

# ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE

## Academic Senate Meeting

Minutes for Tuesday, March 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 (AR)      Vice President: Ana Gómez de Torres (AGT)  
Secretary: Héctor Álvarez (HA)      Member-at-Large: Fred Patrick (FP)  
Member-at-Large: Thesa Roepke (TR)

### Senators-Voting Members (P: Present / A: Absent):

Héctor Álvarez (P), Diane Auten (P), Ben Britten (P), Bob Bryant (A), Chris Carroll (P), Rajni Chaudhari (P), David DeGroot (P), Ana Gómez de Torres (P), Melanie Guido Brunét (P), Alicia Fox (P), Yvon Frazier (P), Sean Gottlieb (P), Mark Hammill or Leonard Champion (A), Chris Hite (P), Anna Kopcrak (P), Martin Landeros (P), Gabriel Marquez (P), Anne McMeeking (A), Fred Patrick (P), Carissa Perales (P), Chuck Provencio (P), Alberto Restrepo ((P): votes only to break a tie), Alina Romo (A), Thesa Roepke (P), Monique Sequra (P), Danya Serrano (P), Chris Sprecher (P), Kiri Villa (P), Liz West (P)

**Proxy Voter Present:** Larry Manalo ((P): Proxy for Amy Gisclon)

### Student Representative:

Faith Davis, ASBG, Director Academic Affairs (P)

### Guests:

Deborah Pirman (Dean, Ext. Campus); Larry Manalo (Faculty, Health Sciences); Richard Mahon (PT Faculty); David Millard (Chief, Campus Police); Monica Millard (Dean, AA, Fine Arts, Social & Behavioral Sciences); Patricia Sanchez-Koivisto (PT Faculty, Kinesiology, Recreation, Athletics); Ora Shrecengost (Student, ASBG); Jessica Solorio (PT Faculty, English); Wendy Sutter (Faculty, Mathematical Sciences)

### Remote (Zoom) Participant Guests:

Sean Newton (Faculty, Public Safety); Xavier Oritz (Asst. Director, IT Serv.); Christine Reed (Counselor/Coordinator, MESA/STEM Academic Success Center)

### CCPD Council Co-Chairs Present (P: Present / NP: Not Present):

Student Learning Council: (P): Julia Raybould-Rodgers (Faculty, English Dept.) & (P): Bob Curry (Asst. Supt./VP Academic Affairs)

Student Services Council: (NP): Maria Arvizu-Rodriguez (Faculty, Counseling Dept./Univ. Transfer Ctr.) & (P): Genevieve Siwabessy (Asst. Supt./VP Student Services)

Human Resources Council: (P): Thesa Roepke (Faculty, Applied Behavioral Sciences Dept.) & (P): Ruben Ramirez (Exec. Director, Human Resources)

Institutional Effectiveness Council: (P): Fred Patrick (Faculty, Distance Education Specialist-Academic Student Services Dept.) & (P): Craig Bach (Exec. Director Institutional Effectiveness)

Technology Council: (P): Alberto Restrepo (Faculty, Social & Behavioral Sciences Dept.) & (NP): Andy Specht (Exec. Director, IT)

Budget Council: (NP): G. Bierly (Faculty, Social & Behavioral Sciences Dept.) & (P): Dennis Curran (Assoc. Supt./VP Finance and Admin)

Facilities Council: (P): Tyson Aye (Faculty, Kinesiology, Recreation, Athletics) & (P): Dennis Curran (Assoc. Supt./VP Finance and Admin)

**Senate Committee's Co-Chairs Present** (P: Present / NP: Not Present):

Academic Policy & Planning (AP&P) Committee: (P): Larry Manalo (Faculty, Health Sciences) & (P): David DeGroot (Faculty, Articulation Officer, Academic Student Services Dept.)  
Professional Standards Committee: (NP): Carmen Montanez (Faculty, Business Dept/CBIS), (P): David Degroot, (P): Liz West & Bob Curry  
Professional Development Committee: (P): Diane Auten

**ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA**

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

President AR called the meeting called to order at 4:05 pm

**2. Roll Call:**

**Present at time of roll call (27):** D. DeGroot, Y. Frazier, C. Provencio, C. Hite, K. Villa, C. Perales, B. Britten, C. Carroll, M. Guido Brunét, L. Manalo (present by proxy for A. Gisclon), S. Maxson, G. Marquez, D. Auten, A. Fox, S. Gottlieb, A. Kopcrak, M. Landeros, L. West, C. Sprecher, R. Chaudhari, M. Segura, D. Serrano, A. Restrepo, A. Gómez de Torres, F. Patrick, T. Roepke, H. Álvarez

**Absent at time of roll call:** B. Bryant, A. McMeeking, M. Hammill/L. Champion, A. Romo

**AR: Quorum established**

**4 AGT motioned to amend Agenda to remove Action Item #9: AP 4225 Course Repetition/seconded by B. Britten**

Question from floor on the rationale for the change

BC replied AP 4225 is returning to Student Learning Council (SLC) and when the item returns to Senate it will be different.

AR explained ASE received request to pull the item from agenda from SLC. He added that 2/3<sup>rds</sup> in favor is required to amend/modify the agenda.

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR: motion to remove Action Item #9 carries**

**4 AGT motions to add the item '16 Week Calendar discussion' to the REPORTS AND DISCUSSION section of agenda/seconded by D. DeGroot**

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR: motion to add item '16 Week Calendar discussion' to agenda carries**

**3. Approval of Minutes: 2/24/2026 [5] \* (HA)**

**Motion to approve 2/24/2026 minutes by L. Manalo/seconded by C. Sprecher**

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR motion to approve 2/24/2026 Minutes carries**

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

W. Sutter commented on the Equivalency Petition for Faculty Position Item that has been before the Senate previously. She read from a prepared statement:

*"My name is Wendy Sutter and I teach in the Math Department.*

*I know why you didn't vote to pass the Equivalency Proposal at the last Senate meeting.... you are all secretly wanting to teach Math and are going to use option B or D to be able to do that. (laughter from the Senate floor followed)*

*Are you laughing right now, then you understand how ridiculous the current Equivalency options are for B and D?*

*One of the arguments from the Senate floor on Feb 24 was that we should have an equivalency policy that is the same across all disciplines. This is just not realistic.*

- Did your department have the state come to tell you that students are allowed to skip one course level, but you still have to provide support for the students who are underprepared for the course they chose to skip? Math did... in 2019.*
- Did your department have the state come to tell you that you cannot teach any remedial coursework within your department, so you had to eliminate 6 courses from your curriculum? Math did... in 2022.*
- Did your department have the state come to tell you that students can directly sign up for your courses without meeting any prerequisites? Math did... in 2024.*
- Listen to this.... Students are allowed to sign up for Calculus 1 without having taken any previous math. Let that sink in for a while.*

*The only other department on campus that can answer yes to some of these questions is the English department.*

*The reason that the math department advocated for changing Equivalency for new hires is because the bar is set too low for our department needs. We are clearly not a one size fits all across this campus when it comes to Equivalency needs.*

*I am limited to 3 minutes for each Senate public comment, so I'll come again to other Senate meetings to provide*

- 1. information about what other community colleges in CA are doing for their equivalency*
- 2. I'll also tell you about what the Chancellor's office is stating regarding min quals for each major*

*I want people to be informed. I want you to talk with your departments.*

*I emailed all department chairs yesterday to ask for feedback. If your department has any feedback, please email me so that I can meet with the Professional Standards Committee and share what folks are thinking on campus at their next meeting, April 20.*

*Thank you for your time."*

H. Álvarez (HA): Kindly reminded senators, as well as co-chairs and members of CCPD Councils and Senate Standing Committees to continue to actively take notes during Senate meetings in order to report back to their respective departments or councils or committees the feedback, recommendations, and action that takes place at Senate meetings. For example, in reference to the item referenced earlier in previous and in the present Public Comment, the approved Senate Notes have recommendations that can inform the PSC Committee (should anything have been missed in the PSC members present or in any Senator's personal notes). The suggestion applies to all Senate Agenda items, from past and future meetings, adding that approved notes from Senate meetings are on the Academic Senate page on the AHC website for reference and or cross-reference with members' personal notes.

