

ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

Minutes for Tuesday, October 13, 2026

4:00 – 6:00 pm

Room F-225 (Fine Arts Building)

*[See last page of the minutes for details on *, **, ***, Δ]*

Academic Senate Executive Committee (ASE):

President: Ana Gómez de Torres (AGT) **Vice President:** Thesa Roepke (TR)
Secretary: Héctor Álvarez (HA) **Member-at-Large:** Fred Patrick (FP)
Member-at-Large: Alberto Restrepo (AR)

2026-2027 Academic Senators (Department Faculty Representatives):

Academic/Student Services: Ben Britten (BBri)	Applied Social Sciences: Yvon Frazier (YF)	Business: Bob Bryant (BBry)
Counseling-Personal Development: Clint Freeland (CF) Carissa Perales (CPe) Kiri Villa (KV)	English: Chris Carrol (CC) Karina Lara (KA) Tina Nuñez (TN)	Fine Arts: Chris Hite (CH) Anne McMeeking (AM)
Health Sciences Amy Gisclon (AG) Shavaun Maxson (SM)	Industrial Technology: Gabriel Marquez (GM)	Kinesiology, Recreation, Athletics: Chuck Provencio (CPr)
Languages & Communications: Diane Auten (DA)	Life & Physical Sciences: Alicia Fox (AF) Sean Gottlieb (SG) Vince Tobin (VT)	Mathematical Sciences: Anna Kopcrak (AK) Martin Landeros (ML) Liz West (LW)
Public Safety: Marc Hammill (MH)	Social & Behavioral Sciences: Miguel Diaz (MD)	Part-Time Faculty Reps: Monique Segura (MS) Jessica Solorio (JS) Chris Sprecher (CS)

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

Yvon Frazier (P), Bob Bryant (P), Clint Freeland (P), C. Perales (P), K. Villa (P), Chris Carroll (P), Trevor Passage (proxy for Karina Luna (P), Tina Nuñez (P), Chris Hite (P), Anne McMeeking (A), Amy Gisclon (P), Shavaun Maxon (P), Gabriel Marquez (P), Chuck Provencio (P), Diane Auten (P), Alicia Fox (A), Sean Gottlieb (P), Vince Tobin (A), Anna Kopcrak (P), Martin Landeros (P), Liz West (P), Leonard Champion (proxy for Mark Hammill), Miguel Diaz (P), Monique Segura (P), Jessica Solorio (P), Chris Sprecher (P), Ana Gómez de Torres (P: votes only to break a tie), Thesa Roepke (P), Héctor Álvarez (P), Alberto Restrepo (P), Fred Patrick (P)

Senators-Voting Members Present Remote (Zoom Participants) ***:

Ben Britten (P: Just Cause)

Student Representatives-non-voting (P: Present / A: Absent):

Kyle Guyton, (KG: A), Tina Rios (TRi: P)

Guests Present:

Tyson Aye (TA, Faculty, Kinesiology, Recreation, Athletics), John Hood (JH, Faculty, Department Chair, Fine Arts), Larry Manalo Jr. (LM, Faculty, Health Sciences, AP&P Chair), Monica Millard (MM, Dean, Fine Arts and Social & Behavioral Sciences), Andria Perdue-Keiser (AP, Faculty/Coordinator, English Language Development, NC), Deborah Pirman (DP, Dean, Ext. Campus), Genevieve Siwabessy (Asst. Supt./VP Student Services)

Guests Present: Remote (Zoom):

Ruben Ramirez (RR, Exec. Director, Human Resources), Christine Reed (CR, Faculty, Counselor/Coordinator, MESA/STEM Academic Success Center)

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

Student Learning Council:	(NP): Julia Raybould-Rodgers (Faculty, English Dept.) & (NP): 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.) & (NP): 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): Gary Bierly (Faculty, Social & Behavioral Sciences Dept.) & (NP): Laura Becker (Interim Assoc. Supt./VP Finance and Admin)
Facilities Council:	(P): Tyson Aye (Faculty, Kinesiology, Recreation, Athletics) & (NP): Laura Becker (Interim 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): Andria Perdue-Keiser (Faculty/Coordinator, English Language Development, NC)
Professional Standards Committee:	(P): Liz West, (Faculty, Mathematical Sciences)
Professional Development Committee:	(P): Diane Auten (Faculty, Languages & Communications)

ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA

1. Call to Order. [2] (AGT)

President AGT called the meeting called to order at 4:04 pm

2. Roll Call:

Present at time of roll call (27): B. Britten (Zoom), B. Bryant, C. Freeland, C. Perales, K. Villa, C. Carroll, T. Passage (proxy for K. Lara), T. Nuñez, C. Hite, A. Gisclon, S. Maxson, G. Marquez, C. Provencio, D. Auten, Y Frazier, S. Gottlieb, A. Kopcrak, M. Landeros, L. West, M. Segura, C. Sprecher, L. Champion (proxy for M. Hammil), A. Gómez de Torres, T. Roepke, A. Restrepo, F. Patrick, H. Álvarez

AGT: Quorum established

J. Solorio arrived after roll call occurred and participated in the remainder of the meeting.

4 AGT: called for a motion to amend the Agenda: Move Item 14: Adopting the Statewide Low Textbook Cost Amount & Local Symbol into the Information section of Agenda and become Item 11, and to Correct the misspelling of a name found in Agenda Item 16.

A motion to amend Agenda to move and make Agenda Item 14 the new Item 11 and correct the misspelling in Agenda Item 16 is made by A. Kopcrak/seconded by B. Bryant

AGT: called for any objections or abstentions

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AGT: motion to amend the Agenda is approved

3. Approval of Minutes from 9/22/26: [5] * (HA)

A motion to approve the minutes from 9/22/26 is made by B Bryant/seconded by T. Nuñez

AGT called for any objections or abstentions:

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AGT: the motion to approve the 9/22/26 minutes carried unanimous consent.

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

T. Roepke (TR): Faculty Innovation Grant Applications are open and are due Oct 30th. Applications are vetted by the committee and those chosen to receive the grant will be notified by November 9th. TR will host two Technical Assistance sessions via Zoom: one on Friday, Oct 16th, and a second session on Oct 23rd, both will be from 3 p.m. - 5 p.m. Interested faculty email TR for more information and for the Zoom link.

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

AGT acknowledged faculty for being understanding and working with students as they experience undue stress and anxiety due to the recent incident with ICE agents detaining the father of an AHC student on campus. She acknowledged faculty for being flexible and supporting students during these difficult times.

Mentioned the CA Community Colleges Chancellor's Office(CCCCO) *Reimagining Assessment* year-long professional development program and the discipline specific sessions. The link for more information is available through the AHC Academic Senate webpage, go to Statewide Academic Senate (ASCCC) & Conference Links in the navigation area of the webpage.

Mentioned that the CA Community Colleges Chancellors Office (CCCCO) is also providing systemwide leadership support for the *AI for Teaching and Learning Institute* (AI4TL). Colleges selected to participate will receive \$10,000 to design an AI project for teaching and learning with coaching and peer support. More details available through the link found on the AHC Academic Senate webpage, go to Statewide Academic Senate (ASCCC) & Conference Links in the navigation area of the page.

Mentioned the newly established *Faculty Data & Research Committee*. A call was made for up to two additional faculty interested in serving on the committee. Interested faculty are to use the Academic Senate Form: "Academic Senate Council/Committee Participation Request Form" available on the AHC Academic Senate webpage, go to Academic Senate Forms or Frequently Asked Questions on the Navigation part of the page for and look for the *Academic Senate Council/Committee Participation Request Form* link, or reach out to ASE.

Mentioned that the Academic Senate Forms links found on the Academic Senate's webpage are now functional. Reminder to use the new online submission forms moving forward for the following requests:

- Academic Senate Agenda Request Form*
- Academic Senate Council/Committee Participation Request Form
- Chairs/Co-Chairs Councils/Committee Monthly Request Form
- Academic Senators/Department Representatives Form

** When requesting an item to be considered for a future Senate Agenda, be sure to also upload any necessary document(s).*

New Meeting Timekeeper instrument: ASE will use a buzzer to signal when allotted time for an item expires. The instrument was donated by SBCC's Admissions and Records and the Dual Enrollment Program.

A reminder made to continue to circulate the Senate meeting sign-in sheets to ensure everyone who attends signs-in.

CONSENT

None

ACTION ITEMS

6. AP 7921 Full-Time Hiring and Recruitment. * [5] (TR/R. Ramirez (RR))

TR: HR Council has completed a substantial revision of AP 7921. The AP underwent significant reformatting, and all faculty had opportunities to provide feedback (by way of an email request calling for feedback sent earlier in the semester). Feedback that was received was considered by HR Council and was incorporated accordingly.

