

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

Minutes for Tuesday, February 10, 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

Vice President: Ana Gómez de Torres

Secretary: Héctor Álvarez

Member-at-Large: Fred Patrick

Member-at-Large: Thesa Roepke

**Voting Members Present:**

Héctor Álvarez, Diane Auten, Ben Britten, Chris Carroll, Rajni Chaudhari, David DeGroot, Alicia Fox, Yvon Frazier, Amy Gisclon, Anna Gómez de Torres, Sean Gottlieb, Chris Hite, Anna Kopcrak, Martin Landeros, Gabriel Marquez, Anne McMeeking, 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, Liz West

Proxy Voters: Larry Manalo (for Shavaun Maxon)

*\*\*\* Remote Participants:* Melanie Guido Brunet, Marc Hammill

**Student Representative:**

Faith Davis, ASBG, Director Academic Affairs

**Guests:**

LeeAnne McNulty (Dir., Institutional Grants), Deborah Pirman (Dean, Extended Campus), Philip Moore (Programmer, ITS), Wendy Sutter (Faculty)

*\*\*\*Remote Participant Guest:* Monica Millard (Dean, Academic Affairs)

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

- Student Learning Council: Bob Curry (Asst. Supt./VP Academic Affairs)
- Student Services Council: Maria Arvizu-Rodriguez (Faculty) & Genevieve Siwabessy (Asst. Supt./VP Student Services)
- Human Resources Council: Thesa Roepke (Faculty) & Ruben Ramirez (Exec. Dir., HR)
- Institutional Effectiveness: Council: Fred Patrick (Faculty) & Craig Bach (Exec. Dir. Institutional Effectiveness)
- Technology Council: Alberto Restrepo (Faculty) & Andy Specht (Exec. Dir., IT Services)
- 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 4:05 pm

**2. Roll Call:**

H. Álvarez, B. Britten, C. Carroll, D. DeGroot, A. Fox, Y. Frazier, A. Gisclon, A. Gómez de Torres, 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, M. Sequira, D. Serrano, C. Sprecher, K. Villa, L. West

**Quorum met**

**3. Approval of Minutes from 10/28/25 and 11/25/2025 [5] \* (HA)**

10/28/25 and 11/25/25 minutes reviewed.

10/28/25 notes:

C. Hite requested revision, noting that the section of the notes that lists the Senate Department Representatives (page 8) has his last name misspelled as *Hit* and should be corrected to Hite.

T. Roepke noted the meeting date on page 1 of the notes is listed *2005* and should be corrected to 2025.

**Motion to approve minutes from 10/28/25 (amended with corrections noted), and the minutes from 11/25/2025 made by L. Manalo/seconded by B. Britten**

A. Restrepo asked if there were any objections or abstentions to approve the notes and in particular the notes from 10/28 with the minor correction amendments presented above:

**No: (0)**

**Abstain: (0)**

**10/28/25 & 11/15/25 minutes approved**

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

Wendy Sutter (Faculty, Mathematical Sciences Dept.) addressed Agenda Item 11. She stated the Math Department has been working on proposed changes to equivalency since March 2025. The Professional Standards Committee (PSC) presented proposed changes at the Department Chair meetings on October 13 and November 5, 2025, where at the Nov. 5<sup>th</sup> meeting it was learned that some departments had not yet had the opportunity to discuss the proposed changes. The revised equivalency petition appeared on the Senate agenda at the end of November but was not voted on. The Math Dept. had hoped for approval by November 28 to meet the CCAP equivalency petition deadline. The item returned to the Senate today (February 10) with no vote taking place, and it will return to the next Senate meeting for a vote. Sutter urged senators to communicate the proposed changes to their departments so a vote can take place in time before the hiring of new instructors in March 2026. She emphasized the proposal retains an option (Item D) for departments that wish to keep it, while also allowing departments to opt out and eliminate Item D if preferred. She encouraged approval of the proposed changes, citing benefits to both the Math Dept. and the college as a whole. She requested further that, if campus-wide approval is not granted by the Senate, that it be approved at minimum for the Math Dept., given their year-long effort on this work.

