

## **ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE** **Academic Senate Meeting**

Minutes for Tuesday, November 25, 2005

4:00 – 6:00 pm

Room F-225 (Fine Arts Building)

*[See bottom of the minutes for details on \*, \*\*, \*\*\*]*

### **Academic Senate Executive Committee (ASE):**

President: Alberto Restrepo

Vice President: Ana Gómez de Torres

Secretary: Héctor Álvarez

Member-at-Large: Fred Patrick

Member-at-Large: Thesa Roepke

### **Voting Members Present:**

Héctor Álvarez, Bob Bryant, David DeGroot, Rajni Chaudhari, Alicia Fox, Yvon Frazier, Amy Gisclon, Anna Gómez de Torres, Sean Gottlieb, M. Guido Brunet, Chris Hite, Anna Kopcrak, Martin Landeros, Fred Patrick, Carissa Perales, Chuck Provencio, Alberto Restrepo (votes only to break a tie), Thesa Roepke, Alina Romo, Monique Sequra, Danya Serrano, Chris Sprecher, Kiri Villa

Proxy Voters: Ana Gomez de Torres (for Diane Auten), Larry Manalo (for Shavaun Maxon)

### **Student Representative:**

Faith Davis, Director Academic Affairs (ASBG)

### **Guests:**

Karina Lara (Faculty), LeeAnne McNulty (Grants), Deborah Pirman (Dean, Extended Campus), Andrea Keiser Purdue (Interim Dean, Community Ed, Larry Manalo (Faculty), Jessica Solorio (Faculty)

\*\*\*Remote Participant Guests: Dan McNeil (Faculty), Christine Reed (Faculty), and David Vasquez (Director, Admissions & Records)

### **CCPD Council Co-Chairs and Senate Committee's Co-Chairs Present:**

Student Learning Council: Julia Raybould-Rodgers (Faculty)

Student Services Council: Genevieve Siwabessy (Assoc. Superintendent/VP Student Services Services)

Human Resources Council: Thesa Roepke (Faculty)

Institutional Effectiveness: Council: Fred Patrick (Faculty) & Craig Bach (Exec. Director Institutional Effectiveness)

Technology Council: Alberto Restrepo (Faculty)

Academic Policy & Planning (AP&P): Larry Manalo (Faculty) & David DeGroot (Faculty)

## **ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA**

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

Meeting called to order at 4:02 pm

### **2. Roll Call (26):**

H. Álvarez, B. Bryant, R. Chaudhari, D. DeGroot, A. Fox, Y. Frazier, A. Gisclon, A. Gómez de Torres (also proxy for D. Auten), S. Gottlieb, M. Guido Brunet, C. Hite, A. Kopcrak, M. Landeros, L. Manalo (present by proxy for S. Maxon), F. Patrick, C. Perales, C. Provencio, A. Restrepo, T. Roepke, A. Romo, M. Sequra, D. Serrano, C. Sprecher, K. Villa, L. West

**Quorum met**

### **3. Approval of Minutes from 10/14/25. [5] \* (HA)**

#### **Motion to approve by B. Bryant/seconded by A. Fox**

A. Kopcrack (AK) asked for clarification in a section of Public Comments, as what she documented in her personal notes may have been different than what is presented in the Senate notes in review. She shared that she may have incorrectly noted (referencing M. Segura's public comment) if what was stated during public comment was about 'tracking or information available regarding the processes and procedures of the Academic Senate'. M. Segura (MS) asked if it was her public question that AK referenced. AK said yes. MS replied she recalls her comment being about the role of the executive team, specifically in terms of reporting to the body, and the role in relation to closed sessions. AK asked if the Senate notes as presented align with MS's intended remarks. MS reviewed the section of the notes and replied that she "okay" with the notes as presented.

#### **AR asked if there were any objections or abstentions:**

**No: (0)**

**Abstain: (0)**

**10/14/25 minutes approved.**

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

A. Kopcrack (AK) expressed excitement about working on the Data Research Committee and collaborating with fellow faculty. She emphasized the importance of inclusivity in the process and encouraged faculty to reach out to address various needs and considerations.

