



May 2, 2023

Location: <https://zoom.us/j/94542479249?pwd=QmE3bExzRi9rTExDZ21MK1VQU1VJQT09>

Attendance: Frank Accardo, Tanja Baum, Alex Cadena, Martin Covarrubias, Fran Cummings, Libby Curiel, Bill Curington, Brian Brutlag, Margaret Griffith, Shari Herzfeld, Mike Hinze, Jorge Huinquez, Shirley Isaac, Steve Johnson, George Kimber, Michael Koger, Vic Kowalski, Cynthia Lewis, Dave Lindy, Jeannie Liu, Kelly Lynch, Sheila Lynch, Marina Markossian, Angelica Martinez, Greg Miller, Carley Mitchell, Farrah Nakatani, Katie O'Brien, Tyler Okamoto, Dorali Pichardo-Diaz, Dianna Reyes, Angela Rhodes, Mutsuno Ryan, Aditi Sapra, Diego Silva, Kevin Smith, Shelly Spencer, Razvan Stoian, Young Lee

Ad Hoc Members Present: Diana Valladares, Elizabeth Ramirez

Members Absent: Marissa Berru-Licon, Wendy Carrera, Juana Mora, Viviana Villanueva

Guests: Alicia Kruienza, George Wheeler, Heba Griffiths, Earic Dixon-Peters

1. Call to order
 - a. Meeting called to order at 1:01pm
2. Motion to amend the Agenda to include Item 11b
 - a. Moved by K. Smith/ Second by A. Martinez
 - b. Motion passes unanimously (27 aye/0 nay/0 abstain)
3. Motion to adopt the perfected Agenda
 - a. Moved by K. Smith/ Second by A. Martinez
 - b. Motion passes unanimously (28 aye/0 nay/0 abstain)
4. Approval of Minutes from April 18, 2023
 - a. Moved by D. Pichardo-Diaz/Second by B. Brutlag
 - i. M. Koger read that there were no requests to amend the Minutes
 - ii. Minutes approved (28 aye/0 nay/1 abstain)
5. Public Comment: Persons wishing to address the Academic Senate on any item on the agenda or comment on any other matter are allowed three minutes per topic. Pursuant to the Brown Act, the Academic Senate cannot discuss or take action on items not listed on the agenda. Matters brought before the Academic Senate that are not on the agenda may, at the Senate's discretion, be referred to the Senate Executive Council or placed on the next agenda.
 - a. L. Curiel reiterated the networking issue on campus with internet connectivity and that she has been unable to have (consistent) service in the A Building
 - i. T. Baum-Low seconded in the chat that there are still internet issues in the Science Building

6. Committee Reports

a. Senate Committees

- i. Academic Rank, Frank Sotelo – Appendix A
- ii. Curriculum, Elizabeth Ramirez – Appendix B
- iii. Distance Education, Jill Pfeiffer – Appendix C
- iv. Guided Pathways, Lydia Gonzalez – Appendix D (and attached to Agenda)
- v. Instructional Technology (ITC), Dana Arazi
- vi. Open Educational Resources (OER), Sheila Lynch
 1. S. Lynch announced the ZTC Program Planning workgroup had its first meeting and we will meet again.
- vii. Outcomes, Sean Hughes
 1. No report
- viii. Staff Development/FLEX, Katie O'Brien – Appendix E

b. Planning & Fiscal Council Committees

- i. Facilities, Scott Jaeggi
 1. No report
- ii. Institutional Effectiveness (IEC), Julio Flores
 1. No report
- iii. Planning and Procedural Council, Rudy Rios
 1. President Flores will be asking PPC to work through during Summer to continue looking at policies and procedures
- iv. Program Review, Marie Eckstrom
 1. No report
- v. Safety, Brian Brutlag
 1. No report

c. Additional Committees

- i. Enterprise Systems Advisory, Colin Young
 1. No report
- ii. Foundational Skills & Instructional Support, Tyler Okamoto
 1. Several redundant committees are looking at streamlining and removing those redundancies to increase effectiveness
- iii. Online Education Initiative (OEI), TBD
- iv. ASCCC Open Educational Resources Initiative (OERI), Sheila Lynch
 1. No report
- v. Student Equity, Juana Mora
 1. No report
- vi. Student Success and Support Services Program (SSSP), Bill Curington
 1. No report