LeeAnne McNulty and Craig Bach: Reminded the Senate that the college received a Community College Chancellor's Office EEO grant that includes professional development funds for faculty-to-faculty peer-to-peer training. Approximately \$100,000 is available from the grant, with some funds allocated to HR for specific area needs. Faculty interested in developing and leading peer-peer training, including work connected to the new First Year Experience Program, are encouraged to contact Craig.

Philip Moore (programmer, ITS) introduced a new tool he developed that allows students to generate a visual depiction of the courses they are considering adding at the time of registration. The tool will interface with Banner to pull course information into a visual format that can benefit students. Further, this tool will enable students to organize and explore available course options.

Working sessions will be scheduled for folks to attend. A. Restrepo noted that Philip has been invited to present the tool at a future Senate meeting.

C. Reed (Chief negotiator for Faculty Association (FA)) distributed and read a prepared statement (developed by all the FA Officers):

"The Faculty Association and the Academic Senate have worked very hard over the last several years to ensure a professional separation of duties and roles on our campus between the two entities. For those of you who have brought issues forward to the FA for which are those within the role of Senate, your union has supported you in working with the Senate to resolve issues, but remained clear in what issues are the purview of the FA and what issues are the purview of the Senate. As a reminder, the union represents and supports advancements in working conditions and those matters subject to collective bargaining. The Academic Senate represents and supports advancements in 10+1: academic/pedagogical matters.

A few months ago, it came to the FA's attention that part-time faculty representation on the Senate is appointed by the PTFA, that part-time Senate representatives are paid by the PTFA to serve on the Senate, and, in order to be appointed to the Senate, a part-time faculty member must be a union member (paying dues). This struck the union officers as a conflict of interest. While the FA does attend Senate meetings for matters of consultation if needed, the FA does not appoint any senators, pay them to serve, or have any voting rights on matters pertaining to the Senate. At our last union statewide meeting, we asked other unions how part-time faculty were appointed to serve on their senates. No campus had ever even seen a model similar to ours, and we were advised strongly against mixing matters between the union and the Senate. Part-timers at other campuses were elected to serve on their senates through an election in which they were voted in by their peers - a process completely separate from their collective bargaining processes.

The FA would like to remind everyone that serving on councils and committees through our shared governance process is different from serving on the Senate. Councils and committees, as outlined in the CCPD, have appointed representatives from Senate and from FA depending on the charge of the council/committee. While Senate and FA both have representatives appointed to serve on councils and committees, as well as the PTFA, those appointments are based on the role of the representative - that of academic matters or those of working conditions. Unlike shared governance, having part-time faculty members appointed and paid by their union to serve on the Senate is a conflict of interest and does not follow the professional structures for which are in place at this institution and across the state.

The FA does not want this statement to be seen as one of against the PTFA or part-time faculty. The FA truly values the contributions of PTFA and part-time faculty. We are simply asking the Senate to address this conflict of interest by revisiting their bylaws as well as developing a model of PT faculty appointing that models' standards across the state. This is a great opportunity for part-time faculty to more effectively have their voices represented in a model that gives all part-time faculty an opportunity to serve separately from the influence of the union."

Patricia Sanchez-Koivisto (Part-Time Faculty in Kinesiology/Athletics Dept.): Speaking on behalf of Part-Time Faculty Association (PFA) in response to the letter. The PFA affirms their strong support for shared governance and the important role of the Academic Senate. She emphasized that the part-time faculty role is vital in the mission of the college, and that part-time faculty participation in Senate helps ensure that a 'complete faculty perspective' is represented in academic and professional matters, and that their engagement strengthens all faculty and student success. She encouraged continued collaboration with Senate leadership to ensure that part-time faculty voices are included in Senate representation as it strengthens the Senate and the college.

