ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE
Academic Senate Meeting

Minutes for Tuesday, April 28, 2026
4:00 – 6:00 pm
Room F-225 (Fine Arts Building)
*[See last page of the minutes for details on *, **, ***]*

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 G. Britten (P), Bob Bryant (P), Chris Carrol (P), David DeGroot (A), Yvon Frazier (P), Alicia Fox (P), Amy Gisclon (P), Ana Gómez de Torres (P), Sean Gottlieb (P), Melanie Guido Brunét (A), Chris Hite (P), Anna Kopcrak (P), Martin Landeros (P), Gabriel Marquez (P), Shavaun Maxon (P), Anne McMeeking (A), Fred Patrick (P), Carissa Perales (P), Chuck Provencio (P), Alberto Restrepo (P: *votes only to break a tie*), Alina Romo (P), Thesa Roepke (P), Monique Segura (P), Danya Serrano (P), Chris Sprecher (P), Kiri Villa (P), Liz West (P)

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

Rajni Chaudhari (Just Cause), Mark Hammill (Just Cause)

Student Representative (P: Present / A: Absent):

Faith Davis, ASBG, Director Academic Affairs (A)

Guests:

Deborah Pirman (DP, Dean, Ext. Campus); Dan McNiel (Faculty, Social & Behavioral Sciences), Monica Millard (Dean, Academic Affairs: Fine Arts, Social & Behavioral Sciences, Trevor Passage (TP, Faculty, Librarian), Christine Reed (CR, Faculty, Counselor/Coordinator, MESA/STEM Academic Succes Center), Ora Shrecengost (Student, ASBG), J. Solorio (Faculty, PT, English), Wendy Sutter (Faculty, Mathematical Sciences)

Guests: Remote (Zoom) Participants:

Lynn Becerra (Faculty, Personal Development/Counseling Dept.)

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

Student Learning Council:	(NP): Julia Raybould-Rodgers (Faculty, English Dept.) & (P): Bob Curry (BC, 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:	(P): Thesa Roepke (Faculty, Applied Behavioral Sciences Dept.) & (NP): 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 (AP&P) Committee:	(P): Larry Manalo (LM, Faculty, Health Sciences) & (NP): David DeGroot (Faculty, Articulation Officer, Academic Student Services Dept.)
Professional Standards Committee:	(NP): David Degroot (DD, Faculty, Articulation Officer), (P): Liz West (LW, Faculty, Mathematical Sciences) & (P) Bob Curry (BC, Asst. Supt./VP Academic Affairs)
Professional Development Committee:	(P): Diane Auten (DA, Faculty, Languages & Communicaitons)

ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA

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

   AR called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm

2. **Roll Call:**

   Present at time of roll call (25): Y. Frazier, C. Provencio, C. Hite, C. Perales, B. Britten, A. Romo, C. Carroll, A. Gisclon, S. Maxson, G. Marquez, D. Auten, A. Fox, S. Gottlieb, A. Kopcrak, M. Landeros, L. West, R. Chaudhari (Remote-Zoom), C. Sprecher, M. Segura, D. Serrano, A. Restrepo, A. Gómez de Torres, F. Patrick, T. Roepke, H. Álvarez

   AR: Quorum met

   M. Hammil (Remote-Zoom) arrived after roll call occurred and participated in remainder of the meeting.

3. **Approval of Minutes from 3/24/2026 [5] * (HA)**

   Motion to approve 3/24/26 minutes made by B. Bryant/seconded by D. Serrano

   Yes: (22): Y. Frazier, C. Provencio, C. Hite, C. Perales, B. Britten, A. Romo, C. Caroll, A. Gisclon, G. Marquez, D. Auten, A. Fox, S. Gottlieb, A. Kopcrak, M. Landeros, L. West, R. Chaudhari, C. Sprecher, M. Segura, D. Serrano, A. Gomez de Torres, F. Patrick, T. Roepke, H. Álvarez

   No: (0)

   Abstain (2): K. Villa, S. Maxon

   AR: motion to approve the 3/24/26 minutes carried by roll call vote: 22-0-2. Minutes are approved.

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

   L. Manalo (LM) discussed a Professional Development (PD) opportunity planned for August 12, 2026. This PD will cover integrating IDEAA+ and Universal Design (UDL) in Course Outlines of Record (COR). The PowerPoint slides referenced will be available on Senate SharePoint. (AR encouraged everyone to reference the file that will be available on Senate SharePoint as it provides more detail).

