion to approve DEI Awareness Month with an introductory paragraph added: R. Bryant / M. Segura

Discussion: T. Roepke asked about the closing statement from the main message

Yes: 20 - H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, R. Chaudhari, C. Diaz, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. Ana Gomez de Torres, A. Koch, M. Lehne, E. Mason, M. McGill, B. Murtha, K. Musev, A. Omidasalar, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, M. Segura, N. Ward

No: 0

Abstain: L. West, L. Campos, K. George, J. Tuan, A. Restrepo, T. Roepke,

ACTION

5. ***AP 5140 Disabled Student Programs and Services (LAP) [10] (Crosby)**
—*Updates to our DSPS (LAP) Board Policy and Administrative Procedure.*
S. Crosby presented revisions to AP 5140.

Motion: R. Bryant / K. Runkle

Discussion:

Yes: 26 - H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, C. Diaz, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, Ana Gomez de Torres, A. Koch, M. Lehne, E. Mason, M. McGill, B. Murtha, K. Musev, A. Omidasalar, A. Restrepo, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

No: 0

Abstain: 0

6. ***Course Enrollment Maximums Process [10] (Restrepo)**
—*A proposal for establishing, altering, and housing pedagogical Course Enrollment Maximums.*
A. Restrepo presented the history, process and final proposal presented by the committee.

Motion: R. Bryant / C. Hite

Discussion:

Yes: 26 - H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, C. Diaz, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, Ana Gomez de Torres, A. Koch, M. Lehne, E. Mason, M. McGill, B. Murtha, K. Musev, A. Omidasalar, A. Restrepo, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

No: 0

Abstain: 0

7. ***Teaching Modalities Framework [15] (Curry/Senate Exec)**
—*An exploration of teaching modalities to expand frameworks for Fall 2021.*

English department faculty asked if this definition includes the Hybrid format already scheduled in their department with some weekly hours on campus, some online. B. Curry responded yes. Faculty stated that the “Zoomer and Roomer” modality is like teaching two courses simultaneously and is ill-advised. They were concerned that Hybrid would be an additional workload and impact working conditions. Faculty asked about the cost comparison between adding equipment and lowering course caps. R. Curry stated that would not be possible in some areas based on faculty availability. A. Omidasalar asked if there was any poll about vaccination requirements. R. Curry stated no. A. Fox shared that in the Sciences, students are coming into the labs every 4th class. G. Bierly stated that faculty would not be obligated to teach in either modality. L. Manalo asked about course caps going back to pre-COVID in the fall. R. Curry stated that we do not know what the guidance will be in the fall. L. West asked about messaging, communication, and screening for students in the fall. She specifically asked if the District would be giving faculty consistent guidance for safe classrooms. R. Curry said they are discussing with the FA and the PFA what the protocols are, including mask-wearing. He doubts that there will be any other student screening on campus.

Cl. Diaz, Languages and Communication, did not approve the language but did approve the Hybrid modality and asked if synchronous and asynchronous was another option. R. Curry said yes, that is an option. R. Curry said that they are in discussion with the FA and the PFA. ERT is already an approved modality, and how courses are scheduled will depend on that. L. Campos supports the ASCCC definition.

Motion to accept the ASCCC Hybrid Definition: R. Bryant / A. Koch

Discussion:

Yes: 26 - H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, C. Diaz, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, Ana Gomez de Torres, A. Koch, M. Lehne, E. Mason, M. McGill, B. Murtha, K. Musev, A. Omidasalar, A. Restrepo, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

No: 0

Abstain: 0

8. ***LOAC Proposal: Rubrics [10] (West)**
—*A proposal to move from a 3 point to a 2/4 point rubric.*
H. Elliot shared that the type of chart should be dictated by the data being represented. N. Ward asked if the data could be represented in either way – bar chart or pie Chart. L. West responded that IE can determine

what format is best for the data being requested. P. Murphy said that he agreed with H. Elliot and they can mostly accommodate what faculty need.