7. President's Report

a. Discussion: Use of Board Docs for Agendas and Minutes

- i. Background: The Board of Trustees and other Rio Hondo College bodies use Board Docs. This was brought up by Dr. Durdella as a way to streamline

compiling documents for accreditation. Each committee needs to decide for itself whether or not to adopt using Board Docs

1. It is worth noting that PDFs are not 508 Compliant. The use of Board Docs by Senators for Agendas and Minutes will require training
 2. S. Spencer finds Board Docs difficult to use when trying to find and download information
 3. K. O'Brien shared S. Spencer's difficulties and asked M. Koger, as Secretary, for his opinion
 - a. M. Koger replied that while he saw the benefit of having all college documents housed on one platform, he was ambivalent about the idea and would rather leave it to the will of the Senate
 4. S. Lynch thought having the agenda on Board Docs sounded like a good idea but not as a substitute for current Senate practice. Having both, Board Docs and the current practice, isn't a bad idea. S. Lynch asked for clarification if using Board Docs would replace the current practice. A. Rhodes replied that the use of Board Docs would be in place of/a substitution for the current practice. S. Lynch responded that, now knowing this, she was not in favor of using Board Docs because it reduces transparency. The agenda and Minutes are currently searchable on the Rio Hondo College website by anybody wishing to see them. This would be more difficult to do if the Agenda and Minutes were only housed on Board Docs
 5. D. Silva, while not a fan of Board Docs, does see the benefit of housing documents in one place
 - a. S. Lynch reiterated that the current practice is more visible and transparent, whereas housing the Agenda and Minutes on Board Docs would be anti-transparent
- ii. A. Rhodes synthesized the comments from the Senators and sees that Senators are skeptical but that there may be a benefit to housing Agendas and Minutes both on Board Docs and on the website
1. D. Silva noted that sounds more complicated and like more work
 2. R. Rios added that it may be possible the college is not correctly using Board Docs because it is more like an archiving tool. It might be worth talking with Board Docs representatives to address some of the concerns expressed by Senators. There may be features the college is currently not using but should be
 3. D. Pichardo-Diaz asked if Senators would receive paid/compensated training and would the Academic Senate have sole access to admin controls or would others have access. A. Rhodes replied that with PFC, she had to be given access and that there are permissions that can be set

4. K. Smith elaborated that we would be moving from Academic Senate operating its own system to a District-controlled system and the District would not have access to change anything posted by Academic Senate
 5. S. Lynch asked if the discussion could be postponed to a later Senate session given the amount of items on the Agenda
 6. D. Pichardo-Diaz understands the value in centralizing documents but has found Board Docs to not be user-friendly and that it might require additional release time for the Secretary
- iii. A. Rhodes will move discussion of this to a Fall agenda
- b. Discussion: AP7217
- i. AP7217 Proposed from PFC 4/25/23 – Attached to Agenda
 - ii. AP 7217 Proposed from 2019 Senate Task Force – Attached to Agenda
 - iii. Ap 7217 Current – Attached to Agenda
 1. There are multiple elements of the AP that were discussed in the last PFC meeting as being unclear. It was requested that the AP be “kicked back” to PPC for review. A. Rhodes would like to gather feedback from Senators to help guide PPC in their work
 - iv. Discussion:
 1. D. Valladares received comments from many concerned Senators:
 - a. Seems like limiting voices. As a campus, our goal is to be inclusive, not exclusive. That goes from our hiring process to how we approach every decision that impacts our student population. Faculty should have an opportunity to be in any hiring committee within their department to ensure that who we hire is a fit for our students and department.
 - b. The iteration by PFC takes away the one piece of the entire process that reviews discipline expertise, and minimizes it. In the spirit of DEIA, it should be an inclusive process where all faculty who choose to participate in the hiring committee of their division, may choose to do so.
 - c. The new iteration creates a process of exclusion. Currently, all members of a division may choose to participate. With adding the language from PFC that it must be “consulted with the dean”, it can be interpreted that it is up to the dean to decide who can and can’t participate. What are the parameters that the deans will be using to “choose” who is “worthy” of participating in the process? This proposal creates an idea that it is an elite group of people who are worthy of a voice in such a process, and that the Dean must vet it. Faculty should not be made to believe that their voice is not equally important as everyone else in their division. Currently, this process makes all faculty equals.