Monique Segura (PFA Senator from Fine Arts): Asserted that the PFA's internal functions are determined by the PFA, and not by external bodies. She added that it appears the FA is attempting to bargain on behalf of PFA and this is problematic. She cautioned that asking random individuals from other colleges about part-time faculty participation at those colleges is anecdotal at best. She added that she can name many colleges that function as AHC functions with respect to part-time faculty. She noted that the PFA represents all part-time faculty, regardless of union membership (following the Janus Ruling). She noted that PT faculty are not compensated for service in the same manner as FT faculty, and expressed concern that the current discussion is divisive. She encouraged the Senate to focus on positive collaboration moving forward.

Chris Sprecher stated he is the most recent part-time faculty to serve as a Senator (teaches political science). He clarified the PFA appointment process stating that the PFA Board does not directly appoint senators. Instead, the PFA President issues a call for who would like to serve as senators. Interested part-time faculty would respond and submit their names/interest. Then, those interested are invited to present to the PFA Board. The PFA Board hears from those interested (a presentation is made and then they step outside). The PFA Board then discusses, and votes to appoint. Sprecher disputed claims that part-time senators are simply appointed and not elected as a falsehood. He characterized the concerns raised as divisive and unfair, especially given the PFA has new leadership.

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

Acknowledged the robust public comments. AR also welcomed everyone back for the new semester.

Committee Vacancies: Reminded everyone of the urgent need for faculty to serve on committees, in particular the Sabbatical and Academic Integrity Committees. Interested faculty should contact Fred Patrick; appointments are first-come, first-served.

AR reminded everyone that, per Senate practice, items do not carry over from Information to Action across breaks (e.g., Summer or Winter breaks).

Any items presented as Information at the final meeting of the previous semester must be reintroduced as Information during the first meeting of the new semester.

Consequently, the Equivalency Petition Item is listed as Information and is expected to return for Action at the next scheduled Senate Meeting.

#### **CONSENT**

None

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

None

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

##### **6. BP/AP 3430 Prohibition of Harassment. \* [5] (T. Roepke (TR)/R. Ramirez (RR))**

RR presented updates to BP/AP 3430, noting changes are part of the standard 'League updates' involving definition changes.

Attention was drawn to the AP's section on Academic Freedom. It was clarified that although the language in the section was previously stricken the last time the AP was reviewed, it is now legally advised to be included. The clause specifies that while Academic Freedom exists it does not protect conduct that violates the law and anti-discrimination or harassment laws (e.g., Title IX). It was stressed that classroom content must have clear connection to the COR.

L. Manalo requested if an update to include "Freedom of Speech" and "Academic Freedom" can be considered, as they are distinct concepts.

RR replied it could be added to the header.

A. Restrepo (AR): emphasized the need to cross-reference this document with the standalone Academic Freedom policy. He reminded everyone that when policies are reviewed, and a policy mentions something that is also mentioned or part of another policy that it's important to look at both policies to ensure consistency and avoid any contradictions between documents and policies.

A. Kopcrack inquired about the mandated sexual harassment trainings faculty are required to complete (and are sent notifications about from HR) and if there is a need to mention these mandated trainings in this AP.

RR noted that while these requirements are critical and referenced in related policies (BP/AP 3435) they are not explicitly detailed/necessary in this specific AP.

AR: directed Senators to take these items back to their departments for feedback, as the BP/AP will return for Action at the next meeting.

**7. BP/AP 5010 Admissions. \* [5] (M. Arvizu-Rodriguez (MAR))/G. Siwabessy (GS))**

MAR presented updates/changes that are part of the standard 'League updates' involving definition changes around Concurrent vs Dual enrollment terminology.

L. Manalo asked about the college website language pertaining to the terminology: as it indicates dual enrollment not concurrent enrollment and asked if both should be added for consistency.

MAR agreed, acknowledging the state-level changes in the language used around those concepts can be confusing and she will follow up on this.

AR asked for clarification around those words and how they are framed or appear in state and legislative documents: what term(s) are now being used: is it dual enrollment or concurrent enrollment? B. Curry (BC) mentioned they are the same and he has seen both terms used.

L. West asked for clarification on the terms Concurrent Enrollment, Dual Enrollment, and CCAP.

D. Pirman clarified that all CCAP students are concurrent enrollment students, not all concurrent enrollment students are CCAP students, as not all concurrent enrollment students are part of the CCAP agreement.

