

ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE

Academic Senate Meeting

Minutes for Tuesday, April 14, 2026

4:00 – 6:00 pm

Room F-225 (Fine Arts Building)

*[See last page of the minutes for details on *, **, ***, Δ]*

Academic Senate Executive Committee (ASE):

President: Alberto Restrepo (AR) Vice President: Ana Gómez de Torres (AGT)
Secretary: Héctor Álvarez (HA) Member-at-Large: Fred Patrick (FP)
Member-at-Large: Thesa Roepke (TR)

Senators-Voting Members (P: Present / A: Absent):

Héctor Álvarez (P), Diane Auten (P), Ben Britten (P), Bob Bryant (A), Rajni Chaudhari (P), David DeGroot (P), Alicia Fox (P), Yvon Frazier (P), Amy Gisclon (P), Ana Gómez de Torres (P), Sean Gottlieb (P), Melanie Guido Brunét (P), Mark Hammill (A), Chris Hite (A), Anna Kopcrak (P), Martin Landeros (P), Gabriel Marquez (P), Shavaun Maxon (A), Anne McMeeking (A), Fred Patrick (P), Carissa Perales (P), Chuck Provencio (P), Alberto Restrepo ((P): votes only to break a tie), Alina Romo (A), Thesa Roepke (A), Monique Sequra (P), Danya Serrano (P), Kiri Villa (P), Liz West (P)

Senators-Voting Members Present Remote (Zoom Participants) ***:

Chris Carroll (Just Cause), Chris Sprecher (Just Cause)

Student Representative:

Faith Davis, ASBG, Director Academic Affairs (P)

Guests:

James Coon (Coordinator, OER/ZTC Grant), Martha Hull (Faculty, Health Sciences), Monica Millard (Dean, AA, Fine Arts, Social & Behavioral Sciences); Trevor Passage (Faculty, Librarian/English) Deborah Pirman (Dean, Ext. Campus); Julia Sokolovska (Director, LVC & Extended Campus), Jessica Solorio (PT Faculty, English), Wendy Sutter (Faculty, Mathematical Sciences),

Guests: Remote (Zoom) Participants:

Suzie Kopeky (Faculty, Librarian/English), Tessa Ladwig (CCAP Instructor, Math Department), Christine Reed (Counselor/Coordinator, MESA/STEM Academic Success Center)

CCPD Council Co-Chairs Present (P: Present / NP: Not Present):

Student Learning Council: (P-Remote): Julia Raybould-Rodgers (Faculty, English Dept.) & (P): Bob Curry (Asst. Supt./VP Academic Affairs)

Student Services Council: (NP): Maria Arvizu-Rodriguez (Faculty, Counseling Dept./Univ. Transfer Ctr.) & (P): Genevieve Siwabessy (Asst. Supt./VP Student Services)

Human Resources Council: (NP): Thesa Roepke (Faculty, Applied Behavioral Sciences Dept.) & (P): Ruben Ramirez (Exec. Director, Human Resources)

Institutional Effectiveness Council: (P): Fred Patrick (Faculty, Distance Education Specialist-Academic Student Services Dept.) & (P): Craig Bach (Exec. Director Institutional Effectiveness)

Technology Council: (P): Alberto Restrepo (Faculty, Social & Behavioral Sciences Dept.) & (P): Andy Specht (Exec. Director, IT)

Budget Council: (NP): G. Bierly (Faculty, Social & Behavioral Sciences Dept.) & (NP): Dennis Curran (Assoc. Supt./VP Finance and Admin)

Facilities Council: (NP): Tyson Aye (Faculty, Kinesiology, Recreation, Athletics) & (NP): Dennis Curran (Assoc. Supt./VP Finance and Admin)

Senate Committee's Co-Chairs Present (P: Present / NP: Not Present):

Academic Policy & Planning (NP): Larry Manalo (Faculty, Health Sciences) & (P): David DeGroot (Faculty, Articulation (AP&P) Committee: Officer, Academic Student Services Dept.)

Professional Standards Committee: (NP): Carmen Montanez (Faculty, Business Dept/CBIS), (P): David Degroot, (P): Liz West & Bob Curry

Professional Development Committee (P): Diane Auten

ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA

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

President AR called the meeting called to order at 4:03 pm

2. Roll Call:

Present at time of roll call (23): D. DeGroot, Y. Frazier, C. Provencio, K. Villa, C. Perales, B. Britten, C. Carroll (Remote-Zoom), M. Guido Brunét, A. Gisclon, G. Marquez, D. Auten, A. Fox, S. Gottlieb, A. Kopcrak, M. Landeros, L. West, C. Sprecher (Remote-Zoom), M. Segura, D. Serrano, A. Restrepo, A. Gómez de Torres, F. Patrick, H. Álvarez