- d. Policies and procedure wording is symptomatic of the campus culture during that time, mutual trust and respect is not a virtue that we have mastered yet as a community, so it is natural that this concern is present and alarming.
 - e. The faculty voice is only part of the 1st level which is intended for discipline expertise from varied lenses of the faculty in the area. If the candidates forwarded by the hiring committee are not strong enough or don't have enough DEIA considerations, the president already has the power to ask the committee to start again and she has every right to use that authority.
 - f. "What problem are we trying to fix by making this change?" The proposal does not articulate how it will help address or solve a current problem. Additionally, this proposed revision seems to actually be in opposition to our stated values of IDEAA.
 - g. Concerned that the hard work and input of the hiring AP taskforce was not reflected in the proposed revisions.
 - h. One idea is to have prospective candidates conduct a lecture where all faculty are invited to attend (maybe even students) and then submit a recommendation from that group. And allow the 3 designers to go through the remaining hiring phases.
2. F. Cummings provided a historical perspective that in the last couple of decades administration has tried at least twice to limit faculty voices on hiring committees. F. Cummings also expressed mixed feelings about students on hiring committee and was curious about the student panel (3 students trained in DEIA qualifications) reviewing a teaching demo and providing feedback. How would this be administered?
 - a. A. Rhodes mentioned that there is a need for clarification regarding the student feedback component
 3. S. Lynch shared that the Arts and Cultural Programs Division was unanimous in its feeling towards the proposed changes to AP7217. One pivotal issue the Division brought up is that a full-time faculty member becomes a colleague of the entire Division for many years. This is why it is imperative that faculty have a strong voice on hiring committees since they will be working with the potential new hire for many years. The Division concluded that the current proposed revised language of AP7217 be discarded. S. Lynch also recommended convening a new task force to revisit the recommended revisions to AP7217 made by the original 2019 Senate Task Force
 4. B. Brutlag echoed previous sentiments and added that the way in which the AP is being edited eliminates specific language and adds in vague language. B. Brutlag is hesitant in the way in which the vague language could be interpreted

5. L. Curiel shared the same feeling as previous Senators but is also concerned about the framing of the student role. It needs more fleshing out. It is not a student's responsibility to be a DEIA expert and shared her own experience interviewing at an institution that involved students. This could present an undue burden on students
 6. R. Rios looked at the existing AP language which states "a minimum" of 3 faculty members. Could adding the language back in be satisfactory to some of the Senators' concerns?
 7. K. Smith asked for clarification that faculty does not have to concede since the committees require consensus. A. Rhodes replied that to her understanding, a lack of consensus means the status quo would remain
 - a. S. Lynch added that a minority report would detail what was the point of dissent
 8. S. Lynch added that the work of the 2019 task force was never completed. Could this be taken to PFC?
 - a. K. Smith responded that the work was finished in Spring 2022. K. Smith and D. Pichardo-Diaz reached out to the (then) VP of HR and then to bring it to Senate. After a followup email, K. Smith and D. Pichardo-Diaz never heard back from them. The committee "finished" the work but never brought it back to Senate
 - b. S. Lynch clarified her comment that the follow through never happened and that the work was "in limbo" and we should pick up the work by the task force and finish it. A. Rhodes asked for clarification. S. Lynch asked to convene a task force that would look at the original recommendations made by the original task force and then follow through by having it reviewed by HR and then bring it to Senate and PFC
 9. G. Puga added that in 2007 there was a task force on this as well. This has to do with power and who has power over hiring committees. A task force exploring this might be a good idea, as well as bringing back the "minimum" language and sees no problem with robust faculty presence as it promotes inclusion and diversity. Line 58 includes the President in the second-level
- v. **Motion:** To convene a task force that will look at the previous work of the 2019 task force and work with HR on modifying AP 7217
1. Moved by S. Lynch/ Second by A. Martinez
 2. M. Koger read the motion back
 3. S. Herzfeld noted that some Divisions have difficulty recruiting representatives for hiring committees. There should be representation on the task force by Divisions with and without problems in recruiting for hiring committees

