

ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE

Academic Senate Meeting

Minutes for Tuesday, March 11, 2025

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Room F-225 (Fine Arts Building)

Senator's Remote Participation Link ***

[See bottom of the agenda for details.]

AS Executive Committee:

President: Alberto Restrepo (AR)

Vice-President: Fred Patrick (FP)

Secretary: Nancy Jo Ward (NJW)

Member-at-Large: Thesa Roepke (TR)

Member-at-Large: Ana Gomez de Torres (AGT)

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: H. Alvarez, R. Bryant, C. Carroll, R. Chaudhari, D. DeGroot, A. Fox, A. Gomez de Torres, S. Gottlieb, M. Guido Brunet, A. Griscon, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Kopcrak, M. Landeros, L. Manalo (proxy: A. Griscon), G. Marquez, A. McMeeking, M. Nishimori, F. Patrick, C. Perales, C. Provencio, A. Romo, T. Roepke, M. Segura, C. Sprecher, K. Villa, N. Ward, L. West

Student Rep: O. Shrecengost, K. Duvall

Guests: T. Nuñez, R. Hall, C. Reed, L. Lee, Y. Teniente, R. Curry, W. Sutter, K. Walthers, C. Hood, S. Kopecky, D. Pirman, B. Britton, K. Wells, J. Raybould-Rogers, M. Patrick, G. Siwabessy, M. Serpa, E. Krier, K. Novoa

1. **Call to Order. [2] (AR)**
2. **Rollcall 29** - H. Alvarez, R. Bryant, C. Carroll, R. Chaudhari, D. DeGroot, A. Fox, A. Gomez de Torres, S. Gottlieb, M. Guido Brunet, A. Griscon, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Kopcrak, M. Landeros, L. Manalo (proxy: A. Griscon), G. Marquez, A. McMeeking, M. Nishimori, F. Patrick, C. Perales, C. Provencio, A. Romo, T. Roepke, M. Segura, C. Sprecher, K. Villa, N. Ward, L. West
3. **Approval of Minutes from 2/11/2025. * [5] (NJW)**
Motion for Approval: R. Bryant / A. Fox
Discussion:
Yes: 29 - H. Alvarez, R. Bryant, C. Carroll, R. Chaudhari, D. DeGroot, A. Fox, A. Gomez de Torres, S. Gottlieb, M. Guido Brunet, A. Griscon, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Kopcrak, M. Landeros, L. Manalo (proxy: A. Griscon), G. Marquez, A. McMeeking, M. Nishimori, F. Patrick, C. Perales, C. Provencio, A. Romo, T. Roepke, M. Segura, C. Sprecher, K. Villa, N. Ward, L. West
Abstain: 0
No: 0
4. **Public Comments. [3-minute limit per individual]**

T. Nuñez, English Department Chair, spoke on behalf of the ENGL Department, regarding recent Concurrent Enrollment administrative approvals.

"After years of not approving English courses for Concurrent Enrollment, last year, the ENGL Department agreed to a one-year pilot to offer ENGL 101 as Concurrent Enrollment. The number of sections has doubled from fall 24 to spring 25 (from 6 to 14), and the pilot has gone well overall, under the oversight of pilot co-leads, Juila Raybould-Rodgers and myself, who have worked closely with local high school instructors to maintain the rigor of ENGL 101 in the high school setting, including adherence to the 101 Course Outline of Record. There have

been notable hiccups, such as one high school instructor being scheduled by our AHC CE office to teach six sections of ENGL 101 this term, equaling a load of 1.728, well over the full-time instructor overload cap, which is 1.47. This begs the question: are high school CE instructors hired as adjunct or full-time faculty? They are identified as adjunct faculty in the CE Faculty Resource Guide (on pages 10 and 13, for instance), and they are evaluated as adjunct instructors. AHC adjuncts, however, are capped at .8 overload.

This semester, the ENGL Department received requests for new CE courses for 2025-2026, including ENGL 102, 103, 145, and 146. The department declined such expansion in a departmental vote in February. There were two “no” vote exceptions: Julia Raybould-Rodgers and I voted “yes” to pilot ENGL 103 as CE for next year to experiment in good faith because, as co-leads of the 101 CE pilot, we experienced progress with our high school partners, and we saw the 103 pilot as a compromise with the administration. We, therefore, called for a special department meeting, held last Wednesday, and invited Bob Curry and Alberto Restrepo to present Administration and Senate perspectives. The 1½ hour meeting was lively, even salty at times, as we discussed the pros and cons of CE, but we were told the administration would not offer our literature courses without our buy-in, so we decided to call for a revote of ENGL 103 as CE. It was crystal clear at the time that the department did not endorse offering our literature courses as CE. We voted via email the next day, under pressure to meet the March 7 deadline (given the Senate Bill requiring colleges to respond in 60 days to CE requests), and the department voted unanimously to offer ENGL 103 as a one-year pilot.