Absent at time of roll call: C. Hite, A. McMeeking, B. Bryant, A. Romo, S. Maxson, R. Chaudhari M. Hammill, A. Romo, T. Roepke

AR: Quorum established

3. Approval of Minutes: 3/10/2026 [5] * (HA)

Motion to approve the minutes of 3/10/26 is made by M. Guido Brunét/seconded by A. Fox

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: 3/10/2026 minutes are approved by consensus

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

James Coon (JC) introduced himself as the OER/ZCT grant coordinator. He acknowledged the collaboration with Liz West, Susie Kopecky, and also Ana Gomez de Torres' assistance with the ASCCC toward coordinating the upcoming summit/workshop. Collaboration has been ongoing between Allan Hancock College's Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) Program with *Libre Texts* and the ASCCC-OER to host an 'everything OER' comprehensive workshop at AHC on August 14th. This PD opportunity is intended for faculty interested in 'discovering, adopting, remixing, authoring, and integrating EOR into their courses'. Breakfast and lunch will be provided. The event is free for AHC faculty and registration is required. Senators were provided with a LIBRETEXTS WORKSHOP flyer to promote the OER event that will be held on campus on August 14, 2026, from 8:30 am to 3:30 pm.

Faith Davis ((FD) ASGB Student Senate Rep.) reminded everyone of the Rapid Response training that will take place on campus on Friday, April 17th from 5-8 pm. She encouraged everyone to attend.

Monique Segura (PT Faculty and member of PFA): on behalf of the PFA Executive team she thanked Fred Patrick (ASE) for meeting with PT faculty.

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

AR mentioned the ASCC Plenary adding that F. Patrick and D. DeGroot also attended. They will give an update later in the meeting.

He also stated that at the next Senate meeting time will be allocated to share with faculty the results of the FT Faculty Evaluation Process. Work has been ongoing on this for over a year.

CONSENT

6. **Constituency Change in Faculty Hiring Committee. [5] (S. Kopecky (SK)/ASE)**

Increasing faculty membership from three to three-to-five.

AR mentioned this is a non-controversial item, yet he reminded senators that any item on Consent can still be pulled from the Consent Agenda per any senator's request. He also added that the Faculty Hiring Committee (FHC) is a standing committee of the Senate and in its charter lists three members. The members suggested to ASE that they would like to expand membership from 3 to 5 faculty.

SK presented that the FHC would like to expand to up to 5 faculty, feels it would enrich the process and would like the membership to be up to five members.

Motion to approve made by A. Kopcrak (AK)/seconded by B. Britten (BB)

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: Consent Item is Approved

A motion to move and change Agenda Item 17: Faculty Hiring Committee Report to follow Item 6 and become Item 7 made by AK/seconded by M. Guido Brunét (MGB)

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR motion to move and change Agenda Item 17: Faculty Hiring Committee Report to follow Item 6 and become Item 7 carries.

Δ 7. **Faculty Hiring Committee. (S. Kopecky (SK)) [5].**

SK mentioned the Faculty Hiring Committee (FHC) have been having extra meetings to update the DRS Toolkit (it was last updated in 2016). They are looking at the final draft and expect to share the final draft with ASE. Once ASE reviews it the DRS toolkit will be shared with current DRS faculty and the FHC wants to expand training sessions to grow the DRS pool.

AR thanked SK and the work undertaken by the FHC.

ACTION ITEMS

8. **BP/AP 4225 Course Repetition. * [5] (J. Raybould-Rodgers (JRR) / B. Curry (BC))**

AR reminded everyone that while BPs and APs are return for Action, each is looked at separately.

Discussion, BP 4225:

A. Kopcrak (AK) offered feedback (from W. Sutter from the math department) suggesting a friendly amendment/edit to the BP. AK directed attention to the 2nd paragraph and the intended spelling of "insuring". She suggested it should be changed to "ensuring" based on intended definition/intent of the sentence and paragraph.

BC agreed, stating the BP will include the edit to change the spelling.

Motion to approve BP 4225 with the edit to change spelling to *ensuring* made by AK/seconded by A. Fox (AF)

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: motion to approve BP 4225 with friendly amendment carries

Discussion, AP 4225:

BC referenced edits in the document (as is projected on the screen), mentioned most of the revisions were done by B. Britten and Counseling. BB mentioned redundancies in AP were deleted.

Motion to approve AP 4225 made by AK/seconded by D. Serrano (DS)

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: motion to approve AP 4225 Course Repetition carries, the AP is approved

9. BP/AP 4920 Textbook Selection. * [5] (J. Raybould-Rodgers (JRR)/B. Curry (BC))

Discussion, BP 4920

BC reminded everyone that per legislation, all CCCs have been reminded to ensure policies are updated so students have access to textbooks and supplemental materials on the first day of class. Colleges must demonstrate a goal of aspiring to meet legislative mandates. The BP did not change. The AP has changed and language was incorporated to reflect requirements per legislation.