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

AR referenced ongoing discussions regarding the Articulation Officer (AO) replacement due to Dave DeGroot's upcoming retirement. He mentioned the AO position is one of the positions on the list for replacements for hiring (per a College President Memo to ASE, on the Agenda later). Discussions have been ongoing on how the AO position will be structured moving forward. The hope is that administration will hold off on posting the job announcement to allow for more faculty input.

AR also commented on the recurring issue of individual department policies that ASE has been made aware of. Two recent ones that have come up are AI and attendance policies. He reminded everyone that there is no such thing as department policies that are enforceable. He added that departments should discuss best practices yet

should issues arise if/when a faculty member does not comply with a 'dept. policy', this can create a problem that can end up involving the FA. He stressed that enforceable Policies reside within BPs and Senate Policies (adding that Senate Policies have less teeth than BPs).

Graduation: there is a need for name readers at Commencement, ASE is seeking volunteers. Interested faculty please contact Thesa Roepke.

## **CONSENT**

None

## **ACTION ITEMS**

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

SN summarized the report. He reported that SM Co. Fire initially believed they would be able to transition services from AMR-GMR Crop; however, this did not ultimately occur, and the AHC Paramedic Program was informed. Within the region there are currently three paramedic training programs: one in Ventura, one at Cuesta College, and a private program operated by GMR in Atascadero. Following a court battle, GMR decided to reestablish its program, which resulted in ongoing challenges for the AHC Paramedic Program.

SN added that enrollment has been consistently low, as the report describes. The first two cohorts had 11 and 8 students. The most recent group started with 26 students, and 14 remained. Completion rates have also not been ideal, raising concerns with the accrediting body. Also, the program has faced difficulties in retaining qualified instructional staff. At present, of the students remaining in the final cohort, it's been difficult for the program to secure required internship placements locally, necessitating efforts to find internship replacements and opportunities for students outside of the county. These and other factors outlined in the report have collectively led to the recommendation to pursue program closure/deactivation. Notification has also been sent to the accreditation body that the college will not be seeking to be accredited.

B. Curry thanked AR thanks SN for a thorough report.

### **Motion to approve Exemption from Program Vitality Review for Deactivation of Paramedic Program made by A. Fox/seconded by B. Britten**

Question from the floor was raised regarding the timeline for the phase out?

SN explained that, under the teach-out plan outlined in the report, all students remaining in the program are expected to complete program requirements no later than July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2026, with nine students projected to complete on time. He added that the program's closure should not be viewed as a negative reflection on AHC or on his predecessor who worked so diligently to establish the program. Rather, SN emphasized that the regional dynamics faced by the program ultimately led to the program's discontinuation due to those circumstances.

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR motion carries by consensus.**

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

BP 5700:

GS: mentioned there were no changes since last time this was presented to Senate, and that no feedback was received

### **Motion to Approve BP 5700 made by B. Britten/seconded by D. Serrano**

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR: BP 5700 will be sent to College Council**

AP 5700:

GS: mentioned there were no changes since last time this was presented to Senate, and that no feedback was received

**Motion to Approve AP 5700 made by D. Serrano/seconded by B. Britten**

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR: motion to approve AP 5700 carries**

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

BP 3715:

B.C.: reminded everyone that there were no changes and these items are undergoing standard 5-year reviews

**Motion to approve BP 3725 made by B. Britten/seconded by L. Manalo**

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR: motion to approve BP 3715 carriers**

AP: 3715:

**Motion to approve AP 3715 made by M. Guido Brunét/seconded by L. Manalo**

Discussion:

A. Kopcrak (AK) asked for clarification on what is included within the 'course materials' section (page 1) asking if intellectual property rights and AI tools used (currently or those coming in the future) within the Canvas learning management system should be referenced or alluded to in the AP.

TR added that Canvas has Nectir AI already, and asked if this an example of what AK is referring to as an addition into the AP.