Motion: R. Bryant / A. Koch

Discussion:

Yes: 25- H. Alvarez, T. Aye, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, C. Diaz, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, Ana Gomez de Torres, A. Koch, M. Lehne, E. Mason, M. McGill, B. Murtha, K. Musev, A. Omidshar, A. Restrepo, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

No: 0

Abstain: 1- A. Restrepo

INFORMATION

9. President's Remarks

G. Bierly thanked Senate Exec for the support to step into the role of the Academic Senate president for the remainder of the semester.

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

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

J. Tuan shared that this AP was brought forth by the Student Services Council, and it primarily addresses required updates. K. Runkle asked if this applied to continuing students or just new students and if the District can serve all students with the requirements to priority registration? M. Quaid-Maltagliati that this is their current practice and has since summer 2010. L. Campos said that Counseling reviewed this and noticed that the changes moved many student groups around. There was a high level of concern on the high unit majors moved to group 6 and may affect student completions. She asked why that group had been moved down so low and inquired about the requirement for filing the FASFA and the Dream Act. There were concerns about moving the groups around – harming high unit earners and focusing on the life-long learners and asked if there was any data to support these changes. Counseling asked that they move the high unit group back up. L. Campos recommended they get rid of the language on #1-4. J. Tuan shared that new Promise students are considered new students. S. Crosby shared that they were trying to promote the Promise student requirements but wants to respect students who are not Promise students. G. Bierly recommended that it be revised to state “all new students including new Promise students...”

11. Program Review Update [15] (McGuire/Lee/Murphy)

—*Presentation of proposed updates to the program review process.*

P. McGuire spoke to Senate about a proposal for a new process for Program Review and Annual Updates. The Program Review Committee is asking Senate for permission to pilot the new Program Planning process that the committee has developed over the summer. Participating faculty would get a stipend and report back in the fall. The committee is hoping to implement this before the end of fall semester 2021.

The proposal focuses on improving the process, making the work more meaningful, and supporting student learning and equity. The new proposal identifies 5 Core topics to be addressed and outlines a process that allows faculty to choose the topic to focus on each year for five years. Each year faculty will focus on successes, challenges, and planning for improvement specific to that core topic. Each Core topic has approximately six prompts designed to consider the previous year's challenges, develop innovative strategies to address them, and request resources needed for better outcomes. The focused responses serve as a better vehicle for planning that addresses current needs and creates a loop of actions and accountability. Each year you pick an area of focus, possibly in the context of a department effort or a more focused program effort. The goal was to design a more integrated model and could be adapted to work for both Service and Academic programs. The proposal is less form-driven, more organic, and allows faculty to focus on areas that have current challenges or opportunities.

P. McGuire stated that we do a lot of this work every day, but it doesn't necessarily get documented. This new process is an opportunity to work more efficiently and offer ideas from an equitable perspective. He said that faculty could address multiple core topics in a year if they wanted, and ultimately, this is a living document. C. Hite asked about resource requests and wondered if they would have to be focused on only the core aspects. E.

Mason shared that the planning process and requests are finally catching up to the requests made. L. Lee shared that this is a 5-year cycle and does not have a comprehensive report at the end. P. Murphy shared that through the integration of SPOL, the process of resource requests is streamlined. A. Restrepo stated that, in theory, it sounds like an improvement and asked if it were piloted over the summer. A report would need to be given to Senate, followed by a Senate recommendation.

P. Murphy shared that several service and academic faculty, AP&P reps, and Senate Exec were represented at the meetings and were involved in the design of this process. He explained how the proposal allows more time for a focused inquiry, with authentic dialog within a department. He noted that the new method is unique and believes it meets accreditation standards. We are still compelled to reflect on the data and engage in a continuous improvement cycle. Also, there is a direct connection to the Mission and Integrated Planning. The upside to the summer pilot is that it concludes, will be reported on through our shared governance processes.

COUNCIL/COMMITTEE REPORTS [15]

12. AP&P, Facilities, HR

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

L. Manalo said AP&P they are working on the final draft for Health Services program vitality review.

T. Aye Facilities Council reported that the 5-year construction plan priorities were sent via email to faculty. If you have any questions, please email him.

T. Roepke stated that they are bringing the request for participation by PT faculty in elections for Department Chairs; and the Telecommuting BP; and BP on Recruitment and Hiring to Senate in Fall 2021

* documents on Senate Sharepoint