Motion to approve BP 4920 made by AK/seconded by DS

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: BP 4920 is approved by consensus

Discussion, AP 4920:

AK asked if consideration was given to include OER materials as the AP references textbooks published within the last five years.

BC mentioned that was discussed by the Student Learning Council and the decision was reached to leave "textbooks and supplemental materials" as noted in the AP to show the aspiration goal to ensure students have access to textbooks and supplemental materials and resources on the first day of class. The goal is to minimize financial impact or burden on students.

MGB shared concern raised by reading professors regarding language in the AP that appears to encourage the sole use of digital media or resources over tangible books. She noted the wording in the 4th paragraph and the push toward digital media rather than traditional printed, tangible texts.

T. Passage asked if OER is defined as needing to be 'online only', and added that if so, OER materials can be printed if needed.

BC clarified with language from the AP and references were drawn directly from legislation, adding that OER is not only online. Regulations encourage student-centered practices supporting zero textbook cost (ZTC) instructional materials and the goal is to adopt OER and materials where commonly available.

Discussion concluded with acknowledgement that legislative language consistently references OER and ZTC practices, while faculty concerns remained about balancing digital resources with tangible/traditional texts or other recourses for students as not all students prefer digital resources. Minimizing financial impact to students is considered as important to keep in mind.

Motion to approve AP 4920 made by AK/seconded by DS

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: AP 4920 is approved

10. AP 5012 International Students. * [5] (M. Arvizu Rodriguez (MAR)/G. Siwabessy (GS))

Discussion, AP 5012:

GS reminded everyone that the AP is undergoing a standard 5-year review. She acknowledged a question received from the Social and Behavioral Science Dept. whether vaccinations are required for both domestic students and international students at the college. She clarified that vaccine verification is not done by this college. For international students (IS), they must meet other strict criteria for eligibility for visas required for study in the US. The primary visa is the F-1, there is another visa (M-1) for vocational/non-academic studies. Other institutions (e.g. UCs) can require vaccination verification. IS can only enroll in credit courses and need to in 12 units, IS students must demonstrate a certain level of English proficiency.

F. Davis (FD) brought forth a question from discussions with student groups and asked if the unit requirement can be 6 units. GS replied that colleges do not determine unit requirements, the USCIS determines unit requirements as well as other requirements for IS to study in the US.

Motion to approve made by BB/seconded by AK

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: AP 5012 is approved

11. BP/AP 5530 Student Rights and Grievances. * [5] (M. Arvizu Rodriguez (MAR)/G. Siwabessy (GS))

Discussion, BP 5530:

GS: both the BP and the AP are undergoing standard, 5-year reviews. Since the last Senate meeting, no additional feedback has been received. The BP had no significant changes other than formatting.

Motion to approve made by BB/seconded by AK

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: BP 5530 is approved

Discussion, AP 5530:

GS mention that no feedback or questions were received since item came as Information at the last Senate meeting.

Motion to approve made by BB/seconded by AK

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: AP 5530 is approved

12. AO Resolution. * [10] (B. Britten (BB)/D. DeGroot (DD)/ASE)

Discussion, AO Resolution:

AR mentioned the resolution was presented at the last meeting, he asked for feedback/questions.

D. Auten asked if the AO position will be open to anyone, as she heard rumors that Counseling Faculty were targeted, and wanted to know when the position be opened.

BC replied the position will be open to everyone and it is not restricted only Counseling, and that it will open shortly.

D. DeGroot (DD) added it would be ideal to have the position filled before July 1st.

Motion to approve AO Resolution is made by BB/seconded by AK

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: AO Resolution is approved and will be posted on the Academic Senate Website

INFORMATION (FOR FUTURE ACTION/APPROVAL)

13. AI Senate Resolution. [5] (T. Passage (TP))

AR welcomed TP and mentioned he was the previous Academic Senate President.

TP mentioned he is the Chair of the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC). AIC decided not to pursue creating a BP or AP on AI and instruction, and instead, create a resolution and bring it to Senate for consideration and feedback. He thanked the members of AIC for their work.

A. Fox (AF) asked when the AIC got reinstated/re-formed as she served on the AIC in the past and was aware that a chair for the committee was being sought.

TP mentioned he emailed ASE asking if the Seante had worked on anything pertaining to AI and instruction. ASE asked him if he wanted to chair the AIC so the committee could lead the pursuit of AI matters and other matters tasked to the AIC.

AR mentioned that there have been calls in the past for someone to chair the AIC, and no one had come forward. AF agreed but asked if the AIC has been meeting and when did it start meeting. TP mentioned that AIC has met once and at that meeting the decision was made to move forward with the resolution.