The next day Dr. Walthers sent an email message to Senate Exec., affected department chairs (namely film, math, and English), and other administrators that announced the administrative approvals of the literature courses the ENGL Department had specifically not approved for CE, including ENGL 102, 145, and 146. English faculty have subsequently expressed shock, disappointment, and even outrage. We feel blind sighted so here we are.”

J. Jozwiak, English Department faculty spoke to the Senate about the issues of devaluing education by offloading many of our sections to the high school districts.

‘Just because a high school teacher has a master's degree does not mean they are equipped to teach college-level literature curriculum. They will not have the same type of academic freedom that we have in the college classroom. Thus, these students will not have the same college experience in a high school class, no matter what the COR says.

Also, it is decimating our English offerings. In the fall, we have two sections of 102 scheduled, six sections of 103, one section of 145, and no sections of 146. However, we do have 49 sections of 101 scheduled. Thus, the impact of giving our course sections away to the high school districts will be felt by our department, faculty, and students, and this is unfair.

All in all, after 33 years of teaching, this whole movement of offloading our classes to high schools seems like a slap in the face. I also feel completely disgusted by the process. It is very disheartening.”

A. Romo, English Department faculty stated that she did not understand this decision.

“I understand that this is legislation, I understand that this is mandated by the state, and I do completely understand that there is little to be done overall about the move towards CE. I equally understand that FTEs are incredibly important to our college’s solvency.

I do, however, think that the whole situation could have been handled differently. And that there are still AS OF YET issues and solutions that need to be addressed.

- a. To begin: it had been communicated to the English department that the administration would go to bat for the department if we could give good reasons for why the courses should not be offered as CE. We were told that Kevin would go talk to the Superintendent if needed. This did not happen and, I should say, the department gave good reasons, reasons I will return to in a minute. My question is this: Did Tom (or Bob or Mary, for that matter) communicate those reasons to Kevin? I happened to be privy to the beginning of the conversation between Tom and Kevin at the planning retreat where Tom was giving him the results of our vote. I am fully aware that there was a deadline that had to be met, but as far as I can tell, Kevin made his decision over tri-tip. I don’t think decisions as potentially impactful as these should be made without due consideration of all the facts.
- b. Issues with classes not going
- c. Teachers at high school are NOT qualified just because they have a master’s degree

“The governing board of a community college district may enter into a College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) partnership with the governing board of a school district or a county office of education **to offer or expand dual enrollment opportunities for pupils who may not already be college bound or who are underrepresented in higher education**, to develop seamless pathways from high school to community college

for career technical education or preparation for transfer, improve high school graduation rates, or helping high school pupils achieve college and career readiness.”

- a. As used in this section, “underrepresented in higher education” may include first-time college students, low-income students, students who are current or former foster youth, homeless students, students with disabilities, and students with dependent children.

“The CCAP partnership agreement shall certify that a qualified high school teacher teaching a course offered for college credit at a high school campus ***has not displaced or resulted in the termination of an existing community college faculty member teaching the same course at the partnering community college campus.***”

- a. A community college course offered for college credit at the partnering high school campus ***does not reduce access to the same course offered at the partnering community college campus.***
- b. Participation in a CCAP partnership is consistent with the core mission of the community colleges as described in Section 66010.4, and pupils participating in a CCAP ***partnership will not lead to enrollment displacement of otherwise eligible adults in the community college.***

Possible Solution: “A community college district may limit enrollment in a community college course solely to eligible high school pupils if the course is offered at a high school campus, either in person ***or using an online platform, during the regular school day and the community college course is offered pursuant to a CCAP partnership agreement. And, courses can be offered on our campus.***”

M. Brunet echoed her English department colleagues' concerns and added

“the additional hurdle of new rules implemented by the Department of Education, which have provided a means for students and parents to “report” teachers and schools in the K-12 system that teach anything other than a “pro-America” rhetoric which is problematic when allowing high schools/teachers to teach our literature courses, such as American Literature, which closely examines topics such as slavery and the genocide of the First People of this country. What quality of education is being presented through CE if it cannot be done so with truth and integrity in the subject matter, and by teachers who are *trained* to teach these subjects, as English literature and English composition are not synonymous in study or degree.”

W. Sutter, Math Department faculty stated that

“The Math department has had many meetings about Concurrent Enrollment over the past several years, 78 to be specific. Many of these meetings were in-depth conversations about the CE program. We collaborated to put our policies and practices in place to make the CE program successful. Additionally, we collaborated with the CE instructors on the high school campuses to ensure that the CE instructors were being supported and mentored, college-level rigor was being upheld, and deadlines were being met, to name a few examples.

