

ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE

Academic Senate Meeting

Minutes for Tuesday, October 19, 2021

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, C. Diaz, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, A. Gomez de Torres, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Koch, M. Lehne, G. Marquez, M. McGill, C. Pavone, K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, T. Roepke, J. Scarffe, M. Segura, J. Tuan, N. Ward, L. West

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE: J. Rayas

GUESTS: D. DeGroot, R. Curry, D. Vasquez, E. Ysip, R. Hall, Y. Teniente, S. Kramer, L. Karip, L. Maxwell, L. Karapetian, M. Grando, P. McGuire, P. Murphy, A. Kaiser, B. Britten, C. Reed, F. Patrick. J. Bergstrom Smith,

1. **Call to Order [2] (AR)**
2. **Public Comments [3-minute limit per individual]**
3. **Rollcall**
4. **Approval of Minutes from 9/21/2021* [5] (NW)**
Correction: J. Scarffe and J. Joswiak – correct spelling of names

Motion: R. Bryant / A. Koch

Discussion:

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

No: 0

Abstain: 0

5. **President's Remarks [5] (AR)**
A. Restrepo shared that G. Newsom signed bill 361 into law, which means that Brown Act meetings can continue through teleconferencing until 1/2024. Next, he reminded Senate that the Hancock accreditation process requires faculty to serve as a co-chair for each of the four (4) standards. Senate Exec welcomes any faculty who are interested in helping and will be submitting names for the co-chairs. J. Scarffe asked if there was a list posted or the positions. H. Elliot said to push this question to agenda #17. A. Restrepo shared that he will try to exercise caution on expressing opinions as AS president and welcomed faculty to remind him of that.

CONSENT

Request for Senate to approve updates to board policies and administrative procedures vetted by Senate Exec (Summer 2021). [10] (ASE, J. Tuan)

6. BP/AP 4110 Honorary Degrees*
7. BP/AP 5020 Nonresident Tuition*
8. BP 4260 Prerequisites, Corequisites, Advisories*
9. AP/BP 3730 Privacy Protection*

Motion: R. Bryant / K. Runkle

Discussion:

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

No: 0

Abstain: 0

ACTION ITEMS

10. BP/AP 7218 Selection of Department Chair ** [10] (T. Roepke)

- Alteration to the AP that allows for one part-time representative to vote for department chair.

R. Bryant, Business department rep., discussed this item and is concerned that not all departments are the same size; this change will impact departments differently and inquired if there was any consideration of an equal distribution of the impact of this decision. M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, Counseling rep., requested that the process for selection of the PT faculty voting member be transparent and suggested a form of in-service for part-timers to be more fully informed. T. Roepke, Early Childhood Education rep., said that her department supports this and that she could take the percentage issue back to HR Council. G. Marquez, Industrial Technology rep., shared that the eight programs in his area are represented by full-time faculty except for two programs and wondered which of the programs would be represented by that PT faculty vote? He wondered if the part-time faculty would represent the missing full-time faculty? M. Segura asked about the training recommendation and stated that she does not know the ratio of PT vs. FT across campus. She also shared that some PT faculty may teach at more than one college yet want to be involved. M. Arvizu-Rodriguez explained that the training suggestion was around Pt faculty feeling disenfranchised and not as informed. She hopes the appointees are engaged and involved. R. Hall shared that at other colleges, it is uncommon for faculty to be in separate unions. C. Hite reported that Fine Arts did not have issues with this item. K. George, Public Safety rep., shared that his department's FT to PT faculty ratio is very different from most – few FT and many PT. J. Scarffe, Social & Behavioral Sciences rep., reported that her department provided unanimous support for this item. A. Fox, Life & Physical Sciences rep., reported that they supported this item and did not receive any training for voting for Department Chair. C. Pavone, Mathematical Sciences rep., asked if a minimum time of service PT faculty is required for the appointment. L. Campos remarked that all programs are different, and in her department, part-time faculty are not as involved and hopes that they are supported financially to be more involved in all departments. M. Hull, Health

Department rep., asked how the PT faculty member for each department is chosen by their union. A. Restrepo stated that the PT union would determine this.