AK asked if AIC intends to pursue something like what is taking place at Cuesta College where the Senate has provided faculty three prepared statements on AI. She added that faculty there are required to pick 1 of the 3 statements to incorporate into course syllabi.

TP: The AIC is not pursuing that approach; he added that the ASCCC has a paper on best practices that also include syllabi statement examples for faculty to consider. He later agreed to send senators the paper, or that it be added to the Senate SharePoint.

AR mentioned that Academic Senates do not have power to require faculty to use prescriptive language in their syllabi. AK question why PLOs are required on syllabi to which AR replied that PLOs are part of accreditation/regulatory standards. He added that anything that is outside of regulation and accreditation falls under Academic Freedom, and the faculty syllabus is the faculty's purview.

D. Auten described uncertainty among faculty about how to respond when students use AI unethically. What options are there when, for example, cheating with AI takes place, beyond giving zeros on assignments. She is aware that faculty are wondering if students can receive an F grade in the course. Further, she asked what happens when students challenge faculty accusations of AI-use and zeros are given on assignments, especially given the difficulty of proving AI-use or misuse.

TP explained that faculty can issue zeros on assignments but cannot simply fail or expel a student from the course as a result. He added that last year the Senate reviewed and approved the Academic Integrity Policy and no changes were proposed to that policy around AI-use or misuse.

AR clarified distinctions between faculty authority, academic freedom, and institutional processes. He emphasized that faculty are authorized to manage grading and classroom consequences but cannot unilaterally remove students from courses (in agreement with TP's statement) or impose disciplinary actions or sanctions as that would be beyond their instructional role/purview. He added that once matters escalate into formal disciplinary processes, everything shifts into administrative channels and established policies and procedures. AR also reminded the Senate that previous reviews during prior Senate meetings, student conduct and academic integrity policies were considered to treat AI-assisted cheating as form of cheating or plagiarism as written in the BPs/APs, and that the Senate had previously chosen not to create a separate AI-specific policy or misconduct language around AI.

BC added that such disputes would go through the college's established grievance process. He added if resolution is not reached with the instructor, students could then go to the department chair, if not resolved with the department chair, students can then meet with the dean. If the resolution is not made at the dean level, it can eventually escalate, although rare, to involve the VPSS and the more formal process for academic grievance and then the Grievance Officer gets involved.

GS added that the Grievance Officer advises students of the formal grievance process and students are made aware of their rights and responsibilities under the procedure and if the student wishes to pursue it would involve a formal hearing.

BC stressed that faculty retain broad grading authority and to rely on their professional judgment when evaluating whether work appears to be authentic. Instructors can question students about their understanding and if students cannot demonstrate ownership of the work, faculty should grade accordingly. BC stressed that faculty are the final authority on grade determination.

GS encouraged faculty to include AI expectations into their syllabi as these statements/standards provide strong support if students later challenge penalties.

Discussion also centered on "fraudulent students" in online courses. DA asked if faculty are still encouraged to contact students twice and if students fail to respond, can they then be dropped? DA, along with other faculty, want to be clear about what to do as a result fraudulent/ghost students and AI bots in DL courses as this

continues to be a concern across the country. She added that after not hearing from the students she contacts Admissions and Records for guidance.

BC responded that every intent should be made to contact students and if students fail to engage or respond at all, instructors are likely within their right to drop students for non-participation.

GS encouraged faculty to contact A&R and mentioned that resources about fraud are available for faculty on the A&R website, she noted there are faculty recommendations on the A&R site.

F. Davis (FD) provided student feedback and their growing concern about being falsely accused of using AI and unfairly receiving zeros on assignments, despite producing original work. She emphasized that AI detection software is often inaccurate and added that the institution must continuously reevaluate how it approaches AI and academic integrity.

L. West suggested reframing the discussion to 'AI Learning' and AI-use for idea generation that encourages learning.

F. Patrick alerted Senate time expired for discussion on the item.

Motion to extend discussion 5 minutes is made by AK/seconded by AF

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: motion to extend discussion 5 minutes carries

Discussion continued regarding concerns about the implications of the language in the resolution and unexpected consequences for faculty due to the mention of 'faculty will' in the 'be it resolved' sections.

C. Reed suggested to TP that the PSC run the resolution by the FA and PFA.

TP asked if a resolution is binding in any way? He and the PSC thought a resolution was not binding. If so, he can strike 'will' from the resolution.

CR added that even if resolutions are not binding, that does not mean they can't be weaponized.

Suggestions were made from the floor to consider the use of "urge" or "faculty are urged" over "faculty must".