Between the last Senate meeting (9/22) and this meeting, the English Dept. provided additional feedback (mostly clerical in nature and grammar related, including minor corrections to spelling, punctuation, incomplete sentences and other minor related edits). That feedback was incorporated into the AP that was made available for review in the Senate's SharePoint and shared today.

Discussion:

AK asked whether any substantive changes were made, particularly regarding minimum qualifications, and if updates to specific position titles or the responsible parties who will validate are mentioned in the AP (referenced page 6 of the AP: Minimum Qualifications Screen Review of Applicants).

TR noted that references to relevant board policy remain unchanged (AP 7211: Minimum Qualifications and Equivalencies), and updates were made where necessary to reflect current titles and terms used. For example, references to specific administrative positions were revised to align with current organizational structures including the use of term "department chair (or faculty designee if the department does not have a department chair) in consultation with discipline faculty" and "appropriate administrator" (Section II A).

The Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO) title was noted and is spelled correctly.

Also, in Section II A, it was clarified who reviews job specifications (including required, desired or preferred) beyond the state minimum quals to ensure conformity with requirements of equal employment regulations and state and federal non-discrimination laws and the section shows consistency with the Districts EEO Plan. Should the CHRO have to assign a designee, that would be an HR official who is conducting the search (who also serves as the EEO representative of a particular search).

A Senator asked for clarification regarding what constitutes a "small pool" and if a numerical definition should be stated (reference to page 6, Item B of the AP).

RR noted that the constitution of a hiring pool is based on the circumstances of the recruitment. He added there are specialized disciplines (e.g. nursing and other health-related fields) that often generate smaller applicant pools compared to other disciplines). In those instances, extending or reopening a search may not reasonably yield a larger or more diverse group of applicants.

Motion to extend discussion five additional minutes made by S. Gottlieb/seconded by A. Kopcrak

AGT called for any objections or abstentions

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AGT: motion to extend discussion five additional minutes carries.

SG suggested edits (referenced page 1): second paragraph, proposed a change to read "...will select instructors who excel at teaching in the community college setting...". Additionally, on page 2, section II Job Announcements, Item B: pointed out the redundancy in the sentence that reads "...job duties of the job...". Recommendation to revise to read "to perform the duties of the job".

RR commented it should have read 'to perform essential functions of the job but "duties of the job" works as well.

TR asked if the edits can be accepted as a friendly amendment to include on page 1, section B "who can excel at teaching" and on page 2, II. Job Announcements, B.: edit *to perform the job duties of the job* to read instead "perform the duties of job,...".

ASE concurred.

Motion to approve AP7921 with friendly amendment noted was made by B. Bryant/seconded by T. Nuñez

AGT called for any objections or abstentions

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AGT: motion to approve AP 7921 with the friendly amendment carries by unanimous consent.

7. BP/AP 5110 Counseling. * [5] (M. Arvizu-Rodriguez (MAR)/G. Siwabessy (GS))

BP 5110:

GS: Student Services Council received no further edits or feedback since the BP was brought to the Senate last meeting.

Discussion:

Motion to approve BP 5110 made by B. Bryant/seconded by C. Freeland

AGT called for any objections or abstentions

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AGT: BP 5110 is unanimously approved.

AP 5110:

GS: Student Services Council received no further edits or feedback since the AP was brought to the Senate last meeting.

Motion to approve AP 5110 made by A. Kopcrak/seconded by B. Bryant

AGT called for any objections or abstentions

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AGT: BP 5110 is unanimously approved.

8. AP 5013 Students in the Military. * [5] (M. Arvizu-Rodriguez (MAR)/G. Siwabessy (GS))

GS: Student Services Council received no further edits or feedback since this AP was brought to the Senate last meeting.

GS also provided an update on pronoun use in BPs/APs (this requested at the 9.22.26 Senate meeting). She clarified that pronoun use in all BPs/APs gets checked and updated if needed by the President's Office (J. McGee) prior to the Board Policies going to the Board of Trustees.

Discussion:

Motion to approve AP 5013 made by B. Bryant/seconded by A. Kopcrak

AGT called for any objections or abstentions

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AGT: AP 5013 is unanimously approved.

INFORMATION (FOR FUTURE ACTION/APPROVAL)

9. BP/AP 3500 Campus Safety. * [5] (T. Aye (TA)/L. Becker (LB))

TA mentioned Facilities Council meets year-round (including during winter and summer terms). This is necessary as projects, especially larger facilities projects, also take place outside of the regular semester course offerings. Meetings are held the 2nd and 4th Thursday of the month. He wants to be notified if constituent groups are not getting opportunities to provide feedback to Facilities Council.