BC added that dual enrollment is a common term that has been used for decades, and that concurrent enrollment is the official language used at the state level. CCAP refers to specific agreements entered into by the District with high schools.

A. Kopcrack asked if CCAP students in these categories complete or go through the college application process and have access to the student portal as other AHC students. MAR replied yes.

AP 5010: It was noted that the AP was missing an identifying label in the current draft; GS stated it will be corrected.

AR: Senators are to take these to departments for feedback and will return for the next meeting for Action.

**8. BP 5120 Transfer Center. \* [5] (M. Arvizu Rodriguez (MAR))/G. Siwabessy (GS))**

MAR: Student Services Council made minor changes to make it flow better and align with the District's Student Equity Plan.

L. Manalo asked if the BP includes transfer to other community colleges (as the college has entered partnerships (e.g., AHC to SBCC Radiography and is also looking into partnering with Oxnard College for Dental Hygiene).

MAR: no, it deals with transfer to four-year institutions/universities.

B. Britten: BP references baccalaureate so if community college has a bachelor's degree it will apply.

**9. BP/AP 5510 Off-Campus Student Incidents. \*[5] (M. Arvizu Rodriguez (MAR)/G. Siwabessy (GS))**

AR mentioned that when these items were submitted they had a different name and he took the liberty to change the name to Off-Campus Student Incidents. GS was thankful and said no problem.

Discussion focused on title changes and clarifying that the policy pertains to student incidents rather than organizations. MAR added there are few changes, other than title change.

AR: take the BP/AP to departments for feedback, as they return to Senate for Action next meeting.

**10. BP 7810 Faculty Emeritus Status. \* (T. Roepke (TR)/R. Ramirez (RR)/M. Segura (MS))**

TR: there are moderate changes. Previously, emeritus status was for full-time faculty only. It was report that MS addressed HR Council asking for part-time faculty to be considered for emeritus status.

HR Council developed a change to criteria inclusive of part-time faculty (this is the most substantive change). The criteria for full-time faculty have not changed.

Questions about qualifying for discount to campus events or function were addressed and language was added to BP so its equal to what full-time faculty can receive. RR mentioned that item #5 was stricken because there is no designated workplace available.

Larry asked if there is mentioned to access to computers in retirement. AR clarified that there is access to an email account but not hardware.

AR: take the BP to departments for feedback, as it returns to Senate for Action next meeting.

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

T. Roepke reminded Senators that due to technical issues with SharePoint, in order to view the full changes in the document, particularly the footnotes, the document needs to be downloaded as they are not appearing in the SharePoint web preview. This was also noted in the SharePoint when the file is accessed, but it will be updated. She noted that what is projected on the screen in the mtg. shows the actual changes proposed in the document.

L. West (LW) presented: the proposal introduces two primary modifications for disciplines requiring a Master's degree. First, Item B was updated to include "Master's degree in a related discipline" to ensure that candidates possess a degree specifically relevant to their field of instruction. Second, the proposal establishes a provision allowing specific disciplines to opt out of Option D, which currently permits equivalency based on a Bachelor's degree and professional experience and additional units. To ensure clarity on deadlines and before the hiring cycle begins, language was added requiring departments to submit their opt-out preference and notification to the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) by September 1 of each academic year.

Discussion:

S. Gottlieb sought clarification on whether the opt-out option, does it apply to departments or disciplines? LW clarified that the proposal uses the term "disciplines" and is strictly an "opt-out"

process, as all disciplines are currently considered "opted-in." DD added that the PSC has already sought feedback on this from department chairs.

B. Britten (BB) asked about potential litigation the college can face due to the opt-in one year and the possibility to opt-out the next year. Concerned with the flip-flopping.

R. Ramirez (RR) also expressed concern regarding the "flip-flopping" that would allow a discipline to opt-out one year and return the next. He noted that such inconsistent standards over time create a "messy" hiring environment and could expose the District to litigation risks. RR argued that having different standards for different applicants over time is problematic and recommended an "all or nothing" approach, that is, if you opt-out then you're out, or if you opt in your in, you're in. RR added that the Chancellor's Office views equivalency as a vital tool for EEO and inclusive hiring practices.

