ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE
Academic Senate Meeting

Minutes for Tuesday, February 24, 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, Melanie Guido Brunet, Marc Hammill, Alicia Fox, Yvon Frazier, Amy Gisclon, Sean Gottlieb, Chris Hite, Anna Kopcrak, Martin Landeros, Gabriel Marquez, Shavaun Maxon, 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

Student Representative:

Guests:

Erica Biely, (Supv., First Year Exp. Prog.); LeeAnne McNulty (Dir., Inst. Grants); Larry Manalo (Faculty, Health Sciences); David Millard (Chief, Campus Police); M. Millard (Dean, AA, Fine Arts, Social & Behavioral Sciences); Philip Moore (Programmer, IT Services); Deborah Pirman (Dean, Ext. Campus); P. Sanchez-Koivisto (Faculty, Kinesiology, Recreation, Athletics); J. Solorio (Faculty, English); Wendy Sutter (Faculty, Mathematical Sciences)

***Remote Participant Guest:
   Christine Reed (Counselor/Coordinator, MESA/STEM Academic Succes Center)

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

- Student Learning Council: (Julia Raybould-Rodgers (Faculty, English Dept.) & Bob Curry (Asst. Supt./VP Academic Affairs)
- Student Services Council: Maria Arvizu-Rodriguez (Faculty, Counseling Dept.: Univ. Transfer Ctr.)
- Human Resources Council: Thesa Roepke (Faculty, Applied Behavioral Sciences) & Ruben Ramirez (Exec. Director, Human Resources)
- Institutional Effectiveness: Council: Fred Patrick (Faculty, Distance Education Specialist-Academic Student Services Dept.) & Craig Bach (Exec. Director Institutional Effectiveness)
- Technology Council: Alberto Restrepo (Faculty, Social & Behavioral Sciences Dept.) & A. Specht (Exec. Director, IT Services)
- Academic Policy & Planning (AP&P): Larry Manalo (Faculty, Health Sciences) & David DeGroot (Faculty, Articulation Officer, Academic Student Services Dept.)

ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA

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

   Meeting called to order at 4:01 pm

2. **Roll Call:**

D. DeGroot, Y. Frazier, C. Provencio, C. Hite, K. Villa, C. Perales, B. Britten, A. Romo, C. Carroll, M. Guido Brunet, A. Gisclon, S. Maxson, D. Auten, A. Fox, S. Gottlieb, A. Kopcrak, M. Landeros, L. West, C. Sprecher, M. Segura, M. Hammil, D. Serrano, A. Restrepo, F. Patrick, T. Roepke, H. Álvarez

Quorum met

3. Approval of Minutes: N/A [5] * (HA)

AR stated there are no minutes to approve this meeting, as during the last Senate meeting two sets of meeting minutes were approved. The next Senate meeting (3/10/2026) will review minutes from the first meeting of the semester (2/10/2026).

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

M. Segura (MS) provided information in response to questions after the statement that was read/made at the last Senate meeting by the FA. She clarified the Part-time Faculty Association/CA Federation of Teacher (PFA/CFA) has clear contract language agreed upon with the District regarding PFA appointments to councils and committees identified in the CCPD. Appointments are made by the PFA, with assignments for at least one semester during the academic year. MS added that compensation for part-time faculty serving on councils or committees does not come from PFA/CFT union/membership dues. Instead, it comes from a Shared Governance Professional and Development Fund that the District contributes to and is intended to support part-time faculty participation in shared governance activities. MS emphasized she wants to ensure there was accurate understanding of the funding and contractual arrangements between the District and the PFA/CFT.

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

AR thanked MS for her public comments. He added there will be no formal President's Remarks to ensure the Senate agenda items get covered.