BC explained that the current language was developed around 2021 before AI was such a factor, compared to now. He added existing definitions in the AP are based on federal law, and that federal law has not yet addressed AI generated content clearly. He added that any additions would require legal grounding or some kind of law to fall back on or reference to withstand possible challenges in court, and that AI-generated works are not currently recognized as protected intellectual property under existing law. Courts will have to define these issues in the coming years.

AR acknowledged AK's question as an amazing question. He added that at the state and federal levels many are grappling with such a question wondering if a product is generated using AI is considered the intellectual property of the individual who generated it, or whose is it: AIs? AR mentioned there will be a need for an AI policy.

Time ended.

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR: motion to approve AP 3715 carriers**

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

Δ AR reminded everyone that this item was removed from the agenda by an earlier motion

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

BP 4250:

BC mentioned that the changes proposed by the Counseling Department were discussed the last Senate meeting, no further changes.

**Motion to approve by L. Manalo/seconded by B. Britten**

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR BP 4250 is approved**

AP 4250:

BC mentioned that the changes proposed by the Counseling Department were discussed the last Senate meeting, no further changes.

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

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR: AP 4250 is approved**

**11. BP/AP 3430 Prohibition of Harassment. \* [5] (TR/R. Ramirez (RR))**

BP 2420:

Discussion occurred on whether there was a vote on BP 3430 at the previous Senate meeting. S. Gottlieb stated his notes reflect that a vote occurred.

Discussion from several senators expressed uncertainty on the vote, some suggested it was tabled due to technology issues; others stated the AP was the policy postponed due to tech issues.

Due to uncertainty, the BP was voted on again.

RR summarized what was presented during information and at last meeting: the BP has minor League language changes, definition changes/updates, nothing substantive

**Motion to approve BP 3430 made by L. West/seconded by B. Britten**

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR motion to approve BP 3430 carries.**

AP 3430:

TR mentioned the AP was before the Senate at the previous meeting, however, technical issues did not allow the AP to be displayed correctly. She noted, based on prior feedback heard at Senate, HR Council changed the header to read 'Academic Freedom/Freedom of Speech'. She added that related policy is referenced in this AP, e.g. BP 4030: Academic Freedom.

RR referenced the legacy language that was removed from this version of AP 3430. As the analysis of the AP was done, the League version and AHC version were reviewed and what is different is shown in this document. He also added that Academic Freedom was previously removed by the Academic Senate, but it has now returned to this version of the AP as the League version contains it adding that the corresponding paragraph is legally advised but not required. He explained that Academic Freedom does not override Title IX or any discrimination or harassment policies. Complaints can be filed if behavior is inappropriate or not tied to curriculum. The Academic Freedom Policy (BP 4030) does not explicitly address harassment or discrimination as does this policy. He added that the current structure relies on cross-referencing policies.

A. Fox asked when Academic Freedom was removed from within this AP.

Brief discussion ensued over possible years this took place occurred.

AR mentioned it would have occurred prior to 2020

RR recalls that part of discussion was to ensure that the Academic Freedom policy dealt with detailing/defining academic freedom. He added that the academic freedom policy doesn't necessarily talk about prohibition of harassment like this AP in review does, however BP 4030 does cite AP 3430.

L. Manalo (LM) offered a minor correction/friendly amendment: instead of 'Academic Freedom/' to have the AP read 'Academic Freedom and' (i.e., remove the / and include the word "and")

**Motion to approve with friendly amendment that the "slash" get replaced by "and" made by C. Sprecher/seconded by L. Manalo**

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR: AP 3430 is approved with the amendment mentioned in the motion**

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

**12. BP/AP 3530 Weapons on District Property. \* [5] (T. Aye (TA)/D. Curran (DC))**

Discussion:

DC mentioned the BP was approved last Senate meeting.

TR clarified the BP was not approved as it was the wrong version, and today's BP is the correct version as the Penal Code is referenced (the last time the BP came to Senate it was not).

AR mentioned that discussion can cover updates or changes to both the BP and AP as these are Information, he clarified that only when voting on BPs or APS are each taken separately.

BC stated the change referencing the penal code seemed to concern several instructional areas and faculty questioned the appropriateness of how the penal codes referenced to educational settings.