B. Curry (BC) noted that equivalency is permanent once it's granted to an individual.

AR requesting further legal review to ensure District is compliance related to Title V and the grandfathering of equivalencies. BC agreed it will be researched.

BB asked if the PSC has considered what constitutes a "related" Master's degree (gave an example of the Global Studies degree, adding some would say its related to Sociology, some would say Economics, others may say it's not because it's an interdisciplinary degree).

A. Romo suggested a definitive list of related disciplines be developed to eliminate "gray areas" and subjective interpretations.

H. Álvarez (HA) recommended that the state equivalency manual/minimum quals list be explicitly referenced and included in the Equivalency document in review, as this is what is considered a baseline to ensure consistency across the state making decisions less subjective or ambiguous.

LW and DD acknowledged. LW added she will take these ideas back to PSC; DD added that he references minimum quals when situations arise can be considered subjective or ambiguous.

DD reminded the Senate that the college's historically flexible equivalency standards were designed to address the difficulty of recruiting faculty to hired in the college, as the college is in a rural area compared to interest in college's in larger areas.

A. Gomez de Torres (AGdT) inquired about the PSC consideration of pros and cons of opting-in or opting-out.

LW reviewed pros and cons submitted by C. Montanez.

Pros of opting-out would be that departments maintain autonomy over their hiring standards. It would reduce administrative burden by avoiding extra paperwork, and it would allow flexibility for departments to tailor their process.

The cons would be exactly what Dave has mentioned previously: that the candidate pool would shrink. Changing decisions later could cause delays and confusion, and it creates inconsistency across departments, drawing possible scrutiny.

AR cautioned the Senate that state law typically grants the freedom to determine equivalency to the District as a whole, rather than to individual departments or disciplines, and warned against creating a fragmented, non-district-wide policy.

DD agreed, adding that this would create a slippery slope.

RR addressed BB's concerns regarding litigation risks from varying departmental hiring standards. RR clarified that minimum requirements could differ by discipline and that allowing committees to establish distinct competencies is generally acceptable.

RR stated that a review of Title 5 regulations in regard will take place.

He also highlighted that the Chancellor's Office advocates that Districts utilize robust equivalency processes as a best practice for Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO). He emphasized that such processes are intended to break down systemic barriers and foster inclusivity by broadening the candidate pool rather than limiting it. He added that the goals of the equivalency revisions could be achieved through current hiring processes rather than the formal removal of Option D. Refining faculty hiring policies can be an option, specifically through the way competencies are scored, interviews are conducted, and teaching demonstrations are weighted.

Departments can effectively prioritize 'exceptionally qualified' candidates without categorically excluding those who are 'minimally qualified'. RR emphasized that granting equivalency simply allows a candidate to enter the pool; it does not guarantee they are the most qualified for the position, suggesting that a wide recruitment net remains as a valuable tool for finding the candidate who is the best fit for the college.

**Motion to extend discussion 5 minutes by B. Britten/seconded S. Gottlieb**

No objections or abstentions, motion carried.

A. McMeeking reported that the link in the document to the California Community Colleges (CCC) minimum qualifications list takes someone to a different resource.

B. Britten and L. West acknowledged the difficulty of navigating the state website and the frequency of link changes.

H. Álvarez suggested that the PSC address the broken link, and ensure it remains viable due to external factors that control the link.

PSC members confirmed they are working on ensuring the document issues are addressed and links managed.

A. Romo acknowledged RR's earlier suggestions on using rigorous hiring scoring methods noting that it works but only for internal recruitment, but it fails to address the real issue under discussion: CCAP applicants seeking equivalency. She expressed concern that without strict equivalency standards centered on CCAP, instructors with unrelated degrees could be cleared to teach specialized courses.