CONSENT

None

^ AR informed Senate that a request was made to move the Institutional Grants Report, Item #18, to be heard near the top of the agenda (before the start of ACTION Items)

> **Motion to move the Institutional Grants Report Agenda Item 18 to top of agenda (before Action Items) made by A. Kopcrak /seconded by A. Fox**
>
> **No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

> **AR: Motion carries, approved by Consensus**

^18. Institutional Grants Report. * [10] (L. McNulty (LMcN))

LMcN provided updates on several grant activities currently in development or submitted. She mentioned that the grant landscape is changing frequently, and as new funding opportunities emerge her team actively pursues new grants.

All colleges have experienced cuts to National Science Foundation grants. Locally, NSF previously supported student research experiences, including opportunities for students to present at research symposiums. This program was beneficial for equity and access, as it gave community college students access to engage in research opportunities typically available only to students at four-year institutions. Alternative funding resources are sought, especially for students with interests in pursuing engineering fields.

Dana Foundation: funding secured to support biology research for students, specifically targeting engineering and computer science students. This funding aims to increase female representation in these fields.

Henry Luce Foundation Proposal: submitted to support five women in STEM (engineering and computer science) to provide research opportunities under faculty mentorship, with summer research support and administrative assistance for scholarships and supplies.

Arthur N. Rupe Foundation Funding: annual application for funding which helps cover the costs of textbooks, workbooks, scrubs, shoes, blood pressure kits that hard for AHC to afford while for Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA) students.

Early Childhood Education Apprenticeship Program: A new grant proposal submitted to support ECS students through an apprenticeship program at the college's Children's Center.

LMcN mentioned she will send out an updated report on upcoming grants, including potential opportunities from NASA.

ACTION ITEMS

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

   BP 3420:

   RR: provided overview. Restated what was mentioned at the last Senate meeting during Information presentation: BP has minor League language changes, definition changes, nothing substantive.

   Motion to approve BP 3430 by A. Kopcrak /seconded by A. Fox

   No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

   AR: motion to approve BP 3430 carries by Consensus

   AP 3430:

   RR: League revisions only. As mentioned last Senate meeting during Information presentation: a 'compare and contrast' was made between the current campus policy and League policy and the academic freedom portion popped back up in this document and redundancies were stricken as shown in bottom portion of the AP in review.

   Question from floor regarding changes: as the AP in SharePoint is not displaying accurately and relevant sections regarding academic freedom are not shown as mentioned by RR.

   Several efforts were made by TR/ASE to resolve the technical issues with the AP, no success.

   Motion to table AP 3430 until technical difficulties are solved made by B. Britten/seconded by A. Kopcrak

   No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

   AR: motion to table AP 3430 carries by Consensus, AP will return

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

   BP 5010:

   MAR: BP was brought up to par with League language suggestions, minor changes only as discussed last Senate meeting. She asked Senators if feedback or comments were provided. None provided.

   Motion to approve BP 5010 by B. Britten/seconded by A. Kopcrak

   No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

   AR: motion to approve BP 5010 carries by Consensus

   AP 5010:

   MAR: AP has minor changes/updates as discussed during the last Senate meeting's information section.

   Motion to approve AP 5010 made by B. Britten/seconded by A. Fox

   No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

   AR: motion to approve AP 5010 carries by Consensus

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

BP 5120:

MAR: reviewed what was mentioned last Senate meeting during Information: the BP updated to align with latest AHC Student Equity Plan.

Motion to approve BP 5120 by C. Sprecher/seconded by M. Guido Brunet

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: motion to approve BP 5120 carries by Consensus

AP 5120:

MAR: no changes, nothing different, same as was reviewed last Senate meeting during Information.

Motion to approve AP 5120 by B. Britten/seconded by D. Serrano

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: Motion to approve AP 5120 carries by Consensus

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

BP 5510:

MAR: BP had minor changes in the title (Organization was stricken as mentioned last Senate meeting).

Motion to approve BP 5510 by D. Serrano/seconded by B. Britten

Discussion:

A. Kopcrak (AK) asked if Student Services Council (SSC) explored if there were any concerns with what is in the Reference section of the BP, in particular "34 Code of Federal Regulations Section 668.46(b)(7)". She reminded everyone what resulted previously when Senate reviewed a separate BP and after the Reference section codes were researched it was concluded to possibly impact faculty.