   LM referenced legislative mandate Title 5 § 55001. He added that Curriculum Committees need to demonstrate a documented procedure (pursuant to section § 55002) that ensures that course outlines of record (CORs) describe approaches that accommodate and engage diverse student bodies, advance equitable student outcomes, and promote inclusion of all students. The documented procedure guarantees accessibility for every student to ensure that individuals with disabilities can equally participate in learning and that CORs reflect UDL strategies. The college's distance education team has been working to ensure that everything in Canvas meets accessibility standards. The role of Open Educational Resources (OER) is not to be overlooked, and LM mentioned consulting with the OER team to ensure the documentation of these resources are in the CORs. LM also mentioned that discipline placements (pursuant to § 53407) are assigned to the course and are now required to be stated in the COR.

M. Segura invited everyone to attend the Ballet Folklórico Invitational Concert that she is directing. She passed out posters. The event will be on May 7-9th at Boyd Concert Hall (Bldg. F). AHC students are participating and six students are choreographing. Local high school (ERHS, PVHS, SMHS) Folklórico groups have been invited to participate. Also, a new group, Ballet Folklórico Corazón de la Costa, will also participate.

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

ASE has been made aware of concerns expressed by faculty from across several departments that department opinions or votes are not represented at the Senate. A friendly reminder to all Senators: that when they vote on an item they are to represent their department's opinions and department vote. It was stressed that Senators are the voice of their departments. Further, AR added that he was invited to speak at the upcoming Department Chairs meeting about ensuring that department votes take place and department opinions/feedback are brought to Senate meetings to inform discussions.

CONSENT

None

ACTION ITEMS

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

AR mentioned this item was brought to Senate as information in a prior meeting, and that TP has made changes to the item based on previous Senate feedback and that a friendly amendment was added based on the remarks/feedback received.

TP presented the amended resolution (based on the input received from the last Senate meeting). He clarified and read the friendly amendment (which is the only change to the item from what was presented before): "Be it further resolved, that faculty are strongly urged to state their AI policy to students". TP added that the committee remains open to any new input and direction from the Senate moving forward.

Discussion:

BBry advocated that course syllabi should have an AI statement, he added his syllabi have had one for over a year. He stressed the importance of analytical and critical thinking, but students have the choice to use or not use AI as tool in his courses.

AR emphasized that such statements can only be recommendations in course syllabi.

Feedback from the floor: that in the further resolve section it should read 'that faculty are strongly urged to state their AI policy to students;'

Question from the floor: Where do Senate Resolutions live or end up for reference?

TR and AR replied that Senate Resolutions are posted on the Academic Senate website, under the Resolutions section. TP mentioned that adopted Senate Resolutions are also read to the Board of Trustees after adoption.

LM suggested an edit for the final be it resolved to read 'the faculty will not endorse a particular AI tool or app even if provided by the district or chancellor's office'.

Discussion centered on the importance of faculty having options/choice, also it was asked if the final be it resolved is needed (especially when considering the language in the first be it resolved).

AR added that it is important to protect faculty choice, so that faculty do not have to use a particular tool or app, and as such, faculty could explore and decide what to use, if they choose to use AI.

Regarding the final be it resolved, TP added it relevant to be inclusive of situations outside of instruction (such as in grading), and it would also be inclusive of Service Faculty use of AI.

BC added the 3rd statement would be good to have, especially as generations of software evolve and may incorporate AI in the software.

Feedback provided so final be it further resolved reads 'that faculty are not compelled to use a particular AI tool or app even if provided by the District or the Chancellor's Office;'

CR suggested to strike the word "early" from the first Whereas. Suggestion given that it reads 'Whereas, AI can be considered a tool, like calculators and computers;'

TP feels this still captures the intent of the committee.

AR commented that the goal of this AI resolution is to protect faculty, and that the suggestions made today are friendly amendments that do not change the intent or direction of the AI resolution as presented.

Motion to approve the AI Senate Resolution with corrections and the friendly amendments stated and agreed to is made by B. Bryant/seconded by A. Fox.

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: hearing no objections or abstentions the motion to approve the AI Senate Resolution carries by unanimous consent. The resolution passes with the minor corrections and friendly amendments suggested and agreed to.