B. Bryant shared feedback on yesterday's bomb threat and the campus response. He highlighted areas for improvement. There was difficulty with multiple campus communications, as some students thought the bomb threat was a drill. He suggested adding an option during student registration for them to sign up for emergency text alerts. He also suggested guidance is needed to improve evacuation procedures. He added that the traffic congestion that resulted (on around campus) was bad and there is a need for better coordination with local police and fire departments during campus evacuations. Further he noted that the Lompoc Center was left out of the loop regarding the closure information, which caused confusion. He teaches in Lompoc on Mondays, but no one knew it was closed. Faculty and students drove out to the Lompoc Center only to learn it was closed upon arrival.

A. Fox: shared her experience during the bomb threat, noting delays in receiving alerts and student confusion due to overlapping notifications (e.g., earthquake drill and bomb threat alerts). She suggested improving the communication system especially when multiple alerts are made to avoid confusion in the future. She stressed several times that students she encountered were very confused.

F. Davis (student representative) added that students felt unsafe due to the bad traffic jams that resulted due to no traffic management. She suggested that the college provides better guidance on how to evacuate.

L. West shared that she encountered students that were unclear about evacuation instructions (where to and how to evacuate) and suggested clearer messaging.

C. Sprecher referenced delays in notifications regarding the Lompoc campus closure, and noted the confusion encountered by students, faculty and staff due to mixed alerts.

L. McNulty shared that she noticed students waiting for the bus, and that evacuation plans need to consider evacuation for those that rely on buses.

A. Kopcrack (second comment). She shared feedback from the math department in reference to agenda item number #13. The math department expressed lots of frustration with the current process. She added there have been several meetings with Senate Exec (ASE), and several

meetings with the Professional Standards Committee (PSC). It was understood that much like other committee work, that things/items that come forward from committees were supposed to go straight to Consent, and not be an Information item. Such confusion makes the work that committees do frustrating, and it also delays their efforts to implement their recommendations. She added concern about the bad optics this may have with respect to high school partners and CCAP initiatives.

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

Roberts Rules of Order:

AR mentioned he has been polishing up on Roberts Rules of Order. He provided clarification that the Senate follows a modified use of Robert's Rules of Order (RRO). RRO is used as way to expedite meetings, and that Senate for some time has used a modified version of RRO as a voluntary framework to run the Senate meetings.

A. Fox asked who decides, and was the decision made by the President, or the body. AR mentioned that the decision was made years ago by the body, and that when he inherited a Senate Orientation presentation made by a previous Senate President (Marla Allegre) it explained that Senate has followed a modified form of RRO.

Faculty Evaluation Process:

An update on the semester-long work undertaken by Academic Senate Exec (ASE) on the faculty evaluation process was provided. ASE has also been working with the Faculty Association and Administration on this. Meetings have taken place on Fridays centered on revising the faculty evaluation process. Although the process has been slow, completion is nearing. Once finalized, the Evaluation Process documents will be brought to the Senate for approval.

## **CONSENT**

AR mentioned that moving forward if BP/APs have absolutely no changes and are under 5-year review they will be added to Consent. This practice used to happen in the past but for some reason we fell away from the practice. If there is even a minor change to items they will be placed as Information on the agenda.

### **6. Curriculum Summary Report. [5] (L. Manalo/D. DeGroot)**

### **7. BP/AP 5300 Student Equity. \* (M. Arvizu Rodriguez/G. Siwabessy)**

### **8. BP/AP 5570 Student Credit Card Solicitations. \* (M. Arvizu Rodriguez/G. Siwabessy)**

### **9. AP 5610 Voter Registration. \* (M. Arvizu Rodriguez/G. Siwabessy)**

**Motion to approve Consent Calendar made by L. Manalo/second by A. Kopcrack**

**No objections or abstentions**

**Consent Items 6, 7, 8, and 9 above are approved by Consent**

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **10. BP/AP 4900 Transfer of Credit and Course Waiver. \*\* [5] (J. Raybould-Rodgers (JRR)/B. Curry (BC))**

T. Roepke mentioned the BP and AP are combined and therefore can be considered together and not individually, per past Senate review practices. Items 11 and 12 would need to be separated out.