BP 3500:

TA: So far no feedback has been received on any of the items coming from Facilities Council on today's Agenda (e.g., Items 9, 10, and 11). Request for feedback was first requested last May (during spring semester 2026).

AGT mentioned that concerns were previously mentioned and due to additional questions raised recently, Items 9, 10, and 11 are back on the Senate Agenda today to ensure Facilities Council gets feedback. She also mentioned that although these items are not necessarily 10+1, due to impact on faculty and due to past and recent concerns raised by faculty, they are agendaized. BP 3500 is on Agenda for Information and departments will have the opportunity to provide Facilities Council additional feedback.

Discussion:

AK asked if the Emergency Response Plan has it been updated as it seems incomplete or in progress when she referenced it. She also wondered if a Workplace Violence Prevention Plan is part or should be part of this Campus Safety BP/AP.

TA: he will follow up on these questions.

Motion to extend discussion five minutes made by A. Kopcrak/seconded by T. Nuñez

AGT called for any objections or abstentions

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AGT motion to extend discussion is approved.

Question asked about the timeline to complete/submit the Campus Safety Plan.

TA urged for this type of feedback as Facilities Council has been trying to move forward on the policy since May. He added that he will report on the timeline.

SG asked about the section of the policy that references the District use of security camera technology. In particular, the part reading "Security cameras shall be used for safety, security, law enforcement purposes, and business efficiency."

He asked for clarification on the meaning or reference of business efficiency and what exactly security camera use entails.

Senators asked additional questions:

- Are the security cameras Flock Cameras?
- Is facial recognition employed?
- What is the cost/budget associated with the surveillance mentioned in the BP?
- Where are the cameras/surveillance monitoring occurring/where exactly are the cameras located?

It was suggested that The district should be more transparent.

TA asked if the feedback could be emailed to him.

AGT asked for those who provided feedback to email it directly to TA so he has it for Facilities Council.

AGT reminded Senators and in particular Council Chairs/Co-Chairs that as BPs and APs are reviewed, it's important that the CCPD Council check on any BPs or APs that are referenced in the AP/BP under their review, as Councils need to ensure that referenced BPs/APs are up to date

AP 3500:

AGT mentioned the updated language showing on AP 3500. She added it's here as information and charged Senators to take the AP and BP to departments and provide feedback to TA.

TA requested clarification on how feedback on items brought by Facilities Council to Senate will get back to him or LB.

AGT clarified that feedback given on items presented at Senate as Information is to be noted by the Council Co-chairs as the feedback is given. Co-Chairs need to make note of the feedback provided during their presentation/updates of BPs/APs. Co-chairs can request that Senators who gave feedback during the meeting also email said feedback to them but stressed that it's the Council Co-Chairs responsibility to make note of

the feedback provided during Senate meetings. It is similar to what Senators do in order to report back to department what takes place at Seante.

She added, that ideally, Council Co-Chairs should send a *Request for Feedback email* as the work on the BPs/APs is initiated at the Council-level—doing so invites all faculty to provide feedback early on (even before the item(s) come to the Senate. AGT stressed that doing so will allow the Councils to solicit feedback early that can help shape the Council's work at the Council level.

Then items come to Senate as Information (Council Co-Chairs may receive additional or minor feedback during the Senate meeting). Thereafter, Council Co-Chairs are to take the feedback to their respective councils, and the constituent representatives discuss and review the feedback and decide what to incorporate to update further the BPs/APs accordingly. Also, the Council can generate answers to questions raised at Senate. Then the updated BPs/APs return to Senate for Action, and if approved move on to College Council then ultimately to the Board of Trustees.

10. BP/AP 3515 Reporting Crimes. * [5] (T. Aye (TA)/L. Becker (LB))

BP 3515:

Discussion:

AGT mentioned there appears to be no changes or updates to BP 3515 as shown. Senators are to take this back for feedback to Facilities Council.

AP 3515:

Discussion:

AK indicated the file associated with this item on the Senate SharePoint has additional APs/BPs and asked for clarity if other policies (beyond 3515) were to have been reviewed.

AGT clarified that when sending documents that accompany an Agenda Item it is the responsibility of the Council Co-Chairs or presenter(s) of other items to only share what is needed so files are uploaded to the SharePoint for Senators to review—this avoids confusion. She clarified that Senators are to focus only on BP/AP 3515.

AK asked about the *Stop Campus Hazing Act* which appears to be new language in AP 3515. She asked what federal student aid programs would be impacted and if these should be clearly noted.