In Feb 2024 and again in Jan/Feb 2025, the math department voted to not offer Calculus 1 nor Calculus 2 through Concurrent Enrollment. We are offering Statistics, College Algebra, and Trigonometry through Concurrent Enrollment.

On Friday, Mar 7, the math department found out that our decision (which we spent nearly 80 meetings discussing) was completely overridden by the administration at the College without having any form of collaboration, communication, or consultation with the math department.

The College vision statement was quoted where “open and honest communication,” “collaboration,” and “mutual respect” were emphasized. A comparison was made between the College vision statement and the fact that promises of “open and honest communication,” “collaboration” and “mutual respect” were not upheld by the College Administration concerning the recent decisions made about Concurrent Enrollment.

I humbly request that the College Administration follow through with promises clearly stated in the vision statement, and backtrack from the decision made about Concurrent Enrollment until the College Administration takes time to show their respect to departments by collaborating and having open and honest communication with the departments.”

L. Lee, Mathematical Sciences Department Chair spoke:

“I would like to address the decision Kevin announced Friday to accept all applications for concurrent enrollment instructors that meet minimum qualifications. There are many reasons why I don’t support this. I’m here to talk about one, and that is Hancock’s academic standard.

Concurrent enrollment instructors are required to meet minimum qualifications. We call them MINIMUM qualifications. It took me 7 years to be prepared for teaching one subject at our school: Bachelor of Science,

Teaching Credential, and a Masters in Mathematics. To date, it was the hardest thing I have ever done.

When I applied at Hancock College: I filled out an application for the position, wrote an essay, gave a teaching demonstration, and was interviewed by two different panels.

Concurrent enrollment instructors do not have to do any of these things. We have no idea who these people are.

Why does Hancock College have this rigorous application process? Because we have an academic standard to uphold. When our partner universities get a STEM student transferring from Hancock, they know that the student is prepared and can handle the rigor that is to come.

The argument has been made, that if we don't hire these concurrent enrollment instructors then another institution will. Do we want to be the institution that hires the minimally qualified instructor? If we expand this program we drop our high academic standards - and it will show. Eventually, Cal Poly and UCSB are going to look twice when they see an application coming from Hancock College. This can jeopardize our transfer agreements with these universities and negatively impact our finances. This decision is short-sighted, it will lower the standard of what the Hancock name stands for, and quite honestly, it's an insult to those of us who have given everything we have to uphold that standard.

I would like to request three things:

- a. An interview process for concurrent instructors that is equivalent to our own
- b. A qualified math instructor is hired to oversee this process. I was hired to teach math, not administrative high school. We need someone whose sole job it is to administrate this program.
- c. A clear structure that allows feedback and change and a thorough evaluation of outcomes."

A. Koprack, Mathematical Sciences faculty shared her experience.

"Through conversations with other faculty in my department I have three main concerns about expanding, without bounds, our concurrent enrollment offerings:

1. The unintentional workload of AHC faculty to communicate changes and requirements of AHC programs and courses. EG AB 1705 and Deadlines
2. The time gaps students could experience between taking a course and a subsequent course reliant on that prior learning. IE If you don't use it you lose it.
3. The impact on students and how best to serve them in their educational evolution."

K. Walthers spoke to the faculty about the public comments made by the faculty. He apologized and stated that he should have been better about the process. He admitted that he dropped the ball on communicating with faculty in advance to discuss the impact of the new legislation. These are not new courses. These are courses currently offered through Taft College. He believes that AHC faculty are the right ones to work with these students, not Taft College. He said that he believes that we all want to do what is best for our students. The core issue is whether they are going to take these classes, and if our faculty need support via stipends to oversee these courses and the high school faculty teaching these courses. He asked local high schools that if the faculty do not meet minimum qualifications, he is asking them to not push this forward to Taft College. He invited faculty to stop by and talk to him, or yell at him to please schedule a meeting with him through J. McGee.

C. Perales spoke to remind faculty about a professional development opportunity this Friday. Please look at the new Professional Development page on Hancock's website.

5. President's Remarks. [10] (AR)

A. Restrepo shared that he feels that faculty are experiencing something larger than the concurrent enrollment situation. He referred to the mission statement on shared governance in a climate of trust and mutual respect. Many faculty members expressed feeling disrespected and dismissed in the Public Comments aspect of the meeting. He is concerned that this has been building for a while and that he perceives an ongoing disdain for faculty by the administration. The climate of trust is an issue that he has been struggling with for years. He asked the faculty if they want to discuss this situation with the Academic Senate, please talk to your departments and send any requests to him.