AR asked if there were any changes to these items, JRR and BC replied there have been no changes since the first read. AR replied that these items should have been placed on Consent.

**Motion to approve BP/AP 4900 made by B. Bryant/seconded by A. Fox**

**No:(0)**

**Abstain: (0)**

**BP/AP 4900 approved by Consensus**

**11. BP/AP 5052 Open Enrollment. \*\* [5] (M. Arvizu Rodriguez (MAR)/G. Siwabessy (GS))**

BP 5052:

**Motion to approve made by B. Bryant/seconded by L. Manalo**

**No:(0)**

**Abstain: (0)**

**BP 5052 approved by Consensus**

AP 5052:

L. Manalo asked why the Cosmetology program was struck from the BP. GS replied it was not included because it's not currently being offered currently, i.e., the Cosmetology program is currently not active.

Comment from the floor: Cosmetology is still in CurricUNET), so it should be in the BP. GS agreed to leave it and refer the AP to College Council.

**Motion to approve BP 5051 (with the amendment to include/return the wording of the Cosmetology Program back into the BP) made by B. Bryant/seconded by L. Manalo**

**No:(0)**

**Abstain: (0)**

**AP 5052 with the addition noted, approved by Consensus**

**12. BP 5205 Student Accident Insurance. \*\* [5] (M. Arvizu Rodriguez (MAR)/G. Siwabessy (GS))**

BP 5205:

**Motion to approve made by B. Bryant/seconded by A. Fox**

**No:(0)**

**Abstain: (0)**

**BP 5052 is approved by Consensus**

**INFORMATION (FOR FUTURE ACTION/APPROVAL)**

**13. Equivalency Petition for Faculty Positions. \* [10] (C. Montanez (CM)/D. Degroot (DD))**

*This item must come as an Information item again during the Spring 2026 semester, prior to a vote, since this is the last meeting of the Fall semester.*

Discussion focused on proposed revisions to the Equivalency Petition and the review/approval process.

A senator asked if this item relates to or is a result of CCAP.

A. Kopcrack (AK) clarified that while CCAP may be impacted by what the document proposes, the revisions were not designed in response to CCAP; concerns about equivalency predate CCAP. An example was given related to part-time faculty pools and applicants interested in teaching math courses whose previous education and experience does not meet the rigor of upper-division mathematics required by the math department in any significant way.

Addressing the floor, A. Restrepo (AR) stated that items can be on Consent when they are not controversial or are non-problematic. He noted that Senate Exec (ASE) reviewed and provided

feedback on a previous rough draft that was provided by the Professional Standards Committee (PSC). He acknowledged that the PSC initially advanced this version for Consent, however, there have been substantial changes to the document since ASE first reviewed it. Also, AR stated that there were also concerns raised at a recent Department Chairs meeting (November 5<sup>th</sup>): several departments shared they had not had sufficient opportunity to discuss the proposed changes in this document with their departments. Having been aware of this, ASE has an obligation that the item gets more widely heard, and therefore it came today as Information. Also, the perceived urgency to approve the document was reduced after B. Curry explained that any proposed changes would not apply to the upcoming round of approvals. The high schools require a 60-day timeline, and that timeline for the next approval cycle has passed and the upcoming approvals are unaffected since the due date has shifted to March 1<sup>st</sup> (instead of February 1<sup>st</sup>). Given these factors, ASE recommended the item be presented as an Information item rather than Consent to promote transparency and broader faculty and departmental discussion and input can occur.