D. Pirman added that she understood the Penal Code concerns centered on what it would mean in terms of consequences for breaking the policy, that is, it would basically be treated as a criminal infraction rather than a policy infraction.

TR added her department was heavily invested in this policy as the department has faculty in several programs that would be impacted (e.g., Administration of Justice and Theatre) where prop weapons are used, or for track and field coaches use of starter pistols. Feedback suggested adding language 'to be used during academic instruction to meet course objectives as outlined in the COR' be included to not be in violation of the rules or in violation of the penal code referenced. She also asked if pepper spray has been addressed, as students have raised concerns and asked for clarification before.

D. Milard (DM) addressed the section regarding pepper spray: language was added to clarify rules on pepper spray. He added it's legal to carry pepper spray, up to 2.5 oz aerosol spray.

F. Davis asked if students will still have to register possession of pepper spray with Campus Police.

DM said registration is no longer required if compliant

Discussion continued regarding differences between aerosol and gel-based sprays and other varieties of deterrents that are not allowed (e.g. mace and bear sprays)

AR reminded Senators to take this back to departments and to send feedback to TA and DC so both the BP/AP are ready for the next Senate meeting to avoid further delays.

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

**13. Five Year 2028 – 2032 Construction Plan. \* [5] (T. Aye (TA)/D. Curran (DC))**

TA discussed the priority list in the Plan. A University Center has been added; this is in relation to the bachelor's degrees/partnership with CPSLO. Having a University Center was part of agreement between Cal Poly and AHC. He added nothing much has changed in the last couple of years in terms of what has been prioritized. The District is thinking of going out for another Bond due to much-needed facility needs. It was noted that not much construction has taken place since Bldg. F was completed.

L. West (LW) discussed the deteriorated nature of the math building and asked why the math building is now listed as 22 when in previous plans it was listed much higher. She stressed there have been changes in the priority list. She described that ceiling tiles fall, the roof leaks, the temperature in classrooms is not consistent (it's either too hot or too cold). Often the building is unbearable and students and faculty complain often. She urges the need to revisit the math building placement on the list, as it is beyond repair.

TA mention there are two plans and lists, one is construction plan, one is deferred maintenance and he is not sure the issues raised by LW lie within deferred main maintenance.

LW argued further that the building is beyond maintenance restating tiles falling, bathroom flooding, roof leaks and there are safety issues.

TR asked what is the process that is followed when such issues are known.

F. Davis discussed the student perspective and the college's mission to improve outcomes in STEM. She argued it's counterproductive to the college's broader goals if the math building is not a desirable experience, adding that for many students taking math courses often does not rank high on their list of preferences and with the building issues mentioned it does not help. The student learning experience is not helped or improved if the building is failing as has been presented and argued for improvement.

AK, in response to TA's question if this has been documented, added that the Mathematical Sciences Dept Chair has documented issues.

C Reed (CR) added that several years ago there was plan was to remove M300 and M400 and build a new, multi-story Technology Center. She asked what happened to this plan, and why the Technology Center is no longer part of the list presented today. Asked TA to investigate.

AR announced time was up for discussion.

4 **AR asked for a motion to move the 16 Week Calendar Discussion before Item #14: SB 707**

**Motion by B. Britten/seconded by L. Manalo**

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR: motion carries**

13. **16-Week Calendar Discussion (D. McNeil (DM)/G. Siwabessy (GS))**

GS mentioned that DM (the Calendar Committee faculty co-chair) could not be here today. She presented that the Calendar Committee has been exploring the possibility of moving to a 16-week calendar, partly to enable a week-long Thanksgiving break. She noted that the current academic calendar is already tightly structured due to inclusion of winter term and summer sessions, making further compression challenging. The calendar committee was informed of faculty interest and emphasized any move toward a compressed calendar would need to be faculty-driven, adding that the change offers limited benefit to administrators or classified staff. She also clarified that any potential implementation would not occur until 2029-30, given that calendars through 2027-29 are in the process of being approved/going to the BOT.

AR explained this item had been submitted late in a prior agenda, coming after the 72-hour time frame and therefore did not make a previous agenda. The request came again and this item was considered for today's agenda as discussion. He encouraged departmental feedback and broader faculty engagement.