H. Alvarez (HA) acknowledged the previous positions and statements, especially those made by DA, FD, and LW. He encouraged faculty to consider expanding their perspectives on AI-use beyond that 'it's simply or only used for cheating/content generation' and instead consider AI-use for teaching and student learning. He added that faculty at other colleges across the state are developing workshops for students that are centered around the ethical uses of AI within various academic areas/disciplines. HA urged faculty to consider doing something similar at AHC. He argued that the student experience be central, especially if AI policies get developed and are vastly different across disciplines that can result in confusion, and the possibility of increase in disputes as student's encounter contradictory positions from/in different academic areas/course related to AI-use or what constitutes misuse. He stressed, from a counseling and student learning and development perspective, that faculty have an opportunity to encourage student learning and development so students are encouraged to expand their critical thinking and reasoning skills, and increase their development of responsible decision-making skills, while learning how to evaluate bias thereby strengthening their cognitive and metacognitive skills such through evaluation, analysis and ethical reasoning. He reiterated the promise of discipline-specific conversations and development of workshops and conversations about how AI can support learning and development.

FD mentioned an upcoming AI-related event occurring on campus.

Many in attendance asked about the event and stated there was also a second event occurring. One event was mentioned as being sponsored by the Chancellor's Office and is intended for faculty, the other event sponsorship was uncertain but appeared open to the campus and the local community at large.

BB pointed out that the existence of multiple events like this reflects the fragmentation that HA described.

MGB mentioned the importance of acknowledging the growing skepticism toward the adoption of AI altogether. She added that many in her department, and most likely in other departments, are not interested in encouraging students to use AI, and the issue is increasingly polarizing.

FD suggested that faculty resistant to AI use should still have conversations with students and ask why students feel compelled to use AI, and that such conversations can no doubt reveal instructional gaps and blind spots and hopefully will produce better resources or opportunities for student learning. She added this is important to students and encouraged faculty to speak with students.

A. Specht said ITS is open to support and partner with faculty interested in exploring not only AI but also technology use in instruction and how to incorporate it into the classroom or other modalities. He encouraged faculty to reach out to him or participate in the Technology Council.

AR mentioned that time is up, he acknowledged the resolution contained valuable ideas and should not be ignored, even if revisions are needed.

TP added that when the resolution returns for action, the Senate can amend, table, or reject the proposal and expressed hope that meaningful guidance would emerge from the process.

REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

13. LVC Presentation and Directional Statement. [10] (D. Pirman)

DP presented a proposed directional statement and vision for the Lompoc Valley Center (LVC) focused on creating a clearer identity and a long-term, data driven informed strategy to better serve the Lompoc community. The goal is to improve the LVC's impact by defining its purpose, aligning programs and services with actual community needs, and using that direction as a "North Star" for future decision making for the LVC. The goal is to serve the Lompoc community better and respond to its unique needs. Data has been gathered from students and focus groups, and from the local community.

She noted the LVC's struggle with stagnant enrollment and limited success in prior efforts (such as attempts to increase degree pathways and increase degree completion rates at the LVC). Key lessons learned: the Lompoc community is fundamentally different from the Santa Maria service area and should not be treated as a smaller version of the Santa Maria campus. Data collected, through surveys, shows an aging population, declining numbers of traditional students, shrinking agriculture and local government sector jobs, and growth in hospitality, manufacturing and professional services. She also highlighted transportation barriers, limited family friendly activities, while emphasizing community strengths such as entrepreneurship and a strong arts and food culture in Lompoc, and the proximity to the growing space industry, and the relative affordability of the area.

She emphasized the LVC's unique strengths, including its close-knit, student-centered environment and ability to easily reach out to the LVC's student services programs like Counseling, the Library, and Admissions and Records to assist students. Mention of the LVC's newer infrastructure, available land for expansion (compared to the Santa Maria campus), and the Early Childhood Studies Lab School, the Public Safety Training Center was highlighted. She added that these services and programs demonstrate that students will come to the LVC for its distinctive, high-quality offerings and programs.

A proposed draft directional statement was shared, centering on providing accessible academic and workforce programs intentionally designed for non-traditional, working, and adult learners seeking improved social and economic outcomes. She added that the needs of 'traditional students' are not overlooked; however, it was stressed that there is potential in adult learners that in the past have been overlooked. She stressed that the LVC should embrace its role as a commuter campus and better support adult learners rather than viewing them as secondary to traditional students. Success would be measured by stronger enrollment, community recognition, and a student population reflective of the local community.

DP requested faculty feedback on the directional statement draft and expressed interest in potentially bringing it back for Academic Senate adoption by way of a resolution as a strategic planning tool. The survey and a more comprehensive report were made available for further review and feedback and it can be found on the Senate's SharePoint.

LW thanks her for championing Lompoc and the LVC, other senators agreed and added the tremendous potential and the beauty of the LVC.