AR emphasized that although equivalency decisions are local college and Academic Senate decisions, decisions need to be guided by Title 5. He added that nowhere in Title 5 does it state that individual departments can make the decisions. D. DeGroot added, "or disciplines" to AR's remarks. AR agreed with DD's remark.

AR added that as a Senate President he is concerned when it's perceived that power is delegated to departments to make decisions on equivalencies because it needs to be a College decision. AR shared that other faculty have also shared concerns with ASE that allowing departments or disciplines to independently grant equivalency sets a problematic precedent and conflicts with the intent of Title 5. D. DeGroot stated that he "agrees". AR reiterated that his intent is not to influence whether an option in the process gets added or removed, that he has no personal stake in this, rather the concern is with the interpretation of the process.

AR drew a parallel to the local decision-making process that is taking place around DEIA competencies and evaluation of faculty as a good example of the college and the Senate making decisions. The Chancellor's Office has never said that it's a decision left to departments or disciplines to create their own DEIA competencies, rather it's a college decision.

D. De Groot (DD), also a member of the PSC, drew attention to option D. He shared feedback from some department chairs: some agreed to keep D, others were fine with getting rid of D as an option. DD stated some disciplines want, as a compromise, to decide whether to use option D or not, and once a year they can change their decision. DD mentioned he is not happy with this approach for same reasons AR expressed earlier, stating this is not good way to proceed or good precedent to set.

L. West (LW) shared she is one of three faculty members in the PSC (along with DD and Carmen Montanez). She offered that she or Dave could present the proposed changes to departments that haven't yet had a chance to discuss them. AR requested that such a presentation would be great for them to do, and requested for them do it, so that it would help.

LW also shared that the PSC was made aware of concerns around Option D and also Option B. These would apply to those disciplines that require a master's degree (e.g. Math, English, Sociology, Psychology to name a few). This would not impact disciplines that do not require a master's degree.

The PSC is proposing two main changes:

Option B: change wording from "any discipline" to "a related discipline"

Option D: as noted in the document. She stated there has been ongoing debate following a request from the Math Department to remove Option D, and feedback from some department chairs at their meetings.

PSC acknowledged the ongoing debate and discussions between the PSC and department chairs, that some areas expressing concern, in particular, Kinesiology and Physical Education, about removing Option D, which PSC acknowledged. LW shared that data has been presented to the Math Department that shows that Options B and D are most frequently used while option E is rare, and options A and C are essentially not used.

As a compromise, the PSC proposed making Option D discipline-specific, like how College Now works. Departments would be able to opt in or opt out by set deadlines, with decisions tracked and not meant to be changed back and forth.

She added that the document as shown was a truncated working version focused only on relevant sections, not showing footnotes; the full text was not included for clarity.

**Motion to Extend discussion 5 additional minutes made by A. Kopcrack/seconded by L. Manalo.**

The proposal allows disciplines to elect *to opt out* of option D, decisions would need to be communicated to chair of the PSC by September 1<sup>st</sup> in preparation for the 26-27 academic year. A discipline would need to submit their decision to the Chair of the PSC by February 1<sup>st</sup>.

AR asked what the negative effects are of removing option D for departments. DD mentioned that the Recreation Department considers *walk-on* coaches to teach classes in their sport (e.g. volleyball, soccer classes), adding that a similar situation happens in the Fine Arts and CTE areas, where option D is often used.

D. Pirman stated she heard this was not designed with CCAP in mind necessarily, but since she deals with CCAP, she asked: why option D is considered less desirable to option A in a scenario where a high school math teacher with a bachelor's in math and master's in education but has no professional experience (option A) is preferred over a candidate with a bachelor's in math and six years of professional experience but no master's degree (option D). AK explained that Option A emphasizes 18 units of graduate-level or upper-division coursework intended to support broad subject-matter understanding.

Senators expressed lack of clarity and inconsistency with the interpretation of professional experience. PSC representatives acknowledge the concerns and that the committee was responding to a request brought forward, and that the equivalency forms are difficult to interpret and confirmed agreement to review and revise the forms in spring semester, they have found clearer models from other colleges.