CONSENT

None

ACTION ITEMS

6. **BP/AP 2510 Shared Governance. * [5] (ASE)**

A. Kopcrak asked if a rejection of this BP/AP would pertain to what has transpired in the last week. A. Restrepo said that the policy is well written with robust, meaningful engagement. R. Bryant asked if we the college comply with this AP. He also said that the college might need a BP/AP on Concurrent Enrollment and internal, local processes. C. Reed suggested passing this policy to indicate to the BOT Senate is in alignment with this policy, and making a statement at the BOT meeting about the importance of shared governance and how meaningful this policy is. Another option is to propose a resolution. A. Gomez De Torres shared that language in the AP (pg 2??) R. Curry shared that there is an item on the agenda at the next BOT related to this topic. H. Alvarez reminded faculty of Restrepo's request to bring this conversation to departments and faculty that are on councils and committees can have these conversations in those meetings.

Motion for revising the title for Item 6 to be AP 2510: A. Fox / R. Bryant

Discussion:

Yes: 29 - H. Alvarez, R. Bryant, C. Carroll, R. Chaudhari, D. DeGroot, A. Fox, A. Gomez de Torres, S. Gottlieb, M. Guido Brunet, A. Griscon, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Kopcrak, M. Landeros, L. Manalo (proxy: A. Griscon), G. Marquez, A. McMeeking, M. Nishimori, F. Patrick, C. Perales, C. Provencio, A. Romo, T. Roepke, M. Segura, C. Sprecher, K. Villa, N. Ward, L. West

Abstain: 0

No: 0

Motion for Approval: R. Bryant / A. Fox

Discussion:

Yes: 29 - H. Alvarez, R. Bryant, C. Carroll, R. Chaudhari, D. DeGroot, A. Fox, A. Gomez de Torres, S. Gottlieb, M. Guido Brunet, A. Griscon, C. Hite, M. Hull, J. Jozwiak, A. Kopcrak, M. Landeros, L. Manalo (proxy: A. Griscon), G. Marquez, A. McMeeking, M. Nishimori, F. Patrick, C. Perales, C. Provencio, A. Romo, T. Roepke, M. Segura, C. Sprecher, K. Villa, N. Ward, L. West

Abstain: 0

No: 0

INFORMATION (FOR FUTURE ACTION/APPROVAL)

7. **BP/AP 4222 Remedial Coursework. * [5] (J. Raybould-Rodgers/B. Curry)**

This BP/AP is back for discussion and clarification on ESL courses being listed as remedial coursework. R. Curry shared that ESL courses are mentioned here because they are repeatable. Additional changes are from the League, Title V, and Ed Code. Please share this with your departments for comments.

8. **AP 4232 Pass – No Pass. * [5] (J. Raybould-Rodgers/B. Curry)**

Hancock currently does not have a local policy, this AP is legally advised by the League.

REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

9. **Comprehensive Education Plans (CSEPs) and Registration Holds. * [15] (B. Britten)**

B. Britten shared that there is legislation coming that requires a hold on student registration if their academic goal is a degree or certificate and they do not have a CSEP. This practice will be in place Spring of 2026 for enrollment in summer or fall courses. Please share this with your department and encourage faculty to communicate this with their students.

10. **Credit for Prior Learning. [10] (D. DeGroot/B. Curry)**

D. Degroot shared the importance of faculty engagement with this initiative to award credit for prior learning. This is important for veterans and working adults who are coming back to college. He thinks that there is a good fit for CTE programs. Take a look at Palomar College. Be aware of any articulations with CSUs and UCs and if there are impacts. Share this with your department and discuss options.

11. Common Course Numbering Update. (ASE/D. DeGroot)

Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III timelines. Phase I and II are already in the works. Phase III is being organized. Chairs are being notified of the disciplines listed in this phase, and faculty will be nominated to attend the convenings. There is a stipend involved for faculty who are selected to be part of this process. The spreadsheet will be posted on the Senate Sharepoint and available to faculty to review and make nominations.

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

12. edTAC (AR/X. Ortiz)

X. Ortiz wasn't able to attend, this topic is tabled until the next meeting.

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

13. Academic Quality Committee, (E. Krier)

E. Krier shared that they meet on the 4th Wednesday from 4-5 pm in L215. They have been hosting the Faculty Learning Lab on the 1st and 3rd Wednesdays from 4-5 pm in L215 and invite faculty to attend and have casual conversations about instruction, assessment, and grading. Please share this with your department and make suggestions for topics. Reach out to her with questions.

14. Future Agenda Items and Department Suggestions.

15. Adjourn.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: March 25, 2025. Agenda Items are due by March 18, 2025 @ noon.

Documents are available on Senate SharePoint.

Documents available in previous Senate meeting's 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 before 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>