Motion: J. Scarffe / C. Hite

Discussion:

Yes: 20 - R. Chaudhari, C. Diaz, Cl. Diaz, H. Elliott, A. Fox, K. George, A. Gomez de Torres, C. Hite, M. Hull, A. Koch, M. Lehne, G. Marquez, M. McGill, C. Pavone, T. Roepke, J. Scarffe, M. Segura, N. Ward, L. West

No: 1 - R. Bryant

Abstain: 6 - K. Runkle, M. Arvizu-Rodriguez, J. Jozwiak, H. Alvarez, J. Tuan, L. Campos

11. BP/AP 4021 Program Vitality ** [5] (B. Curry/J. Raybould-Rogers)

- Minor proposed changes and/or updates to this board policy and administrative procedure.

Motion: R. Bryant / C. Hite

Discussion:

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

No: 0

Abstain: 0

12. Modification to the “Establishment and Modification of Course Enrollment Maximums” document. ** [5] (AR/B. Curry)

- *Adding clarifying language. To the document to establish a connection to the Class Schedule.*

T. Roepke asked if this document applies to concurrent enrollment. R. Curry answered, “No, it does not restrict how local High Schools offer classes.” T. Roepke shared an experience of differences between what is happening on campus versus in High School courses. R. Curry said that if anyone has concerns with concurrent enrollment courses, please bring those questions to him.

Motion: R. Bryant / C. Hite

Discussion:

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

No: 0

Abstain: 0

INFORMATION (FOR FUTURE ACTION/APPROVAL)

N/A

REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

13. Technology Master Plan Goals **

- Request for faculty participation in the development of goals to guide technology decisions for the next six years. [10] (AR)

N. Ward recommended that the Technology Master Plan has goals that promote responsiveness and accountability to faculty as a whole. She also asked how decisions affecting faculty and students are made and recommended better communication when changes to classroom technology. M. Hull asked about examples of 12 past goals. C. Hite requested transparency in the decision-making process and asked how faculty are included - who is accountable to faculty for decisions that affect their program, who can override these decisions, and how faculty can be more involved in this process. A. Fox spoke about upgrades and new technology - how are faculty supported with OS updates or network changes that affect classroom technology. A. Restrepo acknowledged that this is a problem. A. Fox also expressed frustration for cables and docking station installations that are required for use by FT and PT faculty. A. Koch suggested goals that embrace technology that can accommodate guest speakers via teleconferencing in all classrooms. A. Restrepo said there would be two meetings designed as a technology summit to get input from faculty.

14. Program Review pilot report. [10] (P. McGuire)

- Program Review Committee report on the pilot program conducted over the summer to assess the new process.

P. McGuire gave a brief review of the committee's efforts to modernize and strengthen the Program Review process and reported the results of the summer pilot with four program faculty: A. Kaiser, A. Koch, J. Bergstrom Smith, and P. McGuire. The redesigned process shifts from reporting to planning through 5 core topics: Curriculum Design, Innovative Scheduling, Higher Ed and Industry Partnerships, Enrollment Trends, and Support Services. It utilizes a more concise annual report to address immediate needs and request resources. Program Review becomes a forward-leaning planning process organized around the collation of the five areas and annual updates. The documentation is live, the workload is more balanced, and it fits our accreditation requirements by being tied directly to resource allocation and supporting learning outcomes. P. McGuire shared that of four programs that participated; the endorsement was unanimous. General comments were positive - faculty appreciated the ease in tying documents to planning processes. P. McGuire shared that the final detail is to work out a process for peer-review and validation. The committee plans to share the new process and results of the pilot to various groups around campus to get feedback - input is welcome. R. Bryant asked if programs currently in the review cycle can participate in the new process or use the old process. R. Curry said that faculty should use the old process until Senate has adopted a new one. P. McGuire shared that any delay in vetting the new process affects programs; this is the 3rd pilot, and it is frustrating that the work is done by the committee and not backed by Senate. A. Koch shared that his experience was very similar to the old system but was easier. He stated that "It encourages faculty to have active dialog and transparency with these concepts, and we have systems to support this new system." A. Kaiser said it was motivating to think about your programs this way in a proactive way that will bring faster change. A. Restrepo asked how we could get this document to departments for more input. He stated that this is not an action item yet, but it will come back to Senate to vote on in the near future.