RR acknowledged the CCAP challenge. He added his earlier comments were not specific to CCAP but should be considered and cautioned that 'carving off' equivalency criteria have unintended consequences. He cited EEO plan data noting that only 12.4% of Master's degree holders nationwide are Latino or Hispanic, emphasizing that equivalency was specifically designed to bridge such gaps and avoid unintended exclusionary effects.

G. Marquez (GM) underscored the necessity of industry experience in Career and Technical Education (CTE) related to recent CCAP applicant interest. He argued that a bachelor's degree holder with minimal practical/industry experience might technically qualify to teach but they would be lacking the industry knowledge that is only acquired by 10, 20 or 30 years of professional work experience. GM argued is what is necessary to prepare our students for the workforce. He warned that relying solely on formal degrees without relevant professional or industry work experience (as is currently taking place within the CCAP framework) could compromise CTE program viability and student employment outcomes if professional expertise is not considered.

AR noted that time is up and directed Senators to take this item to departments as it will return for action at the next meeting.

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

### **12. Faculty Innovation Grant. [10] J. Bellrose**

Joann Bellrose, faculty, instructor and program coordinator for the Certified Nursing Program (CNA) reported on the successful implementation of the Innovation Grant awarded during the spring semester, 2025. The grant funded an additional clinical instructor to support groups of 15 students, improving on the instructor to student ratio that traditionally creates bottlenecks due to the high volume of mandated skills checks required by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH). CDPH mandates 1 instructor for 15 students only, and by having an extra instructor across the five local facilities in use by the CNA program, significant increases in efficiency and reduced student frustration was evident because it was possible to accelerate the skills-verification process required by the instructor(s).

The grant directly benefited student learning and success by allowing for small-group instruction and one-on-one instruction for complex tasks like manual blood pressure testing, which Belrose noted helped ease student anxiety around this and other clinical tests. This proved to be of great benefit for students, especially those students that struggle. The dual-instructor model improved delivery of orientations that are required in the facilities and improved safety. The impact was reflected in a 100% pass rate in the state board test, with testers and local facilities noting that Hancock student graduates were exceptionally well-prepared compared to peers from other institutions. Student feedback was also overwhelmingly positive, highlighting the value of increased practice time and reduced wait periods for instructor observation allowing students to get skills checked and not miss other available opportunities. The instructor's feedback was also positive. Bellrose was thankful for the grant, and grateful to L. Manalo for his assistance with the grant.

### **13. CCAP Taskforce Update. [10] (A. Gomez de Torres (AGdT)/B. Curry (BC))**

AGdT emphasized that the taskforce has been meeting weekly since October 2024 to address the state-mandated expansion of CCAP. She noted that the taskforce is currently refining documents, including site and instructor approval forms, faculty portfolio guidelines, and evaluation procedures. She invited participation reminding everyone that the taskforce is an open meeting every Thursday (4 to 5:30 p.m.) where all faculty are encouraged to bring their concerns. She added that CCAP is here, it's a state directive, and invited anyone to participate.

M. Segura (MS) asked if part-time faculty are on the taskforce. AGdT said no. BC clarified that the group has primarily been departmentally focused rather than labor focused. It was stated that the invitation for faculty participation was issued last semester at a Senate meeting. B. Britten confirmed that at least one part-time counselor inquired about volunteering. MS suggested that part-time faculty may not have been sufficiently informed.

Several comments from the floor: senators stated that they recall the invitation to all faculty was made last semester, at a previous Senate meeting.

C. Hite (CH): asked if the task force is considering publishing recommendations related to the implications of CCAP hiring, specifically linking this to the previous discussion centered around Agenda Item 11 (Equivalency). CH suggested that the taskforce should provide formal guidance on equivalency standards, particularly as it pertains to the CCAP Memorandum of Understanding.

Comments in response from the floor: several senators agreed with CH.

L. West (LW) added that when the college hires a CCAP teacher, even though they are not our faculty, they are hired to teach our courses, and this means they have been determined to be equivalent to AHC faculty. So, an argument can be made that if they are hired to teach CCAP courses then they are eligible to teach other AHC courses.

