

ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE

Academic Senate Special Meeting

Agenda for Tuesday, March 29, 2022

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

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

AS PRESIDENT: A. Restrepo

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

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:

GUESTS: D. DeGroot, L. Manalo, M. Lau, R. Curry, E. Biely, L. Lee, P. McGuire, M. Grando, S. Ramirez Gelpi, P. Murphy, R. Andres, R. Ramirez, L. Bradbury, N. Ornelas

1. **Call to Order. [2] (AR)**
2. **Rollcall.**
3. **Public Comments. [3-minute limit per individual]**

CONSENT

4. **AP&P Curriculum Summary Report. * [5] (L. Manalo)**

Changes include prerequisite language with English 101, D 325, and prerequisite language for FCS 120. R. Andres reported that another language in the previous report that had to do with English 112 is a co-requisite course, so that's been removed. It just now says placement is based on upon AHC placement policy.

Motion: R. Bryant / T. Nunez

Discussion:

Yes: 24 -H. Alvarez, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, A. Gomez de Torres, M. Guido Brunét, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Koch, G. Marquez, M. McGill, C. Pavone, T. Nuñez, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

Abstain: 0

No: 0

ACTION ITEMS

5. **BP/AP 3420 Equal Employment Opportunity and Staff Diversity ** [5] (T. Roepke/R. Ramirez)**

T. Roepke stated that this BP/AP had language that needed to be updated based on the recently revised and approved BP/AP 7120 Recruitment and Hiring language.

Motion: R. Bryant / A. Koch

Discussion:

Yes: 24 -H. Alvarez, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, A. Gomez de Torres, M. Guido Brunét, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Koch, G. Marquez, M. McGill, C. Pavone, T. Nuñez, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

Abstain: 0

No: 0

6. **AB 705 Equitable Placement and Completion Improvement Plan ** [20] (Senators and Department Chairs from Math & English Depts/B. Curry/P. Murphy)**

A. Restrepo reminded the faculty that this document requires his signature. J. Jozwiak stated that they had a small email discussion and are having their department meeting next week. C. Hite said that it was discussed in the Fine Arts department stated that, in general, there was no support. Cl. Diaz noted that they had not discussed it, and the majority of votes discussed via email would abstain and hoped that there would be more math courses. T. Nunez asked for supporting data on why we are not choosing option 3. L. West said that the overwhelming data shows that option 3 – the college would still be out of compliance. P. Murphy shared the data on throughput – the completion of transfer-level math and transfer-level English within the first year of college. We would have to show that those students who completed pre-transfer have reasonable throughput rates. H. Elliot asked what institutional options we have for supporting those students. P. Murphy stated that they may have completed AHC graduation requirements, but we are still out of compliance. J. Tuan asked about the goal of transfer versus non-transfer. Murphy responded with stats that supported this direction. Throughput is four attempts to be successful (?) L. Manalo asked if we have more throughput with more attempts and, if students self-select or are placed, what do we do for the students who were not successful. Murphy stated that you could only start one level below transfer level to stay on track, and their catalog year dictates what math course is required. CTE courses that have discipline-specific pre-transfer level math courses have options if the course qualifies for AHC graduation requirements. J. Jozwiak asked how throughput is considered learning if students have to take the course three times to be successful. She shared that we have tried this in the past and asked if it works. L. West recommends Math 100 for CTE students, and limiting the choices seems more effective. L. Campos stated that Counseling was concerned that Math 100 only has four sections and may not be enough considering how many Math 300 are going away. She asked if we are worried about completions and how this affects state funding based on completions. P. Murphy stated that we are likely to lose students who opt-out. R. Curry said they would respond by adding sections as the needs arise. J. Dimick reiterated that by choosing Option 3, AHC would not be in compliance, which may affect funding. L. Manalo said that discipline faculty make prerequisite and co-requisite decisions. Some may consider the review of essential concepts as part of a course. L. Manalo has not received any instructions on batch processing. H. Elliot stated that those decisions might be affected by state language in C-IDs. For instance, courses listed as prerequisites will no longer be offered yet required. A. Gomez stated that other colleges refused to accept AB 705 due to the disproportional impact on students. This vote is for A. Restrepo to sign the document.

Motion: L. West / T. Nunez

Discussion:

Yes: 9 - R. Chaudhari, A. Fox, M. Hull, A. Koch, G. Marquez, T. Nuñez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, L. West

Abstain: 8 - Cl. Diaz, M. McGill, L. Campos, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, R. Bryant, K. Runkle, H. Elliot, C. Pavone,

No: 7 - J. Jozwiak, N. Ward, H. Alvarez, A. Gomez de Torres, C. Hite, M. Guido Brunét, J. Tuan,

Motion to table this item and bring it back at the next mtg: L. West / R. Bryant

Yes: 23 - H. Alvarez, R. Bryant, L. Campos, R. Chaudhari, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, A. Gomez de Torres, M. Guido Brunét, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Koch, G. Marquez, C. Pavone, T. Nuñez, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

Abstain: 1 - M. McGill

No: 0

INFORMATION (FOR FUTURE ACTION/APPROVAL)

7. AP 4255 Dismissal and Readmission * [5] (J. Tuan/N. Ornelas)

J. Tuan shared that the changes in the AP are not policy-related, just consistency in language. A. Fox recommended that "he/she/they" become "they." N. Ornelas reported that the league recommends him/her/them. Please share this with your department.