LW requested more specific details and asked for sample scheduling models to understand better how a compressed calendar would affect courses and scheduling, especially for math and science-lab based courses.

GS agreed and mentioned that yesterday's calendar committee has begun discussion but also welcomes feedback today.

C. Hite mentioned the fine arts department supports the idea. He asked about the 10-minute addition that has been discussed previously and its possible impact on class meeting times and scheduling.

BC noted that compressing the calendar would likely require longer class meeting times, may impact flex time, especially for Science and Math areas, but exact time calculations have not yet occurred, and need to.

Several Senators raised concerns about instructional time and contractual impacts.

BB and CR highlighted the need to consider implications for the 175-day contract

**Motion by A. Kopcrak to extend discussion 5 minutes/seconded by A. Fox**

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR: motion to extend discussion 5 minutes carries**

S. Maxon raised concerns specific to health science programs due to strict clinical hour requirements, and daily time limits that could make further compression difficult, potentially requiring programs like nursing to extend their schedules beyond allowable daily timelines (a possible impact may require having to schedule an additional week to meet instructional objectives).

GS mentioned clinical hours were brought up in yesterday's Calendar Committee meeting by the Senate Rep, A. McMeeking. GS suggested a possible Senate workgroup could be established to explore the ideas further. She acknowledges the need to consider the collective bargaining agreement.

AK asked whether input was being solicited from Cuesta College since they are moving to a compressed calendar and if external pressures (e.g., alignment with Cal Poly) are influencing the move.

GS stated there is no direct coordination with Cal Poly, AHC sets its own calendar, as does Cal Poly. There currently exists misalignment as they are on quarter system and AHC is semester, although CP will be moving to a semester model. She has not been in touch with Cuesta acknowledging they would be a good resource.

A. Fox mentioned she taught at a previous college where the passing periods were less than 10 minutes between classes (e.g., a class was 8 to 9:25 am and the next class started at 9:30 am if when instructors went even a couple minutes over it created unpleasant attitudes and looks.

C. Bach mentioned all models he has looked at retain at least 10 minutes between courses.

AR also questioned what is driving the move to a 16-week calendar as he has been hearing about other colleges considering this and wondered if there is trend in the CA community college system for such a move.

GS and BC both replied they are not aware of any formal trend.

R. Mahon stated that about 20 years ago many of the largest FTES colleges in the system starting moving to a 6-week winter session between January and President's day weekend, a 16-week spring semester that ends the second week of June, a six or eight week summer, and then 16 week fall semester that ends before Christmas, so it's not new.

AR suggested providing more distance learning/online courses may help as the thought of possibly having to increase class times while maintaining 10 minutes in between classes may result in possibly offering less sections on any given day or days due to facilities/available classrooms.

#### **14. SB 707 Changes to the Teleconferencing Requirement of the Brown Act. \* [5] (AR)**

AR presented updates regarding changes to SB 707 that went into effect on January 1, 2026, and modifies aspects of the Brown Act, particularly around teleconferencing and accessibility to participation in meetings by the public. He noted the revisions are viewed as a modernization of the telecommunications portion of the Brown Act and are widely described as one of the most significant updates in decades.

Two major areas of impact were emphasized. First, legislation introduces new language around public access and participation and outreach requirements for meetings. The application of the provisions around educational institutions is viewed by many as ambivalent and currently are interpreted as not fully applying to educational institutions, but in the future it most likely will. If applied, this would require translation of meeting agendas and public-facing materials (e.g., agendas, minutes, meeting materials) into languages spoken by at least 20% of the local community, as well as proactive outreach to non-English speaking and historically underrepresented groups. AR stressed that compliance would be arduous, and resource-intensive and institutional help would be needed and require significant institutional support to be in compliance. He added provisions do apply to larger eligible legislative bodies (e.g., city councils and larger Brown Act bodies).