CH added, in regard to larger state push to increase CCAP courses, that it seems like colleges are being asked to overlook the fact that high school teachers do not meet min. quals requirements and then are encouraged to use option D (it can be viewed that admin is pushing this).

BC replied that they (admin) have always followed the recommendations made by the PSC, except one time, which was a unique circumstance.

D. Pirman (DP) added that new forms have been developed to clearly delineate decisions regarding course approval and instructor equivalency to prevent misunderstandings.

A. Kopcrack asked if the taskforce or if anyone is aware of potential new legislation or mandates coming from the Chancellors Office related to what can or cannot be done relative to CCAP.

A. Restrepo clarified that CCAP mandates come directly from Sacramento/legislation and Education Code, rather than the Chancellor's Office.

DP added that Vision 2030 includes mention of CCAP.

**14. Program Vitality Process and the Discontinuance of the Paramedic Program. \* [10] (ASE/B. Curry (BC))**

AR: this item will serve as the inaugural "test case" for the college's newly refined Program Vitality Policy. AR reminded the Senate that the updated policy, developed collaboratively with Senate Executive leadership (acknowledged N. Jo Ward) and the administration work that occurred last year, provides three pathways for program discontinuance: 1): a comprehensive year-long evaluation, 2): an expedited process, or 3): an immediate discontinuance if specific criteria are met and both the faculty in the program and administration are in full agreement. In this instance, both the Paramedic faculty and the administration concur that the program is no longer viable.

BC provided the background for the recommendation, noting that while the program is high-quality, its operational model was built on a partnership with Santa Barbara County Fire that failed to materialize. The college anticipated that County Fire would secure the regional emergency services contract, allowing students free access to mandatory ride-along clinical hours. However, when the contract was instead awarded to AMR (a private entity), things shifted. AMR requires the college to pay for student placements, a cost model that the District cannot sustain. For the past two years, the program has struggled to place students, forcing them to travel as far as Bakersfield or Ventura for clinical hours. While the decision is difficult, BC noted that a viable Paramedic program remains available at Cuesta College, providing a local alternative for students.

The administration is recommending the expedited process (the criteria-based exemption), given that the data and rationale presented in program faculty report are so clearly aligned to qualify for expedited process. A detailed report was authored by Sean, the faculty program lead, has been prepared and includes a teach-out plan. BC clarified that once the current one-year cohort completes their studies, no new students will be admitted.

AR emphasized that Senate Exec (ASE) initially approached this proposal with heavy skepticism and caution. However, after a thorough review of the exhaustive data presented, ASE felt the discontinuance was justified. He assured everyone that ASE did not take programs proposed for discontinuance lightly, as ASE always looks out for the maintenance of academic programs.

S. Gottlieb pointed out that the link to access the report is not working. AGdT and TR acknowledged awareness of the technical issues with the links to the document during the meeting, and the full report is now available on Senate's SharePoint.

AR: asked senators to review and share the full report with their departments before the item returns at the next meeting for further consideration.

**15. Follow-up To (and 'Lessons Learned' From) November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2025, Campus Emergency Evacuation. \* [10] (T. Aye (TA)/D. Curran (DC))**

DC provided an update on the 'lessons learned' following the recent bomb threat and campus closure. He reported that while the campus was successfully cleared in under an hour, the transition was not perfect. The Facilities Council is currently reviewing feedback to improve emergency preparedness, with a specific focus on refining communication and messaging protocols. The hope is that nothing like this happens again, but should it, the campus and local police department will be better prepared.

A significant portion of the discussion centered on the challenges of exiting campus during an emergency.

A. Kopcrack inquired about the status of coordinating with local law enforcement for off-campus traffic control. DC confirmed that while Santa Maria PD arrived within ten minutes, managing the gridlock at campus exits was difficult.

A. Fox (AF) shared student reports of 30-minute delays, specifically noting that regular traffic continued to flow toward campus on Bradley Road, while students were trying to evacuate.

DC acknowledged that Santa Maria PD is reviewing their own procedures to better manage perimeter shutdowns and prevent incoming traffic should future evacuations be required.