**L. Manalo motions to extend discussion an additional five minutes (after hearing notice from timekeepers that time is up)/seconded by A. Kopcrack.**

A. Romo asked who has the final authority to approve the document. AR explained that PSC provides a draft (after departments have had the opportunity to review and discuss it and provide feedback), but final approval rests with the Senate. He added that this is why ASE placed the item as Information rather than Consent because it was not ready to adopt today since it has not had wider feedback.

A. Romo and M. Guido Brunet (MGB) objected to Option D, arguing that professional experience without advanced degrees does not adequately qualify instructors, and negatively affects student preparedness.

L. Manalo recommends adding discipline specific qualifiers or limiting Option D to areas such as CTE, excluding disciplines like English and Math.

C. Hite acknowledged A. Romo's statements and the English Departments position. He also sought clarification on whether these standards, once adopted, would effectively govern CCAP. Liz confirmed that equivalency standards would apply to anyone seeking equivalency to teach college courses, not just CCAP.

H. Alvarez emphasized that when we (as senators) take this item back to our departments for input it is also necessary to develop clear guidance so it can be provided at the next Senate meeting, adding that department feedback should help shape the Equivalency Petition. Otherwise, we run the risk of returning in February (2026) with little to offer PSC to shape the document and we'll find ourselves in the same predicament.

AR caution against creating discipline or department specific standards, referencing comments made earlier, that authority resides with the Senate and the college, not individual departments.

**Senators are to take this item to their departments for feedback as it will return to the first Senate meeting in February.**

## **REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)**

### **14. Add Without an Add Code Project. [10] (D. Vasquez (DV)/G. Siwabessy (GS))**

G. Siwabessy (GS) informed the body that last year the Student Success & Equity Committee (SSEC) did an assessment reviewing policies and practices that are barriers to students. SSEC brought forward to Student Services Council an interest in allowing students to add without an add code during the first week of the term. Winter 2025 was a test case. D. Vasquez (DV) and IT tested it out with few classes, 3 sections, and it went smoothly (students were able to add classes that had space/were not full/didn't have waitlists). GS added that all the identified target boxes were hit so this could be replicated toward a larger implementation).

ASBG drafted a resolution with an interest in supporting and expanding this project further. Conversations continued over the course of spring semester and DV has continued working with IT on the roll out. At the end of last spring, the interest in broader implementation was shared with Dept Chairs (they should have shared this with their departments then). This initiative was also shared with Senate Exec by way of a MEMO. The goal is to get this ready for the upcoming Winter (2026) term and Spring (2026).

#### **Discussion**

A. Fox asked for clarification on what was meant by boxes earlier. GS explained this referred to all the necessary IT related conditions needing to work to implement the initiative moving forward.

A. Fox what if a student registers on a Monday and does not show up for the week, can they be dropped. GS replied to follow your department's established policy, if that is what you consistently do, then yes student can be dropped.

L. West (LW) asked for clarification of when the waitlist feature starts. GS: if the class fills before the start of the semester then the waitlist is triggered. Once the class is full at the start of the semester then the need for an add code comes into effect. LW recommended that students be informed about how all this will work, and if they add the first week they need to show up to the very next class meeting to not fall behind.

M. Segura asked if this would complicate things with fraud and DL courses. DV mentioned the Chancellors Office has implemented measures to mitigate fraud, and it has diminished. He added that that he has been working with IT as well, and that overall, the CCC system has seen a decrease in fraud cases.

C. Provencio provided Kinesiology department feedback sharing concern that during that 1<sup>st</sup> week critical information is presented to students, including how to be successful in courses, and that having to request add codes would allow instructors to talk to students about what has been missed and how to ensure success. Concern now would be that students can just add and not talk to instructors, and his department is worried this may lead to students performing lower

than desired. Also, he asked if data will be collected on the outcomes to learn what results when students enroll later in the process. G. Bach thinks this is a good idea.