8. BP/AP 4250 Probation, Dismissal, and Readmission * [5] (J. Tuan/N. Ornelas)

There are no policy changes, just league language, consistency in other languages, and reorganization.

9. BP 4070 Auditing and Auditing Fees * [5] (J. Tuan/N. Ornelas)

There are no proposed changes to this BP, just a regular review cycle for Accreditation. H. Elliot asked why AHC prohibits auditing. N. Ornelas said this decision happened when AHC was launching concurrent enrollment, but Senate could review and change this if desired. Auditing may affect departments differently. Please share this with your department. L. Manalo stated that classroom sizes might not accommodate additional people, especially during social distance.

10. BP/AP 5050 Student Success Support Program* [5] (J. Tuan/N. Ornelas)

J. Tuan shared that the Chancellor's office required revisions. The AP includes language AB 705 instead of assessment instruments. Please share this with your department.

11. BP 4106 Nursing Programs * [5] (J. Raybould-Rogers/B. Curry)

R. Curry shared that this is a new optional policy. The nursing program recommended the BP only and chose to omit some of the league language. They elected not to have an AP because of the changes that frequently happen at the state level. L. Manalo recommended that the first word in the first paragraph change from "Registered" to "Prospective." Please share this with your department.

12. BP/AP 4922 Minimum Class Size * [5] (J. Raybould-Rogers/B. Curry)

R. Curry shared that this is due for a 5-year review and that there are no recommended changes. L. Manalo asked if we need to specify credit versus non-credit. Please share this with your department.

13. Program Review process proposal * [20] (P. McGuire, Program Review Committee)

- Description of the new process for program review.

A. Gomez shared that there is a folder with documents on this topic. P. McGuire shared that this new process addressed problems that have come up over the last few years – looking forward versus reporting and redundancy. The basic design is an annual planning document required by title 5, learning outcomes. Significantly shorter than the current yearly update. The second aspect is that we organized topics from the comprehensive into five core topics addressed at least once during the 6-year cycle, in no particular order. A. Restrepo asked about the possibility of having to address core topics more than once over the five years. P. McGuire stated that this may happen as the program responds to things like legislation or advisory committee recommendations and that this format provides opportunities as changes occur. The 6th year is an opportunity to validate through peer review and collaboration. This process is more adaptive and responsive. Institutional planning is tied to the process and becomes more manageable with the SPOL (Strategic Planning Online) software. Less work, less tedious. A. Restrepo asked if a guide had been developed. P. McGuire said yes and shared the guide. A. Restrepo asked about the prompts of the Core Topics. P. McGuire shared the sample prompts. His analysis of current program reviews page counts ranged from 310 pages to 45 pages, and digging out resource requests from those documents. A. Restrepo asked about the integration of Program Learning Outcomes. P. McGuire answered that yes, there are assessment questions in the annual planning document, but the frequency of the assessment cycle is recommended by LOAC and voted on by Senate. He stated that learning outcomes are a vital part of planning. R. Curry said that it is difficult to show evidence of assessments in Accreditation and appreciates that this process has that built-in. P. McGuire shared that there are multiple opportunities to tie assessment to resource requests and planning. K. Runkle asked if this process applies to student service programs and instructional programs. P. McGuire answered that it does. P. Murphy reminded the faculty that student services requested input. N. Ward shared that this new process directly connects documentation to institutional initiatives and Accreditation. Please share this with your department.

14. BP/AP 4105 Distance Education * [15] (F. Patrick)

A. Restrepo asked if Senators were willing to table this item. Due to outdated language and the

Chancellor's office requirements, the current policy needs many revisions. F. Patrick agreed that the faculty had suggested meaningful changes.

Motion to table Item 14: A. Koch / T. Roepke

Discussion:

Yes: All

No:

Abstain:

15. Definitions of Distance Education (DE) modalities. * [10] (AR)

A. Restrepo shared a document that defines DE modalities, including both instructional and service faculty. L. Campos stated that the language for Service is for all service faculty, not just Counseling. Please share this with your department.

REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

16. Accreditation update [5] (ASE).

- Membership and procedures concerning the accreditation process. (ASE)
- Update (T. Passage, B. Stokes, NJW, F. Patrick, ASE)
 - Thursday 3/31 9:30-11:00 Accreditation Information and Input Session. Faculty are invited to participate and have two weeks to look at the documents and provide input. P. Murphy spoke shared that the Climate Survey has been launched. A link was shared with all AHC employees. A report will be shared with College Council to review and respond to any areas that need improvement.

17. Adjourn.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: April 5, 2022. Agenda Items due by March 29, 2022 @ noon.

* Documents available on Senate SharePoint.

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