MAR replied SSC investigated this and found no concerns.

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: Motion to approve AP 5510 carries by Consensus

AP: 5510

MAR: no changes from what was presented at the last Senate meeting.

Motion to approve AP 5510 by B. Britten/seconded by M. M. Guido Brunet

Discussion:

L. Manalo: asked for clarification on the jurisdiction of students referred to in the AP, does it limit to student incidents in Santa Barbara Co and San Luis Obispo Co students. MAR incidents that the AP refers only to students the Districts serves.

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: Motion to approve AP 5510 carries by Consensus

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

Discussion:

A. Kopcrak (AK) asked if the formatting issues brought up at the last Senate meeting got cleaned up, as formatting issues still show in the file on SharePoint. She noted that #5 and #8 are empty, and #11 shows content and it's listed twice (i.e., there are two #11 items listed in the BP).

AR added that if there are no content changes or additions, a motion can be proposed to approve this BP with changes to the formatting items as suggested by AK.

L. Manalo (LM) asked for clarification about the phrase 'part-time faculty in good standing' asking if it refers to limiting eligibility to only two part-faculty members.

B. Curry (BC) explained that the language refers to the part-time faculty contract and eligibility for credit.

RR clarified that the district currently uses two classifications for part-time faculty: Pool 1 and Pool 2, not the formerly used "associate faculty" designation (this no longer exists). He explained that Pool 1 faculty do not have seniority and must meet certain criteria, including serving several consecutive semesters and completing a qualifying evaluation, to move into Pool 2 status. Once in Pool 2, faculty can gain seniority. He added that only part-time faculty with seniority (Pool 2) would qualify for the Emeritus Faculty designation under the policy.

LM asked whether part-time faculty would know if they were in Pool 2 status, both RR and BC confirmed that they would.

MS added that part-time faculty are aware of their status because Pool 2 provides seniority privileges, whereas Pool 1 faculty function in a more temporary capacity until completing the evaluation process required to move into Pool 2.

Motion to approve with formatting and general editing by A. Kopcrak/seconded by B. Britten.

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AR: Motion to approve BP 7810 with formatting and general editing carried by Consensus

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

Discussion:

S. Gottlieb (SG) presented concerns from faculty in his department regarding the "determination of related disciplines", noting the words 'related discipline' appear 7-8 times in the document. His dept. wants to know who or what entity would determine "what qualifies as a related discipline".

DD explained that in practice determination can be seen as somewhat subjective but stressed that he and the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) are always guided by the minimum qualifications listed for the discipline. He stressed they always start with the min. quals document.

B. Curry (BC) added that the PSC often consults with/asks relevant department faculty when determining where a discipline is related, since the PSC may not have the subject expertise.

A. Fox (AF) suggested that the document should clearly indicate that faculty in the discipline in question will always be asked/consulted. She asked about implementation of what is determined to be a related discipline and that this process needs to be clarified.

SG raised concerns about Option D allowing disciplines to opt in or opt out, noting that allowing this annual change could be problematic. He suggested adding or considering time frames. For example, you can change your option every x- number of years to avoid departments or disciplines changing yearly.

BC: mention that the idea of it being an annual consideration was discussed, e.g., Sept 1st of every academic year was suggested as date.

BC and DD both acknowledged the PSC also thought the opting changes to be problematic.

L. Manalo (LM): offered a rule of thumb for discipline placement stating that it must meet the designated minimum qualifications of the listed discipline placement of any course. He added colleges could 'ask' for more qualifications but could never ask for less than the minimum established qualification. LM also asked if the course outline of record could be used/considered; instead of relying on non-discipline experts choosing which discipline or related discipline qualifies.