11. Adopting the Statewide Low Textbook Cost Amount & Local Symbol. * [5] (T. Passage (TP)/L. West (LW))

TP and LW are the ZTC Grant faculty liaisons. They would like Senate to take action to change the Low Textbook Cost (LTC) designation limit to \$30 (from the existing \$40) to meet the statewide standardized amount.

Also, they would like Senate to adopt a new LTC symbol to identify to students (and others) in Class Search what courses use LTC textbooks.

A Chancellor's Office memo requesting colleges adopt the \$30 amount was referenced. The Chancellor's Office memo explains that the \$30 recommendation is based on the Statewide Student Senate recommendation.

TP acknowledges that the AHC Senate had previously approved \$40 but would like faculty to acknowledge what students statewide have proposed as a reasonable amount for textbooks (\$30 and below), and that they did so through the Statewide Student Senate.

Discussion:

AGT asked if the proposed new LTC symbol is used statewide.

BBri replied there is probably no standardized statewide symbol and referenced Cuesta's Zero-Materials-Cost symbol as being different than what AHC currently uses.

LW mentioned Campus Graphics was consulted and they created the proposed LTC symbol up for consideration to adopt.

AGT asked senators to have departments consider if the change from \$40 to \$30 would impact their program.

LM asked what would happen if a department or program determined that textbook cost(s) are more than \$30.

TP: the course would not receive the designation, as the choose not to adopt LTC was made.

TN asked if the \$30 applies to bookstore textbook costs?

TP: Yes.

DA asked, if implemented, would it take effect Spring 2027?

TP: Most likely "no". Due to XB12 coding system process, implementation would most like take effect Fall 27.

AGT: take this to departments, feedback should be sent to TP and LW.

REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

12. Personal Equipment Restrictions & Guidelines. * [10] (T. Aye (TA)/L. Becker (LB))

AGT clarified this item is a non-action item. Feedback can be discussed/given now, and if departments have additional feedback it needs to be provided directly to TA and LB so they can inform Facilities Council and then respond.

TA mentioned this item has received some feedback in the past. He stated it was determined that personal refrigerators or couches are not permissible (he referenced a fire in an office was caused by a personal refrigerator). He added that exceptions can be granted due to medical circumstances. Requests would go through HR.

Discussion:

LW shared Math Department concerns with chairs and other office and classroom necessities as being outdated, dilapidated, or not functioning. Faculty have asked for updated equipment for years; however, it is not clear how requests are approved and would like more clarity on how replacement happens, timelines, and in general more transparency.

LM added he is aware of departments having using 'a collection fund' (from personal monies) to buy necessary furniture and then learn it should have been approved first. He asked if a provision for that can be considered. Can departments have an allotted budget for equipment?

SG mentioned his department has a refrigerator that is in the common space/work room, however he expressed concern if faculty or staff may have to store medication (such as insulin) and in those instances that should not be relegated to a public refrigerator due to privacy and safety.

Senators agreed, and stated the document appears to only focus on restrictions and asked for exceptions to be noted.

Additional concerns were raised about having to store medication or food (for faculty or staff who have dietary restrictions). It was shared that often things placed in breakroom refrigerators get taken or discarded by mistake. This document should include or be receptive to such needs.

Questions about the use of personal fans were raised, as the older buildings do not have functioning or available air conditioning or have restrictive cross air flow to ventilate classrooms (students and faculty have complained).

It was suggested the policy can benefit by being clear or establishing standards of things that faculty and students should have, rather than how it is currently focused: on what should not be there. There appears to be too much emphasis on restrictions.

TRi (student) shared that students have expressed similar concerns to ASBG as those have been raised today and added that students agree that faculty should have the things needed so they can teach and so the spaces are comfortable for students and faculty (some buildings are too hot). She added that addressing these matters will also benefit students and improve learning.

AR shared that although what is presented on this document is not necessarily part of the 10+1, what ends up in the document is still part of shared governance and all constituent groups should have input to help shape what eventually will be in the document.

AGT encouraged that additional feedback be emailed to TA/LB.

13. Furniture Guidelines. * [5] (T. Aye (TA)/L. Becker (LB))

Discussion centered on concerns about proposed furniture guidelines contained in the document. The document as presented seems prohibited.

TR raised concern from Career Technical Education (CTE) programs as they have specialized equipment needs that are often not part of the standard catalogs the College makes available for purchases.

Other Senators echoed that standardized district furniture options may not always be appropriate for certain instructional environments. One example involved existing couches being removed and replaced with district-issued furniture that was viewed as unsuitable for program needs.