Second, the bill updates teleconferencing rules which apply to educational bodies. These changes provide greater flexibility for remote participation and replace prior "emergency provisions" with an expanded definition of "just cause". Newly included justifications for just cause cover circumstances such as childcare, illness and other personal obligations. This will allow for broader access for members to participate remotely and will still comply with open meeting requirements. Additionally, the updated rules allow for remote participants to count toward quorum. Other requirements include two-way public access (audio or video, for AHC this means Zoom), online posting or meeting materials and documentation of remote participation in meeting records.

AR highlighted that the language at the end of the AHC Senate Agendas has been updated to reflect such changes and encouraged members to review the provided materials (two files) related to SB 707.

**15. Faculty Hiring Positions for Academic Year 2026 – 2027 Memo from Kevin Walthers (KW). \* [5] (ASE)**

AR reviewed a memo sent to ASE sent by KW regarding faculty hiring positions. There will be two positions in Math, the Articulation Officer position, a Nursing position (all due to retirements), and Business position (to help support the 2+2 business program with Cal Poly and due to a faculty retirement from the business department). KW mentioned in the memo these five positions are in addition to three positions that were mid-year hires.

LW and senators raised concern around the CBOT program as J. Derry retired. Will there be back-fill? Comments made that students rely on this program and certificates and the degree as they create opportunities for work, and the possible impact to courses if a CBOT faculty position is not replaced.

BC mentioned that the Dean in area is working on this, and there is no intention of changing the program right now and the hope is the new faculty hire could address the need in that area.

**16. Part-time Faculty Appointments to and Participation in the Academic Senate \* [20] (ASE/All)**

AR mentioned this is on Agenda because of the request by the full-time Faculty Association (FA) to look at and possibly change the Articles of Agreement. He added that such revisions are rare and significant, and that changes have only occurred a few times in the past several decades (once in 2014 and the other in 2021). He was clear to frame the discussion as preliminary and exploratory; it's a fact-finding attempt conducted by ASE and he was charged to do more in-depth research that will be presented today. Everyone was strongly encouraged to consider the points, do their own research and provide their findings to the Senate.

AR stated several times that neither ASE nor himself have an agenda here, but there is a responsibility to investigate because of the formal request from the FA. He underscored the goal of the research as guided by a dual responsibility: 1) to increase and improve part-time faculty participation in Senate, and 2) to protect the legal integrity and mandate given to Academic Senates under Title 5. He acknowledged long-standing concerns of part-time faculty marginalization, and this is an attempt to strengthen their participation, not diminish it, while ensuring compliance with governance structures. Senate Presidents are charged to ensure all faculty can participate in governance, and he takes this charge seriously.

AR presented the current structure in place, three part-time faculty representatives serve on the Academic Senate, their selection is described in the Senate's Articles of Agreement as being appointed by the Part-time Faculty Association (PFA).

The research has revealed possible concerns that this model may create vulnerabilities by blurring the clear distinctions that have been established between the purviews of the Academic Senates (academic and professional matters) and those of collective bargaining units (labor matters) under California's "parallel tracks" governance system. He noted potential risks such as conflicts of interest, disenfranchisement of non-union part-time faculty members, and challenges to the Senates authority under Title 5. He stressed this is a serious matter and warrants investigation.

He acknowledged the part-time faculty concerns raised at the last Senate meeting as legitimate and assured everyone the goal is not to marginalize anyone but to present findings from the research conducted. He argued everyone to keep this in mind, and that research is on-going, and that there is an ask for members present to conduct their own research to help inform the matter.

AR stated that the appointment model in place is uncommon statewide, as most colleges use Senate-run elections in which part-time faculty (as a whole) can elect their representatives. It was stressed again that the goal is not to reduce part-time faculty participation and instead suggested possible options to increase it.

C. Sprecher challenged aspects of the characterization of the current process, clarifying that part-time faculty representatives are not appointed but rather are selected through a process that encourages part-time faculty to participate in Senate or in councils and committees. Interested part-time faculty respond to a call sent by the PFA to serve. Interested part-time faculty then present to the PFA Board, the board then votes. Further, he questioned why the issue is being raised now, after many years with no concern, and questioned if this is due to the PFA having new leadership and is currently undergoing negotiations with the district. As such, this is seen by many part-timers as being possibly politically motivated, even if it's not. He also suggested that gathering statewide data should not be difficult as it should be readily verified.