INFORMATION (FOR FUTURE ACTION/APPROVAL)

7. Equivalency for Faculty Positions. * [5] (L. West (LW))

The Professional Standards Committee (PSC) continues to meet and has proposed changes based on feedback received from various disciplines on campus:

- added *ALL* in the title (to be clear that what is proposed is intended for all Faculty positions),
- added *semester* to 1. a): to clarify its 24 <u>semester</u> units of course work),
- added wording to 1. b): to now read: Master's degree in <u>a related </u>discipline, <u>as specified by the discipline faculty</u>, plus two years of professional <u>industry</u> experience related to the discipline of the assignment or two years of successful experience teaching a range <u>of college or university</u> courses in the discipline of the assignment)
- added *as specified by the discipline faculty* to 1. c): (to now read: Completion of the coursework equivalent to a master's degree in the discipline or a related discipline, <u>as specified by the discipline faculty</u>, including at least 24 graduate semester units…)
- PSC is moving to completely strike D.

Discussion:

Questions if the PSC has received feedback in favor of retaining D.

LW issued reminder that she is not the chair of the committee but is aware that some areas are in favor of keeping option D (referenced that B. Curry has also brought attention that some areas/disciplines on campus that would like to retain D). LW added that AHC is the only college that has wording like that found in option D. The PSC would be interesting to know how many times the D option has been used in the past.

Questions on whether the Counseling Department has considered possible impacts on the Counseling Department. BBri replied that the department has begun discussing the item and awaits the changes/input from today to discuss further.

LM argued the PSC to also be inclusive of trimester and quarter units to not exclude any candidates. Also, the suggestion was made to include *a doctorate program* (instead of only listing a Ph.D.) to the section that currently reads when a candidate is enrolled in a Ph.D. program that does not award a Master's Degree.

BBri mentioned that conversion of quarter units to semester may not favor those who earned a Master's degree in a program that offers courses in quarter units (due to the quarter unit conversion into semester unit convention). He provided an example that 4 quarter units is equivalent to 2.67 semester units when converted.

LW asked for clarification if the suggestion is to have it read: 24 semester and or equivalent quarter units.

LM stated trimester should be in there too, as he is aware of some programs that operate in trimesters that are shorter periods than semesters.

HA favored being clear on what are the minimum units required, and asked if the faculty and the PSC have established that 24 semester units is the baseline or considered as the minimum to meet the necessary competencies of a discipline, and if so, then the PSC can consider to be inclusive of quarter and trimester units as suggested and consider the quarter unit equivalent (e.g. 36 quarter units would be equivalent to 24 semester units). If there is consensus then that should be presented at Senate for recommendation.

A motion to extend discussion 5 minutes is made by S. Gottlieb (SG), seconded by A. Kopcrak (AK).

No: (0) / Abstain (0)

AR: hearing no objections or abstentions the motion carries by unanimous consent.

Discussion:

BC provided an answer to the number of times option D has been used: it has been used six times since 2017 (drama, dance, ceramics, art history and two other times related to concurrent enrollment (history and political science).

AR referenced section 1. b) suggested it should read 'professional or industry' not just industry, adding he recalls this recommendation to include professional was made at a previous Senate meeting as its important to CTE programs.

LW acknowledged and referenced AR's suggestion can be part of 1b.

LW raised that the PSC has concern with 18 or 24 semester units as noted in the current version.

Several senators referenced HA's early comment and raised similar concern regarding what number of units are appropriate and asked what disciplines want to have less than 24 semester units.

LW mentioned that in option C it also lists/reads 24 graduate semester units.

D. Pirman (DP) asked for clarification on quarter to semester unit conversion determination. CR and BBri provided explanation on how quarter units are calculated.

CH provided feedback from Fine Arts adding that when they seek to hire full-time faculty, they have no problem with candidates meeting the unit requirements, the issue arises with some adjunct or high school level teachers seek positions to teach AHC courses. Fine Arts has concerns that not having options will effectively cut off opportunities for potential candidates in the fine arts areas (and no doubt other career technical areas as well) to fill positions, as often some individuals leave teaching to participate in industry. Without options, CTE areas will be disproportionally affected.

YF agreed and added the same holds for all CTE disciplines broadly and asked if PSC has sought feedback from all CTE disciplines.

LW urged everyone to remember that this proposal gets at the heart of disciplines that only require a Master's degree only.

AR reminded everyone that the item is part of Information and that Senators must present this item and feedback to their departments, so they then consider the extent of the impacts as presented, and after, return with a department vote.