Senators raised the need for flexibility or an exemption process that would allow departments or programs to purchase furniture and equipment (outside what is standardized) when justified by the program to meet instructional and student needs. Concerns were also raised about space constraints, including the kitchen area and very small faculty offices.

AR raised distinctions between standards, guidelines, and what constitutes a formal policy. The enforceability of such standards and guidelines was questioned, especially when departments or divisions interpret and apply guidelines or standards differently.

Several senators agreed and expressed concern that inconsistent enforcement can create inequities, with one department being prohibited from a purchase while another department may be permitted and this is problematic.

Senators suggested that clearer language, or potentially a formal policy, could help establish what is mandatory, what is recommended, and where departments should have discretion. The question was asked if departments could have a budget.

Senators suggested that student feedback is also obtained.

It was stressed that the document provides consistency while retaining flexibility to accommodate faculty identified, program-specific needs.

TA acknowledged the feedback and indicated that the concerns would be taken to Facilities Council for further consideration. Participants were also encouraged to continue providing feedback and to email him directly.

14. Faculty Innovation Fund Report. * [10] (A. Gisclon (AG))

Academic Progression of Dental Assisting Students to Dental Hygiene Practice

AG: The Dental Assistance (DA) Program coordinated a field trip for AHC students to visit Oxnard College's Dental Hygiene Program. The program received \$6960 from the Faculty Innovation Fund to expand student awareness of education and career pathways in Dental Hygiene. Brooke Souza (Faculty, Counselor and Health Sciences Liaison) was also involved and accompanied the students. Twelve students participated and they received a campus and dental clinic tour, meetings with Oxnard College Dental Hygiene program faculty, and a counseling workshop focused on understanding program requirements and expectations as well as the admission process.

Students had an opportunity to experience a Dental Hygiene program firsthand while also allowing AHC faculty to establish connections with Oxnard faculty and staff to support AHC students interested in continuing their education in dental hygiene after the DA program at AHC. Students also learned about Oxnard College's bachelor's degree pathway, prerequisite and admissions requirements, and the highly competitive selection process. Currently, there are seven community colleges in CA that offer a bachelor's degree in dental hygiene.

The grant afforded opportunities for AHC DA Program to learn more about the importance of intentional articulation and transfer planning, and that this is key if the DA program is to serve as a pathway for greater opportunities in dental careers beyond AHC's DA program. Regional labor data reveals a need for Dental Hygiene professionals in the area, and that there are limited availability of programs near the AHC service area (Taft and Oxnard College are the nearest programs. The DA program is aware that relocating is often a challenge for AHC students). A long-term goal is to ensure opportunities for AHC students beyond the DA program. There is a need to establish stronger partnerships, articulation agreements, clinical affiliations, and ideally establish a Dental Hygiene program at AHC would be key to reducing barriers to meet the health care needs of the community.

A motion to extend discussion five-additional minutes made by A. Kopcrak/seconded by B. Bryant

AGT called for any objections or abstentions

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AGT motion to extend discussion is approved.

Discussion:

CF shared that students often express to Counselors interest in Taft's Dental Hygiene program and asked if the DA program is considering partnering with Taft as well, for students to have similar experiences as they did with Oxnard College. Additionally, he added that students are often discouraged to learn that there are no closer options to pursue Dental Hygiene.

AG: the DA program is aware and would like to explore opportunities with Taft.

A question was raised whether the perceived bottle neck in students pursuing dental hygiene programs is due to the lack of facilities or the need for instructors.

AG: probably both are factors, but there are certainly others like keeping class size small which impact the number of accepted applicants each year. She added that a clinical affiliation with Taft would be ideal and it's something AHC decides to pursue.

AG summarized that The DA program will continue surveying student interest in Dental Hygiene and explore pathways. The program seeks to provide additional campus and Dental Hygiene program visits, so AHC students can explore Dental Hygiene options firsthand. They want to explore articulation or transfer pathways further to assist student transition into Dental Hygiene programs. Additionally, they want to explore potential partnerships or clinical affiliations (e.g., with Taft College as well). They want to examine barriers students face to expand Dental Hygiene education locally, particularly facility capacity and instructor availability as the longer-term goal of determining the feasibility of creating a Dental Hygiene program at AHC would increase local access to the profession and support the region's needs for Dental Hygiene professionals.