15. Equivalency for Faculty Positions. [5] (D. DeGroot (DD))

DD explained that discussions have taken place for over a year. The PSC has removed the previously controversial "Part D" option which had allowed disciplines to opt in or out. He noted his personal concerns that Part D created a "slippery slope" and supported replacing it with clearer language modeled after practices that

currently occur at other colleges: candidates without a master's degree in the discipline would need a bachelor's degree plus 30 graduate semester units in the discipline, effectively equivalent to a master's degree. He also acknowledged the recent research done by W. Sutter that informed what is now being proposed.

LW highlighted specific revisions to Part B clarifying what is meant by a "related discipline" and what is meant by "as specified by the discipline." She read aloud the changes after comments from the floor expressed that the handwritten text in red ink that appears on the draft was not easy to read/confusing. LW read: 'Master's degree in a related discipline, as specified by the discipline, plus two years of professional industry experience, related to the discipline of the assignment or two years of successful experience, teaching a range of courses in the discipline of the assignment.'

DD emphasized that discipline faculty, not the Professional Standards Committee, should determine what qualifies as a related discipline, since discipline faculty are the content/discipline experts.

BC clarified that, in practice, departments already vet these issues during the hiring processes, but the language changes would make expectations more explicit, especially in CCAP situations where candidates are not hired through traditional departmental processes. The employment authorization form was referenced and suggestion to be developed as a parallel form.

FP mentioned time was up for discussion.

Motion to extend discussion 5 minutes made by LW/seconded by A. Romo (AAR)

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: motion to extend discussion 5 minutes carries

AR posed a question around Item B and asked for clarification about what two years of industry experience means, especially for disciplines like his (sociology) where industry experience does not necessarily apply. He suggested edits to read 'professional and industry experience' and asked if that would help. LW was agreed to the suggestion.

AAR raised concerns from the English department about vague terminology, particularly around who defines 'professional experience' and what constitutes 'teaching at a college and university level'. She stressed for clarification on what is considered as 'professional experience'. Her department also has questions and concerns whether teaching AP or dual-enrollment courses at the high school level is being counted or considered as equivalent 'to college-level teaching experience'. She argued that teaching AP or college courses in high school settings should not automatically qualify someone as equivalent to holding a master's degree in the discipline or having college or university-level teaching experience and recommended making the language more specific regarding what constitutes college-level teaching experience.

LW asked if revising the language to specify 'teaching at a college, university, or institution of higher education' would satisfy concerns from the English department. AAR replied that being as clear as possible helps.

DD noted that many colleges treat AP courses as college-level credit for equivalency purposes.

D. Perman (DP) mentioned that from conversations she has had with high schools it has been made clear to her that teaching AP differs from true college instruction because AP courses still rely only standardized exams as a safeguard, whereas college courses rely on the expertise of the college faculty to teach the content and have rigorous enough and varied assessments to meet the COR's intent. She argued that treating AP as being equivalent to a college course is indeed debatable.

MGB and AAR noted that these differing interpretations demonstrate why clearer, more specific language was needed, and this is important to English faculty, and perhaps other faculty and departments as well.

DP added that in her understanding of word 'discipline' as it's used in the legislation is defined in relation to the California Community College Chancellor's Office discipline listings. BC agreed.

AAR added that AHC has and continues to receive requests from people with a master's degree outside of the discipline who say they have taught AP English for X-number of years in the high school, and ultimately have been approved to teach ENGL C1000, and this is concerning to her department. BC agreed it has happened.

BB questioned if Option A (as it reads) would or could be used to cover such requests that AAR described, that is, anyone with a bachelor's degree can claim to have 18 units of upper division coursework and holding a master's degree outside of the discipline would allow them to use Option A.

Several senators commented that in that circumstance, some seeking equivalency then would or could not yet have any professional experience and Option A would be an option for them be considered to teach. The need for clarification was echoed.

WS expressed frustration that the issue had been under discussion for over a year, and it seems that although progress has been made there is still no consensus and Action has not yet occurred. She asked if the proposal included the words 'teaching a range of college courses' would address AAR's concerns brought from the English department. WS also noted that many nearby colleges already use Option B (as shown in the proposal). WS reiterated support for fully eliminating Part D, a position also shared by other departments, but understands eliminating it can impact other departments and programs. She also asked for clarity when the item will be Action as it seems the proposal has been in perpetual discussion at the Senate.

BC recommended that senators consult with their department chairs because at the Chairs Meeting several chairs raised concerns with the proposal, and to do so before the proposal returns for action (as this will ensure that department-specific concerns can be formally raised and addressed).