HA called for the PSC to provide an updated/cleaned up document with the feedback that was agreed to today—so Senators can take the item to their departments for discussion and possible subsequent action/vote. Without an updated document, departments are left to vote on a proposal/document that does not reflect the will of the Senate discussed today. He added that it's important that departments have context and are clear of what they are voting on and an updated document provided to senators to then present to their departments will help.

AR agreed and requested to the PSC to send ASE a clean/updated version so that all Senators will receive it by email.

A motion to extend discussion an additional 5 minutes to have clarity to best represent what needs to go forward to departments is made by A. Kopcrak, seconded by B. Britten.

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: hearing no objections or abstentions the motion carries by unanimous consent.

Discussion:

Business Dept. feedback: BBry mentioned they are in favor of the equivalency petition. He noted the department welcomes, favors, and seeks instructors that can bring real world experience in business into their courses. Academic rigor is important and valued.

AF offered minor edits required in option E: the need for a period, and a typo was noted for correction.

LW asked those disciplines with concerns (including but not limited to CTE areas) to email the concerns so she can bring them to the PSC and thorough research can take place and be reviewed against the appropriate minimum qualifications handbook.

Discussion continued regarding considering potential impact of changes to discipline classification and CORs, also the need to be mindful of possible effects on articulation.

Suggestions offered to title the document *Master's Level Faculty Positions* and within parenthesis include additional language that what follows applies to full-time, part-time, CCAP positions.

A question was raised whether a modified equivalency could apply to only certain departments.

AR clarified this is not possible and reminded everyone of a previous 'no position' on if equivalency can be department specific.

Senators were directed to take the proposal to their departments for review. Members of the PSC will ensure that ASE receives a clean version of the proposal (that includes feedback and suggestions from today's meeting). Once received, the document will be distributed to senators to share it with their departments.

8. Resolution to Adopt Directional Statement for the Lompoc Valley Center. * [5] (ASE/D. Pirman (DP))

DP alluded to the presentation made at the last Senate meeting and the research conducted to inform the resolution before Senate today. She summarized that the resolution was drafted to serve as tool and north star to inform decisions for the Lompoc Valley Center. She read the Therefore, Be It Resolved section.

Discussion:

Clarification questions regarding possible implications to the current composition of the AHC District (will it change) and if the college's mission or goals will need revision. Also, clarification was asked on the differences between a center and campus.

DP stated the statement is not replacing the mission or values of the District or calling for another district or separate college/campus entity to be formed. Rather it is in service of the established values and mission of the AHC District and it intends to have something specific for the LVC, and the Lompoc community. She mentioned that ed code has specific meanings for campus and center designations tied to financing, and AHC has historically decided to call it a Center (the LVC).

A concern was raised regarding the framing of the Lompoc community profile, specifically that broadly categorizing it as 'non-traditional, working, and adult leaners' oversimplifies a diverse population that also includes traditional students, and this could be misconstrued as the document goes public.

DP clarified that the intent is to address historically underserved adult and working populations without marginalizing traditional students and agreed to rework the language in the WHEREAS to state the aim is to intentionally include non-traditional and working adult learners alongside traditional students.

A motion to extend discussion an additional five (5) minutes made by A. Kopcrak, seconded by B. Britten.

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: hearing no objections or abstentions the motion to extend discussion an additional five minutes carries by unanimous consent.

A minor change was suggested by LW to the final paragraph: to change "as the local hub of learning" to "a local hub of learning" to be inclusive of other learning activities that take place. DP agreed.

CS supported the resolution's intent drawing from lived and teaching experiences having taught there for over 10 years working with adult learners, military veterans, and recent high school graduates. He feels the draft accurately reflects how Lompoc residents view the Lompoc Center, and he does not believe the community would perceive it negatively. He feels minor language adjustments are necessary before the statement goes public and that the core message captures the local realities and would likely resonate positively with the Lompoc community.

DP assured everyone, especially for those not present at the last Senate meeting (when a thorough presentation/report was made that gave more background and described the methods used that informed the directional statement) that the community was consulted and the use of focus groups, conversations with people who live in the community, discussion with students and folks who teach at the LVC). Input was actively sought, and for those interested in specifics that in-depth report is available in the Senate's SharePoint.

AR addressed that approved Senate Resolutions are statements of the faculty's position on a matter.

AR asked for an updated Resolution draft that includes the Senate feedback offered today, once received, ASE will send the updated draft to Senators for a vote at the next Senate meeting.

REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

9. Faculty Association's Article 17 (Evaluation and Tenure) of the Collective Bargaining Agreement Update. [30] (C. Reed (CR)/B. Curry (BC)/AR)

CR gave an update on the revised full-time faculty evaluation process and Article 17 (Evaluation and Tenure) negotiations. A joint evaluation task force was created (pursuant to Article 1.4) composed of representatives from the Academic Senate, the Faculty Association (FA), and the District—they worked for the past year and a half to overhaul the evaluation criteria and process. Ed code and Title 5 mandates that the Academic Senate is consulted for matters related to faculty evaluation, tenure review, and Faculty Service Areas, hence the Senate participation in the task force, and why this update/report is before the Senate today.

The presentation was framed as a report rather than an information item for department feedback because the language in Article 17 was already formally negotiated between the FA and the District.

The revised evaluation moves away from prior, 'basic checklist type of evaluation' toward a more reflective, growth-minded model.

An overview of the evaluation process/workflow diagram was presented by AR. He explained that the updated framework integrates six core evaluation documents alongside a seventh, the DEIA self-reflection. The task force worked on developing or updating all documents. The Initial Orientation Meeting was covered. The three-member team reviews all submitted documentation to then draft an Evaluation Team Report. The Team's recommendations include: a recommendation for continued employment, and when achieved, a recommendation to award tenure. There is an option for a conditional recommendation, and a not recommended for continued employment option (for probationary and temporary faculty only). Not recommended for continued employment does not apply as an option for tenured faculty, as those instances are handled under separate contractual procedures. The Final Growth Meeting is different than what used to happen in the past. The intent is to have an open, honest dialogue regarding possible professional development without fear of evaluative repercussions. If a 'conditional recommendation' is issued, the team drafts a Concerns Report and Improvement Plan, which is formally addressed and incorporated into the Final Report during the meeting. He added that the Mentorship Program is embedded throughout the process. Mentors operate independently and cannot serve on the evaluatee's formal evaluation team. Mentorship is offered voluntarily as support system for new faculty navigating their first year but becomes mandatory if a faculty member receives a conditional recommendation and concerns report.

CR added that the revised evaluation incorporates the new DEIA requirements, and the DE Peer Review requirements, both required per accreditation. DEIA competencies were explained and framed as a more reflective process and will be required of all faculty during evaluation. The DE Peer Review may be used to assess a faculty member's compliance with federal and state requirements for Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) between instructors and students. It may not be used to determine continued employment with a primary assignment. Noncompliance, however, may result in required remediation followed by a second DE Peer Review.

A motion to extend discussion an additional ten (10) minutes to account for questions made by A. Kopcrak, seconded by A. Fox

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: hearing no objections or abstentions the motion to extend discussion an additional 10 minutes carries by unanimous consent.

Additionally, the task force updated evaluation criteria, created updated role-specific forms, established a Mentorship Program and strengthened contractual expectations surrounding Professional Development and College Service obligations. The Mentorship Program offers trained mentors $500/term stipend for up to four terms and is an opportunity for new, probationary hires or for faculty on conditional improvement plans. Training of faculty mentors will begin in Fall 2026. The Senate will establish a pool of mentors (full-time, tenured faculty to serve as mentors).

Discussion:

Question if the presentation will be available and what are the next steps.

It was addressed that the presentation is available on the FA website for members to review. The FA will hold office hours to answer questions, followed by a two-week voting window for FA members. Pending a successful vote/ratification, the agreement would move to the Board of Trustees on June 16th.

Over the summer, HR and the FA will incorporate the changes into the revised article (a red-lined version that includes the new language) that will be posted on the HR website—it will also include all the new and updated evaluation forms).

There will be joint training sessions for deans, department chairs, and staff on the new processes effective fall 2026 (again if ratified). The article will be open again the following year, improvement is always sought.

Clarification on what can be used to demonstrate RSI, if emails to students count, and not just interaction with students in Canvas.

AR referenced the Allan Hancock College Regular and Substantive Instructor Initiated Contact Policy that the Senate has approved and that it is located on the Senate Website under Distance Education Documents. Email is acceptable, and the policy lists other methods. Everyone was encouraged to review that resource.

Concerns raised of the continued challenge to have students complete the Instructional Faculty Student Feedback Form, especially for online courses (Class Climate Survey).

Clarification on the PD Plan was asked, specifically if deans approve what was submitted, and what is meant by quantitative professional development plan and the qualitive college service plan.

BC and CR clarified that deans do not approve it, but they can question the activity(ies).