DV shared a workflow (tree) diagram that outlines the process and indicates what actions are allowed or not allowed at each step. He also created a FAQ document that was recently updated to incorporate helpful feedback and questions raised by Prof. Wendy Hadley. DV also shared the diagram at a Department Chairs meeting and received feedback that the diagram effectively illustrates the process.

TR asked if the FAQ document can be emailed to ASE so it can be shared with Senators and departments.

#### **15. Institutional Grants Update. \* [10] (L. McNulty (LMcN))**

L. McNulty (LMcN) provided an overview of current institutional grants, organized by three stages: grants in development, grants submitted, and newly awarded grants. The focus across many proposals is expanding short-term career pathways, supporting equity-focused student success initiatives, and stabilizing funding through a mix of public and private sources.

##### **Grants in Development:**

###### **California Regional Investment Initiative:**

A proposed aerospace-focused workforce grant developed in partnership with ArtCraft. The project would provide hands-on, short-term training pathways aligned with regional labor market needs by utilizing ArtCraft facilities during their off-hours. The model addresses space constraints on campus while offering students access to high-quality, real-world training and equipment.

###### **Dorothy Rupe Grant (CNA Support)**

An annually submitted grant to support CNA students with textbooks, uniforms, equipment, and licensing exam fees.

###### **Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (U.S. Department of Education CTE Grant (Short Pathways))**

A highly competitive federal grant supporting short-term (two years or less) CTE pathways, including both credit and noncredit programs such as truck driving, electronics, and engineering technology. The grant targets students facing financial barriers and aims to help them complete a small number of courses leading to industry certifications and livable-wage employment.

###### **Dental Hygiene Program (adding DH program):**

Dental hygiene was added due to strong regional demand. Grant funding would support costly equipment purchases, faculty staffing, and the use of off-site dental offices to address campus space limitations (local dentists have expressed interest).

##### **Grants Submitted**

###### **SEM Convergence / Henry Luce Foundation**

Submitted to help replace funding lost when a multi-college NSF undergraduate research grant was terminated. The project supports student research experiences, including summer research and transfer partnerships with Cal Poly, with a strong focus on women, students of color, and first-generation students. The college has been invited to a follow-up meeting with the foundation.

###### **Adult Learner Success Grant**

Focuses on outreach to students who stopped attending and were close to completing a degree or industry certification, encouraging re-enrollment and completion ("Start here, finish here").

### **Culturally Responsive/ Robert Wood Johnson Foundation**

This proposal aims to diversify STEM pathways, basic needs support, textbooks, conference attendance. The college was notified that it was not selected for funding.

### **Newly Awarded Grants**

#### **Bridges to the Baccalaureate Support/ Dana Foundation**

Private foundation funding is awarded to stabilize and sustain undergraduate research and transfer pathways. This marks the foundation's first-ever award to a community college and reflects a strategic shift toward cultivating private foundation partnerships amid uncertainty in federal funding.

#### **Rising Scholar Network / Juvenile Justice Program**

Continued funding under a new Chancellor's Office cycle to support justice-involved students.

#### **EEO Innovative Best Practices Grant/ Chancellor's Office**

A two-year award (approximately \$100,000) primarily focused on faculty support. A small portion is allocated to HR for contingency support related to equity initiatives (CSEA showed interest in having DRS after learning about the faculty DRS at the DEIA Summit).

Most of the funds will support faculty through faculty to faculty led mentoring and professional development projects informed by student success and equity data. Possible focus areas include culturally responsive curriculum, equity-minded grading, and teaching methodologies. Funds may be used for faculty mentorship, external experts, conferences, and professional learning opportunities. Craig Bach will serve as project director, with plans to recruit both full-time and part-time faculty mentors and develop a replicable model for data-informed faculty support. Inform departments and if faculty are interested reach out to Graig. GB mentioned that an announcement will also be made.

#### **College Corp**

Have received this in the past, funding to develop the next generation of leaders through meaningful community service.