BC: reminded everyone that equivalencies are the same as meeting minimum qualifications. Once it's established that someone meets equivalency, they have the same privileges as anyone who meets minimum quals, as there is no meaningful distinction. Disciplines are assigned to courses, but once the discipline is assigned a course, anybody who either meets that through outright meeting the established minimum quals, or through an equivalency process, has access to teaching that course.

L. West suggested that some of the concerns about determining related disciplines could be addressed in the future, through updating the forms as has been suggested and making the forms more user friendly.

BC stressed caution, adding that he did research (as a question came up at a previous Senate mtg.) regarding equivalency: if someone is assigned equivalency, then the rules change, so that the person would no longer meet the new equivalency rule(s) established, e.g., because option D changed), the person would still have equivalency. He stressed there are not take backs.

B. Britten added changes in the future or updating the forms would constitute significant changes and that would require review.

LW suggests that the questions raised by SG and AF about what related discipline means could be addressed in the form, as the equivalency forms typically come the PSC from the discipline, or more specifically the dean of that discipline. The form could require an explanation of how the disciplines are related.

AF asked if the form could be approved with that caveat.

DD shared a personal perspective that the proposal could create a slippery slope, especially if disciplines could change positions frequently, or if equivalency decisions become discipline specific rather than a collegewide, agreed-to policy. He recommended that a taskforce of faculty and administrators be created to more broadly review minimum qualifications and equivalency practices, and to consider the challenges that a rural college like AHC faces in drawing qualified instructors. The taskforce should be guided by the Academic Senate paper on minimum quals. He added that it may be a good idea to look at other rural colleges like AHC to learn what and how they are going about it. He suggested the need to revisit this item, and that the PSC could work on the forms making the process clearer.

A. Kopcrak asked whether the equivalency form as presented could move forward with the understanding that additional work would continue in the future.

F. Patrick indicated that Time has Expired for discussion.

AR asked if there is a motion on the item.

Motion to approve the Equivalency option with the understanding that further work will take place by A. Kopcrak/seconded by M. Landeros

AR asked if there are any objections or abstentions

Several objections and abstentions were heard from the floor.

AR declared that roll call vote is required.

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: (5): C. Provencio; C. Hite; A. Kopcrak; M. Landeros; L. West

No: (12): D. DeGroot; K. Villa; C. Perales; B. Britten; A. Romo; C. Carrol; M. Guido Brunet; A. Gisclon; R. Chaudhari; C. Sprecher; M. Segura; H. Álvarez

Abstain: (9): Y. Frazier; S. Maxson; D. Auten; A. Fox; S. Gottlieb; M. Hammill; D. Serrano; F. Patrick; T. Roepke

Absent (4): A. McMeeking; B. Bryant; G. Marquez; A. Gómez de Torres

AR: motion to approve the Equivalency option with the understanding that further work will take place does not carry

AK asked if a motion does not pass, can a senate representative introduce a different motion on the same agenda item.

FP responded that generally this is not allowed after a vote.

DD added that the item would need to be brought back at a future meeting, consistent with standard parliamentary practice stating this often occurs when a motion to approve does not carry at ASCCC plenaries.

AK shared the Math Dept. is anticipating two retirements and hiring as a result, and the dept. is interested in removing the "D" option from the equivalency forms and asked if this could be addressed during this current item.

FP and DD indicated it could not be addressed under this item, and it would need to return in a future meeting.

AR acknowledged FP and DD's guidance on parliamentarian procedure.

INFORMATION (FOR FUTURE ACTION/APPROVAL)

12. **Exemption From Program Vitality Review for Deactivation of Paramedic Program * [10] (S. Newton (SN)/B. Curry (BC))**

AR reminded everyone that this item was brought up under *Reports and Discussions* at a previous Senate meeting and is now presented as Information. It was clarified that "deactivation" is the correct technical term used now, not discontinued. He stressed that faculty have the responsibility to not take lightly the deactivation of any program.

The body was directed to review the Program Vitality Policy which outlines three processes: 1): Full Review/extended process (can take approximately 1-year), 2): the Expediated process (can take about 3 months), and 3): the Exemption process which under certain criteria can be done almost automatically.