AF questioned if the formal 'lessons learned' document included the extensive public comments made during a previous Senate meeting. While DC could only verify the data provided to the Facilities Council, G. Siwabessy confirmed that notes from those meetings were captured (by Graig and herself) and brought back to the Cabinet to ensure that faculty concerns and student experiences are integrated into the final emergency response plan.

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

**16. Facilities Council. [5] (T. Aye (TA)/D. Curran (DC))**

DC provided an update on the college's facilities planning, focusing on the state of aging infrastructure and college's strategy for long-term funding. He highlighted that the college is currently prioritizing its deferred maintenance and capital projects lists. Several immediate concerns were shared:

HVAC Systems: Following a major failure in Bldg. M, the college is proactively monitoring the Building D unit, which is approximately 40–50 years old and nearing the end of its life.

Electrical Systems: Portions of the campus electrical grid are over 60 years old and require significant upgrades to ensure stability and safety.

Multiple buildings have exceeded the 40- to 60-year mark, with Bldg. N identified as the highest priority for complete modernization or replacement.

With the 2006 bond funds nearly exhausted, the administration is discussing a new bond measure for the November 2026 ballot.

Funding Goals: The proposal seeks an authorization between \$190 million and \$290 million, intended to sustain campus improvements for the next 20 to 30 years.

Priorities for these funds include the Building N project, upgrading CTE (Career and Technical Education) facilities to meet local workforce demands, and improving campus-wide safety and technology.

The Board of Trustees is expected to vote in June on whether to officially move forward with a bond measure for the election. In the interim, the college will begin community outreach

with local organizations like Rotary and parent support groups at local schools to build awareness and support.

**17. Budget Council (G. Bierly (GB)/D. Curran (DC))**

DC provided an update on the budget outlook as the college begins the budget cycle for fiscal year 26-27. While the institution remains fiscally stable, DC noted several emerging pressures on the general fund. For the first time in many years, the college is facing a projected budget deficit. DC identified several factors contributing to this shift:

Flat Apportionment. The college has received the same amount of state apportionment for two consecutive years, which has not kept pace with rising operational costs.

Rising Fixed Costs: Even without new contractual obligations, non-discretionary expenses including insurance, utilities, and IT service contracts continue to increase annually.

Deficit Projections: The Board-approved budget reflects a nearly \$6 million deficit, though DC expects the actual year-end figure to be closer to \$2 million due to conservative budgeting practices. The college intends to use its reserves to cover this shortfall.

DC added that despite the current deficit, the long-term fiscal outlook relies heavily on enrollment, and enrollment is slowly increasing. He hopes enrollment growth is sustained as expected to gradually increase state funding over the next two to three years, with the goal of returning to a surplus budget. Future stability remains dependent on the state's COLA (Cost of Living Adjustment) and the outcome of upcoming collective bargaining cycles with CSEA, part-time faculty (PFA), and full-time faculty (FA).

**18. Technology Council (AR/A. Specht (AS))**

(AR) provided an update focusing on the statewide rollout of Gemini AI. He added that the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office has secured a contract providing the full version of Gemini AI to all CA CCCs at no cost. He acknowledged that access to such a powerful tool may cause many concern regarding academic integrity, and the Technology Council and Cabinet agreed that the college should not, and cannot, hide this resource from students, many of whom have already discovered and have begun using it.

The administration intends to launch a dedicated webpage with sign-up instructions soon. AR emphasized the importance of informing faculty through the Senate before this general or broader announcement is made. He added that perhaps the release of Gemini AI will motivate faculty to participate in the Academic Integrity Committee to address the evolving landscape of AI use in the classroom.

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

**None**

**19. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND DEPARTMENT SUGGESTIONS**

None

**18. ADJOURN**

**Meeting adjourned at 6 pm**

*Next Academic Senate Meeting: February 24, 2026.*

*Agenda Items due by February 17, 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:**

Marc Hammill 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 Kopcrak  
Martin Landeros  
Liz West

**Part-Time Faculty Reps.:**

Monique Segura  
Chris Sprecher  
Rajni Chaudhari