~~**114. Adopting the Statewide Low Textbook Cost Amount & Local Symbol. * [5] (T. Passage/L. West)**~~

By approved motion, this Item: Adopting the Statewide Low Textbook Cost Amount & Symbol was moved into Information section of the Agenda and became Item 11.

15. DRS Toolkit. * [10] (S. Kopecky (SK))

SK could not be present, John Hood (JH, Fine Arts faculty and Dept. Chair) member of the Faculty Hiring Committee presented updates on the DRS Toolkit.

The DRS toolkit has been in review for the past year and has undergone a complete update. He acknowledged the faculty who have done work encompassing earlier trainings for DRS and the development of the first Diversity Resource Specialist Toolkit: Héctor Álvarez, Mayra Morales, Yvonne Teniente-Cuello, as well as early work on the DRS role initiated by Margaret Tillery, Robert Nichols, and Donna Bishop.

Work on the updating of the new DRS Toolkit was conducted by John Hood, Susie Kopecky, Ron Lovell, and Mary Pat Nelson. They removed outdated images and graphs (the prior handbook had not been edited since it was first produced back in 2016). New links to new data dashboards were added as well as links to relevant and updated BPs and APs have been included, as well as other edits have been made. The document has also been sent to Phil Hamer to ensure it is ready to make accessible via the website.

JH mentioned ASE has provided feedback. The role of the Diversity Resource Specialist has been clarified/updated in the revised document. The DRS Toolkit stipulates that training for faculty to serve as a DRS needs to take place every three years. He encouraged everyone to review the updated toolkit.

Discussion:

Should the committee or the Senate address when administration reconfigures a hiring committee—does/should the DRS or Department Chair play a role in these cases?).

Suggestion made to create video and workshops for faculty interested in serving as a DRS.

Has the document considered updates to DEI/EEO changes from the state?

AGT: did consultation with HR Council occur?

TR: noted possible references to outdated sources (has newer research articles been considered to include in this updated document?). Also, she referenced a typo and correction needed: page 9 it lists BP/AP 721 (it should be AP 7921).

AK: asked if it is the DRS role, or the role of someone on the hiring committee, to have the responsibility for investigating or evaluating an applicant's use of AI in application materials, especially because the application is now all online. She added it's becoming common for schools and colleges are exploring supervised or proctored essay writings to ensure applicants produce their own work rather than relying on AI. Hiring and screening committees are noticing AI generated content in applications.

The importance of continued discussions of AI related concerns was encouraged (not just in hiring, but overall). Specific to this item, it was shared that AI monitoring may be more of an HR charge or a policy issue rather than the responsibility of specific person on the hiring committee, or the DRS.

It was mentioned that Currently there is nothing in a policy that prohibits the use of AI.

AGT: The DRS toolkit is not return for Action, as it's on the Agenda as report from a Senate Standing Committee. She encouraged everyone to read it thoroughly and any feedback be sent to S. Kopecky and J. Hood. She noted that feedback was also given today.

16. Curriculum Development Workflow * [5] (L. Manalo (LM)/B. Britten (BBri)/A. Perdue-Keiser (APK)/V. Smith (VS))

AGT: The need for a *Curriculum Development Workflow* resource was raised at the last Senate meeting due to departments requesting more clarity on the process, who to contact, timelines, etc. Due to technical difficulties, the updated document is not viewable but will be available in Senate's SharePoint. Therefore, for purposes of this item, the existing file in the SharePoint was used.

LM summarized the curriculum development workflow, the approval process, timelines, and appropriate points of contact. He emphasized that curriculum timelines are driven by the college catalog development, and AP&P 'plans backward' to ensure Chancellor's Office requirements are met, and that AP&P reports make Academic Senate and Board of Trustees meeting schedules. Also, when applicable, CSU and UC articulation timelines need to be considered for AP&P's work and reporting.

The importance of understanding how proposals move through multiple stages of review was stressed, as that impacts everything. A general rule of thumb to keep in mind is that a proposal that reaches AP&P, generally by October, should make or could be included to be part of next year's college catalog. For example, this year the date was October 1st, but AP&P worked with ASE and the date was extended to October 15th. The October date each year is important to enable all intended proposals to make the AP&P Summary Report so it can eventually proceed to the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting in November. This would allow, ultimately, for all proposals included in the Summary Report to make the following year's catalog. Everyone was reminded that before it goes to the BOT, the Summary Report first comes to the Academic Senate for review/approval). Proposals submitted after October will be considered for the following/year after next catalog.