LMcN mentioned a backlog of other grants, and she is willing to return to Senate to provide updates next semester

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

#### **16. Calendar Committee. [5] (M. McComas)**

Dan McNeal is presenting (Megan McComas could not attend). Dan serves on calendar committee as Co-Chair, Genevieve is Chair. The Calendar Committee is in the early stages of discussion and has not made any decisions. Two potential calendar changes are being explored for future calendars, with additional data and scenarios to be reviewed at the next meeting on December 1<sup>st</sup> in the Sky Room.

#### **Full Week Thanksgiving Break**

Proposal to take the entire week of Thanksgiving off. It would require adding approximately three instructional days elsewhere in the fall semester, most likely at the beginning. Not a common practice among community colleges; limited examples exist (e.g., San Diego CCD, Solano College adds a Wednesday). Potential benefits include alignment with K-12 calendars and support for students and staff with school-aged children.

Concerns include impacts on instructional days, finals scheduling, and Friday classes.

No decision has been made; faculty input is encouraged.

### **Compressed 16-Week Calendar**

Model includes 15 weeks of instruction plus one week of finals. It is common among CSUs and other colleges; Cuesta College is moving toward this model. Likely implementation would involve adding 5–10 minutes to class meetings.

Possible impacts discussed:

- Block scheduling and class meeting times
- Lab turnover time and workload, particularly in STEM and Friday/Saturday labs
- Effects on short-term courses (e.g., 8-week, late-start classes)
- Placement of spring break and term splits
- Potential implications for summer and winter session scheduling

### **Questions and Concerns Raised**

- Whether a finals week is required by Education Code and how would this look with 175-day and other contractual obligations.
- Impact of added class time on lab scheduling, facilities, and instruction.
- Effects on short-term courses (Terms 3 and 4).
- Consequences for Friday and Saturday classes, and labs.
- Whether calendar changes could better support summer and winter offerings.
- Need to review how peer institutions have implemented similar calendars.

The Calendar Committee will review additional data and calendar models at the December 1 meeting.

Faculty are encouraged to discuss these proposals within their departments and provide feedback.

Dan invited feedback directly, noting calendar changes are a negotiable item.

Further information will be shared with Senate once more analysis is completed

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

#### **None**

### **17. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND DEPARTMENT SUGGESTIONS**

A Fox asked about the meaning of the papers shown during the Senate meeting, she figured they are to remind the speakers about time remaining (e.g., five minutes vs 10 minutes left). B. Bryant asked what the meaning of the yellow paper shown.

A. Gomez de Torres (who shows the papers and keeps time) explained that yellow means five minutes left on the topic. AF said its confusing because there are 15-minute signs, 10-minute times, and suggested it may be better to have laminated, color coded, larger signs on a stick.

H. Alvarez emphasized the importance of senators fulfilling their roles as representatives of the faculty by actively communicating what takes place at Senate meetings to departments, the same applies to faculty reps on a council or committee. While productive discussions are occurring at councils and committees, and in today's senate meeting, HA noted the need to ensure such conversations are consistently shared with departments, and that departmental feedback is brought back and it should be brought back to the Senate floor. This two-way communication helps ensure that departmental feedback informs Senate discussions thereby reflecting a collective faculty voice that informs the development and refinement of policies and other work taken on by Senate and its Standing Committees. He added that this is a

responsibility that applies to all senators, not only ASE members, and encouraged continued improvement in this area.

## **18. ADJOURN**

5:45 pm, meeting adjourned

*Next Academic Senate Meeting: February 10, 2026.*

*Agenda Items due by February 3, 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>

## **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:**

Mark Hammil or  
Leonard Champion

### **Applied Social Sciences:**

Yvon Frazier

### **English:**

Melanie Guido Brunet  
Chris Carroll  
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 Kopcak  
Martin Landeros  
Liz West

### **Part-Time Faculty Reps.:**

Monique Segura  
Chris Sprecher  
Rajni Chaudhari