The Senate agreed that the proposal would return at the next Senate meeting as Information for discussion, and that the PSC needs to bring a cleaner, revised version with suggestions/recommendations given in order for action/a vote to occur at the final meeting of the semester (May 12th). It was stressed that these tasks are not WS's responsibility (i.e. to prepare or edit the proposal), the responsibility falls on the PSC.

16. ASCCC 2026 Spring Plenary Report. [10] (D. DeGroot (DD)/FP/AR)

An update on what took place at the ASCCC 2026 Spring plenary was given. The first two days are meetings and sessions. It was mentioned that Saturday is dedicated to voting and is considered as the most exhausting day by many who attend plenaries due to the reading/deliberation of numerous resolutions and the voting on each of those resolutions.

Three big takeaways were shared about Plenaries: 1.): the learning experiences gained through attending sessions, 2nd.): The democratic process of being able to represent your college at the sessions and particularly at the Saturday voting on resolutions, and 3.): the networking, the ability to meet people, create new contacts, and learn about what is happening at other colleges.

AR noted that AI was a huge topic of discussion, especially the conversation at the state level to move away from simply viewing AI within the scope of academic integrity to the equitable use of AI. This was argued due to workforce needs/demands and expectations that college students know how to use and apply AI to the specific task(s) required in the workplace/industry. Many colleges and universities are already preparing students to use AI, and we don't want to have our students fall behind.

Another big topic is strengthening pathways in two areas: the NC to CR transition, and the other is reimagining STEM as STEAM (as this affirms that art history and studio arts are also vital components of science and technology education).

OER also remains big, as so is Faculty Governance and Leadership, and Universal Design.

Regarding Resolutions: there is strong push-back against Administrative, top-down mandates, the implementation of Cal-GETC and Common Course Numbering, asserting control over the AI-frontier, STEAM, and modernizing local Senate operations.

AR added that each year, before plenaries, departments and programs are asked to look at the proposed statewide resolutions to give AHC Plenary attendees direction on how to respond to resolutions and inform deliberations and voting on Saturday. He mentioned that typically ASE and plenary attendees do not get department feedback but this year the Math department offered feedback on two resolutions, and he thanked them. He added that they (AR, DD, FD) met at length the night before to strategize how to present the math department's con position at the Con-Mic the next day. They concluded that DD would present the math department's position at the con-mic, due to DD's influence and state-wide reputation. However, AR added that at the previous day's meetings it had become clear of the overwhelming positive support for the resolution, as

many faculty statewide view it as an opportunity for PD. The resolution had resounding positive votes, and it passed with the highest votes, 93-7 in favor.

AK gave context on the resolution that AR alluded to. The proposed resolution was to build a taskforce that would build PD for math instructors to address the diversity of math needs in classrooms and the lack of success of pass rates exclusively. It was not to build on any other success metrics or other possible solutions, thus the math department's request to vote no on this resolution as they felt it was limited due to it focusing exclusively on pass rates and not on other important factors such as student knowledge or understanding.

AR reported on the statewide Academic Senate resolution related to revising the minimum qualifications in mathematics. The proposal, supported by the math department, sought to revise minimum qualifications related to master's degrees in mathematics education, but it failed with approximately 35% support and 65% opposition. AR noted that many opponents represented small rural colleges like AHC.

LW clarified that the proposal was not intended to eliminate mathematics education degrees, but rather to strengthen qualification requirements.

AR shared that one significant argument against the resolution involved concerns about gender equity.

FP noted time expired on discussion.

A motion to extend discussion 5 minutes made by DD/seconded by S. Gottlieb

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: motion to extend discussion 5 minutes passes.

AR continued explaining the gender equity concern adding that delegates noted that master's degrees in mathematics are earned predominantly by men (over 60%), while master's degrees in mathematics education are earned largely by women (over 60%), leading some to argue that removing or limiting the math education pathway could create unintended gender bias in the field. This was interpreted as very significant by many in attendance.

DD added that supporters of retaining mathematics education qualifications emphasized the value of pedagogical preparation and teaching strategies embedded in those degrees.

DD also summarized curriculum-related plenary discussions, particularly around Course Identification Numbering (CID), Common Course Numbering, and transfer templates. DD explained that Phase 3 templates are complete but are being held at the Chancellor's Office pending assurances from the CSU and UC systems that they will be accepted and workable for transfer. DD expressed skepticism about achieving universal UC/CSU agreement on the templates.

DD also discussed conversations about incorporating IDEA/DEIA concepts into Course Outlines of Record. A colleague demonstrated an AI-based Chancellor's Office tool that analyzes CORs and suggests ways to integrate IDEA concepts, which DD described as useful and worth sharing with AP&P.