ASE has looked at the report prepared by S. Newton (SN) and found it could qualify under the third process, the Exemption process. It was stressed that the decision is not up to ASE, rather it's a Senate decision.

Senators asked to review SN's written explanation and call for deactivation and determine if the Exemption option for deactivation should be followed.

BC suggested inviting SN to a future meeting to address any questions or concerns raised by departments; M. Hammill agreed to coordinate this.

B. Britten posed a procedural question regarding deactivation asking if a program is deactivated could it be brought back in the future.

D. DeGroot (DD) explained it would be deactivated with the Chancellor's Office, and then if in the future a once deactivated program were to be considered to return, it would have to go through the college process as a new program.

DD raised the importance of confirming the status of students currently enrolled in the program, especially of going through the Expediated or Exemption process.

BC replied that students enrolled in the program now are the current cohort, there are no new students being considered for the program.

D. Perman reported the teach out/phase out plan in the report has been approved by the college's accrediting agencies and it has been thoroughly vetted by all agencies the college has a responsibility to report too.

AR: this item will return for Action at a future Senate meeting, assuring everyone the option to table is available if extra time is needed.

13. **BP/AP 3530 Weapons on District Property. * [10] (T. Aye (TA)/D. Curran (DC))**

Discussion:

DC mentioned this has gone back and forth and that changes have been made to reflect previous AS feedback and requested changes, and also to comply with what is requested by the League's guidelines.

A. Kopcrak asked for clarification regarding the inclusion of imitation firearms/props (she recalled this was concern raised previously by PCPA and theatre and AJ), and if the Penal Code in the AP supersedes departmental need.

DC replied the AP has addressed this and allows for props, starter pistols, and knives for food preparation.

Review of the document in SharePoint revealed the policy does not show the changes.

DC acknowledged that the version shown for review is not the updated version and it would need to come back at the next Senate meeting.

A. Romo was asked if pepper spray was addressed.

DC said it was, restating that document in review today does not show updates to the pepper spray as it's the incorrect version, but the updated version has it. He added that the updated version includes that Pepper spray must be less than 2.5 oz.

The item will return and ASE will be provided the updated file.

14. BP/AP 5700 Athletics. * [5] (M. Arvizu Rodriguez (MAR)/G. Siwabessy (GS))

BP 5700:

MAR mentioned the BP incorporates League language changes: CCCAA has been changed in the document to now read 3C2A. Terminology around gender has been updated to be in line with new League language recommendations.

S. Gottlieb mentioned an instance of CCCAA still showing in the document.

MAR acknowledged this and will correct it.

AP 5700:

MAR: minimal changes to the AP, SSC has incorporated League language changes

AR reminded everyone, especially Councils, that when files or BPs and APs are sent for Senate review that the most updated files need to be provided to ASE so the file(s) that are uploaded to SharePoint for Senators to access are the most accurate showing most recent edits.

15. BP/AP 3715 Intellectual Property. * [5] (J. Raybould-Rodgers (JRR)/B. Curry (BC))

BP 3715:

JRR mentioned item is undergoing the five-year mandatory review and update, Student Learning Council has not recommended changes

AR mentioned an entire summer spent in the past working on the last version of this policy so he is happy to hear there are no needed changes.

AP 3715:

BC added that a lot of what is in this AP comes from Federal Law.

L. Manalo asked if there are stipulations regarding Creative Commons included in the AP.

AR and BC believe it was addressed in the past update, however BC encouraged feedback, changes or suggestions be brought to the next meeting or emailed to JRR and himself.

AR: take these items to departments for Action at future meeting

16. AP 4225. Course Repetition * [5] (J. Raybould-Rodgers (JRR)/B. Curry (BC))

JRR mentioned this item is similarly undergoing the standard five-year review and SLC suggested no changes but welcomes feedback.