AR responded that the analysis and findings presented are based on the language of the Articles of Agreement, regardless of how processes may function in practice at the college and reiterated that the review

underway was initiated in response to a formal request made to investigate, not independently by him or anyone on ASE. He reiterated this is happening now because of the request that came to Seante by the FA to investigate. He likened this to what occurred in 2021, then MS asked the Senate to investigate having part-time faculty vote in ASE elections, and similarly, then, the request was taken seriously, research happened, discussions occurred at Senate, and the Articles of Agreement were changed so that the 3 part-time faculty that serve on Senate could vote in ASE elections.

MS raised concerns about the lack of consultation with the PFA during the research process. She expressed that the absence of engagement with them is disrespectful and reinforces perceptions that the full-time faculty and the FA are making decisions on what they feel is best for part-time faculty, since no consultation occurred. She added that the three or four different colleges in Orange County do the exact same thing as what occurs here. She has reached out to the California Community College Association president to research, adding that president has told her that it is the norm to go out and seek part-time faculty to serve as it is done here locally. MS added that the part-time faculty association does not care if someone is a member of the union or not, and that they facilitate the process to have part-time faculty represented.

AR acknowledged the important voice brought by part-time faculty. He responded that this initial research was intentionally conducted independently to avoid influence by either the FA or the PTFA. This is why neither were initially consulted or reached out to in order to avoid the intermingling of governance and bargaining roles, given the concerns about having to clearly maintain separation between the two. This is a clear focus.

**Motion to extend discussion 5-additional minutes made by A. Kopcrak/seconded by A. Fox.**

**No: (0) / Abstain: (0)**

**AR motion to extend carries**

CR (FA representative) provided additional context to CS's inquiry into the origin of the issue. She explained that during HR Council there have been several instances that prompted RR (HR Exec. Director and Co-Chair of the Council) to call for the maintaining of clear boundaries due to the part-time representative raising bargaining issues during HR Council meetings. CR added that about eight months ago she spoke with MS after learning about the part-time faculty association's role in the selection of representatives and that they are receiving compensation. This raised concerns about a potential conflict of interest, not based on past misconduct but instead on future risk or perception. She emphasized the issue is to be preventative rather than reactive and it aligns with the need to maintain clear separation between governance and labor functions.

CS asked if there have been specific incidents that prompted the concern within Senate

CR responded that to her knowledge she has not observed any within Senate, but she does not attend every Senate meeting to adequately determine that, adding that the concern is more structural rather than individual.

MS added that part-time faculty participation is tied to funding and is compensated by the college, which is to support part-time faculty involvement across multiple shared governance activities (councils, committees, Senate). Changes to representation could have financial and logistical implications for part-time faculty. She asked if the Senate then would compensate part-time faculty to participate if changes to the current process occur.

CR argued that compensation should not be discussed at Senate as it falls under collective bargaining and is not within the Senate purview. She identified this as an example of the concern.

MS clarified she is not bargaining and explained that compensation doesn't come from their bargaining unit, rather it comes from the college so part-time faculty are encouraged to participate. Both MS and CS reiterated they are explaining how compensation works and not bargaining at Senate.

AR explained he has reached out to the ASCCC for input and has not heard back. If by the Plenary he does not hear back, then while at the Plenary he will consult with ASCCC leadership. He stressed again that he welcomes everyone to do their research and provide input to Senate. He also encouraged the part-time faculty to provide information and their research into what other colleges do in regard. AR reiterated that the goal is to expand and support part-time faculty participation, not reduce it. He admitted being surprised with the perceived resistance by the PFA to improving broader part-time faculty involvement that ultimately would result in greater participation.

R. Mahon asked if the PowerPoint presentation will be shared, AR said it would be uploaded to SharePoint for access.

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

**17. CCAP Taskforce Update. (AGT/B. Curry (BC)/C. Bach (CB))**

*Report on CCAP Research Project.*

Will be Moved to Next Mtg.

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

**None**

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

None

**21. ADJOURN**

**Meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.**

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

*Agenda Items due by March 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 Brunét, Chris Carrol,  
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