CR referenced the MOU that modifies Article 16 definitions are professional growth activities to align with BP 7160. It was mentioned that PD activities are Senate Purview.

It was clarified that Quantitative refers to reporting by the hour what you are doing for professional development. Qualitative means you are telling them what you are doing for college service but not reported by the hour (this can be a list).

10. CCAP Faculty Evaluation. [10] (AGT/ B. Curry (BC))

AGT: Update on the CCAP Task Force work on developing an evaluation tool. The part-time faculty evaluation tool was used as template and built upon. Adherence to course content and academic rigor were primary objectives in developing the tool, and this guided the framing of the questions.

To evaluate learning outcomes beyond a simple classroom visit, an "evidence packet" will be required that consists of syllabi, assignments, exams, and handouts. SLO assessment and other elements of the COR like graded student work with instructor feedback. Evaluators will use the packet alongside classroom observations to verify alignment with course outlines of record. They are also working on the course syllabus and materials checklist and expect this to return with feedback from task force members.

BC mentioned that Deans will handle a separate section assessing timelines and operational adherence. Negative or subpar evaluations will trigger a mandatory remediation process. Feedback from Department Chairs will also be gathered to inform the evaluation process. He reiterated the aim of the task force to ensure the evaluation will allow the observer to assess if the instruction adheres to the course outcomes. The materials will enable more insight beyond the classroom observation.

Discussion:

LM suggested that a justification or comment section be added for when 'does not meet standard' or 'needs improvement' is used. BC agreed and also mentioned that should those conclusions be reached that remediation will be available to be able to continue to teach. LM also suggested an edit and use the full college name: to add Alan, currently it reads Hancock College on the form.

LW asked for a rubric that explains what meets or exceeds means—this needs to be clarified and defined. Additionally, she suggested adding comment boxes with require justification for a non-standard rating and to clarify post-evaluation administrative outcomes. She added that its important CCAP instructors know where to send their syllabus and to know all deadlines.

BC discussed the task force has discussed developing a rubric, and that is where they are headed.

BBri urded the task force to consider practical considerations regarding remote observation of instruction were raised, and the need to establish tech standards so observers do not rely on makeshift setups during live instruction. An example was given that while teaching, the CCAP instructor was holding a device in hand while moving around so the evaluator could witness instruction. He suggested establishing tech standards that schools requesting to teach AHC courses must also provide acceptable tech so observers do not rely on makeshift setups during the observation of live instruction.

BC acknowledged that remote assessment brings different challenges and is upon to suggestions.

TR asked if the intention of task force is for Senate to look at the administrative portion of the evaluation and what happens after. Are there thoughts to also add 'recommended for continued employment' or 'needs remediation'.

BC: the task force needs to finalize that language so the outcome will be explicit. They have talked about being encouraging and discouraging.

AGT concluded that the task force will incorporate feedback from Senate and department chairs and present the finalized materials checklist and rubric drafts at the next Senate meeting.

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

None

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

None

11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND DEPARTMENT SUGGESTIONS

None

12. ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 5:50 pm

Next Academic Senate Meeting: May 12, 2026.

Agenda Items due by May 5, 2026 @ noon.

* *Documents available on Senate SharePoint*

** *Documents available in previous Senate meetings 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

2025-2026 Academic Senators
(Department Faculty Representatives):

Academic/Student Services:
Dave DeGroot (DD)

Applied Social Sciences:
Yvon Frazier (YF)

Business:
Bob Bryant (BBry)

Counseling-Personal Development:
Ben Britten (BBri),
Carissa Perales (CPe),
Kiri Villa (KV)

English:
Melanie Guido Brunét (MGB),
Chris Carrol (CC), Alina Romo (AR)

Fine Arts:
Chris Hite (CH),
Anne McMeeking (AM)

Health Sciences
Amy Gisclon (AG),
Shavaun Maxson (SM)

Industrial Technology:
Gabriel Marquez (GM)

Kinesiology, Recreation, Athletics:
Chuck Provencio (CPr)

Languages & Communications:
Diane Auten (DA)

Life & Physical Sciences:
Alicia Fox (AF), Sean Gottlieb (SG)

Mathematical Sciences:
Anna Kopcrak (AK),
Martin Landeros (ML), Liz West (LW)

Public Safety:
Marc Hammill (MH)

Social & Behavioral Sciences:
Danya Serrano (DS)

Part-Time Faculty Reps:
Monique Segura (MS),
Chris Sprecher (CS),
Rajni Chaudhari (RC)