L. Manalo (LM) asked this AP needs to include course repetition associated with the Non-Credit area. BC mentioned NC has different policies.

A. Kopcrak asked if this AP should follow CSU policies, in particular Cal Poly due to the 2+2 programs between AHC and CPSLO.

BC and AR clarified that this AP follows CA Community Colleges policies regarding repetition of CCC courses only. Once a student transfers then repetition policies of the university apply.

LM suggested revising the introductory sentence as the use of 'substandard' is confusing.

BC encouraged recommendations of preferred wording to consider changes.

B. Britten provided clarification on whether a course can be repeated if a C or higher grade was earned: a student can petition to repeat a course once, after 36 months and meeting other stipulated circumstances

(there is a dynamic form available through A&R website that students would use). He clarified further that for transfer; the first attempt grade is what is considered.

LW raised attention to the sentence in the AP that misstates that a student needs to complete a petition to repeat a course if a substandard grade was earned, adding that a student can repeat the course if a substandard grade is earn once or twice without completing a petition.

BC acknowledged its poorly written and it will be looked at it and rewritten, adding the AP will return.

17. **BP/AP 4250 Probation, Dismissal, and Readmission. * [5] (J. Raybould-Rodgers (JRB)/B. Curry (BC))**

BP 4250:

BC mentioned this BP was looked at last year, approved spring 2025. He added that Counseling has proposed changes and these are reflected in this version under review.

Counseling is proposing changes to reflect guidance coming from the state regarding nomenclature that has been traditionally used. The request is to update the terms "Academic Dismissal" to "Academic Pause" and "Academic Probation" to "Academic Notice". It was mentioned that Hartnell College and other colleges have already incorporated similar changes in nomenclature, and the changes proposed are 'procedural' to get a head of the changes that are coming. He added the changes are due to the stigma that is associated with the term probation outside academic contexts.

AP 4250:

BB stated that changes requested by Counseling in the AP are a little more involved. The recommendation from Counseling will require that students who are on 2nd Academic Notice will need to have two scheduled appointments with a Counselor to provide more intrusive counseling with students earlier on. Also, Academic Dismissal (i.e., making a student sit out for a term) or what will be referred to as Academic Pause is not required by Title 5 (rather it states that colleges may dismiss students with a substandard GPA). Consequently, and based on data compiled from Probation-Reinstated students, it was discovered that when students have been dismissed through existing policy (i.e., made to sit out and not able to register), students often don't return (only 5% return, and if they do it often takes them over 430 days to return and register again for a course(s). The loss of financial aid is a determining factor. Changes to the AP as proposed will allow students to take at least a 1-unit class (or more units), in consultation with a counselor. So, if students take at least a 1-unit class and earn a C or better/2.0 gpa or higher (in a term) they can reapply and possibly qualify for the CCPG for the following term. The goal is to have students keep going and work more closely with Counseling.

AR: take these items to departments for feedback.

REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

^18. Institutional Grants Report. * [10] (L. McNulty (LMcN))

^Item was taken out of order/moved to before ACTION Items by approved motion, see page 2.

19. **Schedule Builder. [10] (P. Moore (PM))**

A. Specht introduced Philip Moore. PM is programmer in IT Services (ITS) and in addition to a new schedule optimization tool he developed and will present on today, PM also developed a tool that is able to decipher faculty load to support the District's payroll systems so faculty can be paid--the Senate floor applauded the efforts.

PM presented a web-based "Schedule Builder" application that pulls real-time data from Banner to generate all available or possible conflict-free class schedules for students. He demonstrated the tool's interface and functionality that includes the ability to:

- generate multiple student class schedule combinations
- visually display schedules in a calendar format
- filter results by campus, time constraints, and availability
- reduce the high number of possible student class schedules generated for easier student review and selection

- bookmark abilities so students can save preferred schedules

The tool is still in development with plans for additional features such as expanded filtering and enhanced display of course details. PM emphasized that upcoming working sessions and user testing with departments will help refine functionality and ensure accuracy.