LM added that AP&P responds to a heavy workload associated with recent curriculum changes, adjustments to course units and hours, discipline name changes, noncredit curriculum, common course numbering, C-ID alignment, and development of ADTs. It's important to understand how changes, no matter how small, impact programs, AP&P workload, and compliance requirements: all this requires intensive coordination and review by AP&P.

LM and APK acknowledged the extensive work undertaken by all the AP&P faculty department representatives as well as the contributions by the extended AP&P (non-voting) members. Also highlighted was the work of the Technical Review Committee, the Articulation Officer's (B. Britten) role, Trevor Passage's role, (although not a member of the TRC, TP reviews everything as well). Additionally, the important work of Curriculum Analyst, (Vicky Smith), and Curriculum Technician (Jay Taylor-Burns) was acknowledged.

APK: echoed the workflow and processes outlined by LM. APK also underscored the high volume of proposals they review, and the workload experienced during the current cycle as being not sustainable moving forward. To meet demands and improve the process, the committee is finalizing a concise resource for faculty that will cover proposal types and clearly outline common issues, requirements, expected timelines, key contacts, etc. The goal is to help faculty and deans prepare more complete submissions to avoid delays through the approval process.

Faculty were encouraged to begin developing proposals in the spring as this allows sufficient time for review and revisions before the fall deadline. Ideally, AP&P would like their work in the fall semester to deal with responding to state mandates, compliance requirements, and other urgent or unexpected curriculum needs that often arise.

Faculty are also encouraged to communicate with their AP&P department representatives to establish realistic timelines, have general questions answered, and for discipline-specific guidance. Also, faculty need to consult with the Articulation Officer for articulation-related questions. The TRC Chair (Andria Perdue Keiser), Curriculum Analyst (Vickey Smith) and Deborah Pirman work as a team to clarify any Chancellors Office requirements/recommendations. The importance of speaking with area deans was stressed—early in the initiation of proposals, to assess program priority, student demand, and financial sustainability. State mandates or legally required changes should be direct to the AP&P Chair (Larry Manalo) and he consults with the VP Academic Affairs (B. Curry). Questions regarding course scheduling should be direct to Ricardo Lopez.

LM reiterated the overall goal with the Workflow Resource is to improve communication, clarify responsibilities, establish realistic expectations to ensure curriculum proposals are developed and submitted early enough to move efficiently through the approval processes.

A motion to extend A. Kopcrak/seconded by S. Gottlieb

AGT called for any objections or abstentions

No: (0) / Abstain: (0)

AGT: motion to extend discussion is approved

BBri mentioned the document has been worked on collectively and stressed the importance of relying one's department representatives who serve on AP&P for assistance and guidance early on.

LW: asked if 100-level courses are transferable to CSUs (e.g. are 100-level courses automatic to CSU).

BBri: mentioned yes (as CSU transferability is a local decision) but stressed the importance understanding that transferability of courses is not the same as the articulation of courses.

TN: asked about the process of sunseting a course, what are the timelines.

LM replied that something like can come to AP&P at any time, but caution to be careful and consider any adverse effects to a program.

VS added that sunseting does not happen immediately, it takes time, but when to initiate is key. She passed along a timeline for review.

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

17. Faculty Data & Research Committee. [5] (A. Kopcrak (AK)/C. Bach (CB))

AGT announced Anna Kopcrak as the new faculty co-chair of the Faculty Data & Research Committee.

AK mentioned the committee is officially part of the CCPD. The first meeting will be October 16th, 1 p.m.- 2 p.m. via Zoom. The committee is open to all, like all committees are. However, the makeup/membership of the committee lists 7 faculty members to serve on it, there are still openings for two faculty to serve—if interested, reach out to ASE expressing interest to be appointed. Anyone interested in attending as a guest or to check it out, reach out to AK for the Zoom link.

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

None

18. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND DEPARTMENT SUGGESTIONS

AGT reminded the Senate that the online Senate Forms found on the Academic Senate Website are now functioning.

A suggestion was made for AP&P to consider having a Canvas Shell.

19. ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 6 p.m.

Next Academic Senate Meeting: October 27, 2026.

Agenda Items Due by October 19, 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" (per SB 707) they must submit a request prior to the meeting, as well as indicate the reason for remote participation. For remote participation use the Zoom link below.

Remote participation for "just cause" is limited to five (5) meetings in a calendar year.

*** *If any Senators are participating remotely, this link will also be available to the public for viewing or making public comments*

Senator's Remote Participation Link:

<https://hancockcollege.zoom.us/j/86273338597>

Δ *Denotes a change in the order of Agenda Items by way of an approved motion.*