FP reported on several plenary sessions focused on AI and technology literacy. He noted that resolutions were passed encouraging increased technology and AI literacy, though implementation details remain unclear. A major topic of concern was "agentic AI," meaning AI systems capable of independently performing tasks rather than simply providing feedback. FP warned that emerging AI tools may allow students to complete Canvas courses autonomously and this raised concerns, he added that if that is possible for students it can also be possible for faculty to potentially use similar tools as well, creating implications for regular and substantive interaction requirements and instructional integrity.

CCPD COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES' REPORTS (NON-ACTION ITEMS) [3 min each unless otherwise indicated.]

16. Human Resources Council. (TR/R. Ramirez (RR)).

AR thanked RR for sitting through the entire Senate meeting. AR also noted that TR cannot be present and that C. Reed (a member of HR Council) and RR will provide the report.

CR stated that she has prepared statement prepared by TR. CR reported that HR Council has been heavily focused on reviewing board policies and administrative procedures, including revisions to AP 7921 regarding full-time faculty recruitment and hiring, stating its under five-year review. She explained that over winter break, she,

TR, and J. Blue (JB) worked together to revise the AP due to formatting inconsistencies and confusion created during the transition from the original language in AP 7120.

CR summarized several major revisions and recommendations, including:

- Streamlining the organization and formatting of the AP;
- Removing outdated language now covered under broader hiring policies;
- Incorporating equitable hiring language consistent with current practices;
- Clarifying job announcements, advertising, and application procedures for full-time faculty hiring;
- Revising minimum qualifications and screening language to align with current policy;
- Clarifying committee membership, composition, and confidentiality expectations;
- Adding language regarding DRS training and responsibilities; and
- Clarifying recommendations related to final interviews.

CR stated that the revised AP is currently under review by Cabinet, and, once approved there, it will be distributed to all full-time faculty for feedback before returning to HR Council for finalization prior to it coming to Senate. Faculty were encouraged to watch for the upcoming document and to provide input, faculty can expect it be emailed by TR.

RR praised the extensive work completed by TR, CR, and JB, explaining that when AP 7120 was separated into distinct hiring policies for different employee groups in 2022, much of the original faculty language had simply been copied over. RR noted that the new revisions significantly improved and tailored the policy specifically for faculty hiring while preserving Academic Senate purview over faculty hiring matters.

RR added that Cabinet had already reviewed the draft and has proposed only minor revisions for HR Council to consider before it is finalized. The proposal is expected to return to the Senate for both information and action in future meetings. RR concluded that HR Council continues to work extensively on policies and procedures, many of which do not come before the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES' REPORTS (NON-ACTION ITEMS) [5 min each unless otherwise indicated.]

Δ 17. Faculty Hiring Committee. (S. Kopecky)

By way of a motion earlier in the meeting, the numbering for this item changed as it was moved to follow Agenda Item #6.

17. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND DEPARTMENT SUGGESTIONS

None

18. ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: March 28, 2026.

Agenda Items due by April 21, 2026 @ noon.

* *Documents available on Senate SharePoint*

** *Documents available in previous Senate meeting's on SharePoint Folder*

*** *If a Senator is requesting remote participation due to "just cause" or "emergency circumstances" (per AB 2449) they must submit a request form prior to the meeting and use the Zoom link below.*

Remote participation for "just cause" is limited to two (2) meetings in a calendar year.

Remote participation due to "emergency circumstances" is limited to 20% of the regular Academic Senate meetings in a calendar year (which is equivalent to three meetings for AHC's Academic Senate) and requires approval by the body at the beginning of the meeting (which means it is not guaranteed).

If any Senators are participating remotely, this link will also be available to the public for viewing or making public comments. If no Senators are joining remotely, the meeting will be open to the public only at the designated physical location that is listed at the top of the agenda.

Senator's Remote Participation Link:

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

Δ Denotes a change in the order of Agenda Items by way of an approved motion

2025-2026 Academic Senators (Department Faculty Representatives):

Academic Student Services:

Dave DeGroot

**Counseling-Personal
Development:**

Ben Britten, Carissa Perales, Kiri Villa

Health Sciences

Amy Gisclon, Shavaun Maxson

Languages & Communications:

Diane Auten

Public Safety:

Marc Hammill or Leonard Champion

Applied Social Sciences:

Yvon Frazier

English:

Melanie Guido Brunét, Chris Carrol,
Alina Romo

Industrial Technology

Gabriel Marquez

Life & Physical Sciences:

Alicia Fox, Sean Gottlieb

Social & Behavioral Sciences

Danya Serrano

Business:

Bob Bryant

Fine Arts

Chris Hite, Anne McMeeking

**Kinesiology, Recreation,
Athletics:**

Chuck Provencio

Mathematical Sciences:

Anna Kopcrak, Martin Landeros,
Liz West

Part-Time Faculty Reps:

Monique Segura, Chris Sprecher,
Rajni Chaudhari