Discussion:

A. Romo asked if students can use the tool to search for specific instructors, PM confirmed this feature can be developed.

L. West asked if the tool could prioritize the importance of a course(s), something very important for students in STEM, PM confirmed this could be developed.

S. Gottlieb asked about the possibility of filtering by open seats, PM confirmed the tool already does this through the tool's event cards.

C. Hite asked if the tool can be used to search by short term classes, PM replied this is under consideration with a possible hovering feature over the course that can provide details

B. Britten, in response to PM, suggested distributing information about the working sessions through the Department Chairs who can then share the faculty and he could reach out to PM with a distribution list.

AS noted, a tentative go-live date for this tool is planned for mid-April, ahead of summer/fall registration and that faculty will have earlier access for testing.

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

20. edTAC

AR reported he co-chairs edTAC with Xavier Ortiz (ITS). edTAC is part of the Technology Council and has a focus on classroom technology. AR shared that faculty participation has declined recently and broader faculty representation from different disciplines was encouraged. He outlined an ongoing discussion within ETAC and the Technology Council regarding the design of classrooms' use of technology and envisioning how classroom technology can be used in the future.

Current classrooms are designed to support both podium computers and personal devices (becoming more common with laptop and tablet use). However, this dual setup creates increased complexity, maintenance challenges and expenditures, and multiple points of failure, especially when faculty bring in laptops or portable devices and use the provided docks, which are prone to breaking/failure. AR shared examples of equipment issues (e.g., repeated switcher and dock failures) to illustrate some of the concerns.

The committee is exploring whether future classrooms should shift toward a model centered on faculty bringing their own devices or district computers, especially as laptops and mobile devices become more prevalent. This raises related considerations, including:

- How to redesign classroom infrastructure to support future use
- How to support faculty without devices, in particular part-time faculty
- How to reallocate resources (e.g., reducing fixed classroom equipment to fund more devices or improved setups for all faculty to utilize)

A. Specht (AS) added that other colleges are moving toward similar models and encouraged faculty to observe and share examples from what they learn other institutions are doing, or if attending technology-focused conferences to share what is being done.

L. West reiterated concerns about technology access for part-time faculty, and classroom use, including potential issues with excessive cables and tripping hazards as currently exists in the mathematics building.

AS indicated that increased standardization (e.g., HDMI/USB-C) may help reduce complexity, though not all physical wiring challenges would be eliminated, although safety is a concern and should be reported/document so it can be resolved/addressed.

AR emphasized that overly complex systems have already led to misuse and equipment damage, reinforcing the need for simplification.

L. Manalo inquired about funding, and AS confirmed that classroom technology is included in the proposed bond measure the College will pursue, allowing for future planning discussions.

The update concluded with a reminder of ETAC meeting times (1:30 pm before Senate meets).

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

None

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

    None

22. **ADJOURN**

    Meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm

Next Academic Senate Meeting: March 10, 2026.

Agenda Items due by March 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:	**Applied Social Sciences:**	**Business:**
Dave DeGroot	Yvon Frazier	Bob Bryant

Counseling-Personal Development:	**English:**	**Fine Arts:**
Ben Britten	Melanie Guido Brunet	Chris Hite
Carissa Perales	Chris Carroll	Anne McMeeking
Kiri Villa	Alina Romo	

Health Sciences:	**Industrial Technology:**	**Kinesiology, Recreation, Athletics:**
Amy Gisclon	Gabriel Marquez	Chuck Provencio
Shavaun Maxson		

Languages & Communications:	**Life & Physical Sciences:**	**Mathematical Sciences:**
Diane Auten	Alicia Fox	Anna Kopcrak
	Sean Gottlieb	Martin Landeros
		Liz West

Public Safety:	**Social & Behavioral Sciences:**	**Part-Time Faculty Reps.:**
Marc Hammill or	Danya Serrano	Monique Segura
Leonard Champion		Chris Sprecher
		Rajni Chaudhari