15. Discussion regarding VPAA & VPSS reports to the Board of Trustees on October 12, 2021. [25] (AR/ASE)

Restrepo presented a situation that occurred at last week's BOT meeting. Items 14B and 14C were reports by R. Curry and N. Ornelas. R. Curry reported the numbers of in-person or synchronous and hybrid offerings. Trustee Zacharias asked how counselors were serving students – online or in-person - have modality changes affected students who need counseling services. R. Curry referred the question to N. Ornelas. She reported that there was little face to face opportunities for students to meet with counselors. She stated that LVC has one counselor one day a week, and the main campus has only three counselors three days a week, even though there were 27 full-time counselors. Trustee Zacharias requested that this be brought back to another BOT meeting and the N. Ornales provide a more informed report.

Restrepo shared that he was concerned that the discussion was about an item not on the published agenda. C. Reed asked if the facts were correct and reminded faculty that data presented to the BOT needs to be factual. The number given of 27 counselors is not correct. K. Runkle shared that she was given a choice of modalities in the MOU and was offered this because we are still in a pandemic. She is committed to counseling students and has been for 24 years. She did not choose without thorough consideration and analysis of the data from the 1st three weeks of the fall semester, before the fall MOU: 81% of the requests from students were through emails, students chose to phone in and zoom modalities. She believes that faculty should be involved in contributing to the BOT's questions. J. Tuan shared that she was on campus in person, by phone, zoom, and in-person. Drop-ins mainly were via phone and zoom, not in person. Currently, students prefer zoom and phone calls. She only had 2-3 drop-ins. The other consideration is that Counseling offices are small – less than 6 feet and new exposures were reported by students every week. She modified her schedule based on the demand: all modalities, three days a week, two days a week, offers zoom, and phone. Still, there are very few drop-ins. The pandemic has shifted how we serve students, and it expands opportunities. In the survey conducted last year, more than half recommended online appointments. Britten shared that he is on campus five days a week and 95 appts booked, 35 remote, 60 in person. Other general counselors are making efforts in ways that are not being reported. R. Hall appreciated the video replay. He did not appreciate the inference that are our students not being served. Usually, the President would step in and alleviate the concerns of the BOT, but that did not happen. A. Fox expressed that she is disappointed by the implications that since counselors weren't in person, they weren't available to students. It appears that there is a lack of understanding, and she is disappointed in the answers the VP of Student Services gave to the BOT. L. Karapetian said that she is "livid" because the dialog seemed rehearsed and she feels disrespected. Her job requires one-on-one assessment – 3 hours in a small room. She took a leave of absence to protect her family and continues to work serving students. L. Campos shared her experience in athletics, she is trying to work in person but is pregnant, and the data was sparse on the effects of the vaccine. During the 1st month of the semester, she was exposed and had to be quarantined regularly. Now that testing is in place, it is much smoother. With the MOU in place, she assumed that all faculty had the support of the District, with students in spaces and access to faculty who are working remotely. M. Arvizu-Rodriquez appreciated the well-articulated supported comments. Currently, counselors are managing the system to support students' needs. She is concerned that the Board of Trustees lacks information, and assumptions have been made without consulting faculty. N. Ward expressed frustration that a VP would respond to a question that was not on the agenda without requesting time to investigate thoroughly. C. Reed expressed that our counselors

are a hard-working, committed, diverse group that does fantastic work and is committed to students. She wondered what prompted the BOT to question the work ethic of counseling faculty and why their perception has been skewed. R. Hall had never heard of a situation when the BOT questioned an entire group of faculty. He shared that it is apparent that the BOT does not clearly understand the experience of faculty and the opportunities provided to students through new technologies.

Restrepo said that the BOT is informed through the President and VPs. The Trustees are not supposed to go and investigate on their own. N. Ornales was not prepared to answer whether the students' needs were being served, and the situation resulted in the BOT being extremely concerned. It behooves the faculty to prepare a response that represents a more informed, current reality. J. Scarffe asked for this to be an agenda item to develop a formal response. H. Elliot asked faculty to formulate statements/comments to help frame the issues by Monday of next week. The faculty should send comments to L. Campos, and she will send them on to ASE. A. Restrepo suggested that there needs to be a way to have more frequent communications with the BOT so that there aren't misunderstandings and that the dialog is not filtered through the current structure. Zacharias requested that K. Walthers facilitate more communication with Senate. Please take this back to your department and inquire how students are being served and how Senate should respond.

Motion to move item #16 to next meeting: J. Scarffe / R. Bryant

Discussion:

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

No: 0

Abstain: 0

16. Council/Committee Reports [5]

- edTAC – moved to next meeting.

17. Future Agenda Items and Department Suggestions.

18. Adjourn

* Documents available on Senate SharePoint.

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