4. S. Spencer asked if this was brought to Senate because of PFC voting
 - a. A. Rhodes clarified the timeline beginning with the original task force in 2019 whose work was left “in limbo”. The original task force reached out to the HR director at the time who is no longer employed by the college. The task force also reached out to the VP of HR and did not get a response. PPC had concerns but it moved to PFC. When it appeared on the PFC agenda, A. Rhodes had concerns and was told by VP Miller to address those concerns during the PFC meeting. After the meeting, it was decided the issue would be sent back to PPC. Now, the Senate is gathering information about which direction to go with AP7217
 - b. If convened, the work by the new task force will then go to PPC and from there to PFC
 - c. K. Smith asked if it could go to Senate before going to PFC. A. Rhodes agreed that if any changes are made, it should go to Senate. The communication across groups is missing and that is what is trying to be fixed
5. Motion passes (30 aye/1 nay/0 abstain)

8. Vice President’s Report

- a. 1st Vice President, Kelly Lynch
 - i. SB 411 looks at meetings and teleconferencing. It is being read today
 - ii. AB 1275 looks at student run community college orgs meeting via teleconferencing has been referred back to committee for a re-read
 - iii. One other bill dealing with teleconferencing is being read again in committee
- b. 2nd Vice President, Angelica Martinez
 - i. ASRHC had a busy agenda approved a \$30 LTC threshold to align with ASCCC
 - ii. ASRHC approved AP7217 but had questions about the student involvement process
 - iii. Motion passed to institutionalize a Pride Center
 - iv. Motion passed to not re-approve Rio Café’s contract
 - v. ASRHC also passed a motion supporting a college hour for everyday, Monday through Thursday, after having previously voted down a measure in support of a college hour twice a week. Their reasoning is that this would allow students time to interact with faculty and for more events and student participation
 - vi. Final ASRHC meeting will be next week

9. Unfinished Business

- a. Special Election Results, Steve Johnson
 - i. There was a special election for the 2nd Vice President
 - ii. S. Johnson thanked everyone for participating. Aditi Sapra won the special election
 - iii. A. Rhodes thanked S. Johnson for his work as Parliamentarian and that he will be missed on Senate Exec

- b. Maximum Number of Units for Winter
 - i. Executive Motion: A student may take up to 7 units without counselor approval during the winter term
 - 1. Background: Dr. Dixon-Peters asked for direction regarding the maximum amount of units a student should take during winter. A. Martinez worked with IE and obtained some data which lead to the creation of the Executive Motion
 - 2. K. O'Brien appreciated the data and asked if we would be discussing full-time status for Summer. A. Rhodes believes those were already addressed. The motion for Summer had passed
 - 3. S. Lynch asked for clarification on the data gathering process. A. Rhodes replied that the data focused on students taking 6-6.5 units during Winter. S. Lynch looked at data from PCC which has a 6-week session, and SMC has a 6-week session as well. S. Lynch crunched the numbers on allowing students to take 7 units would be a terrible idea and that 6 units should be the upper threshold
 - 4. K. Smith asked what was the success rate for students taking fewer than the maximum units (for the sake of comparison)
 - a. D. Pichardo-Diaz clarified that they were seeking data to determine if students taking a certain number of units was feasible. Currently, there is no limit on student registration, so putting a limit actually speaks to some concerns expressed by S. Lynch.
 - ii. Motion passes (20 aye/7 nay/3 abstain)
- c. ASCCC Plenary Report, Farrah Nakatani
 - i. F. Nakatani will email the ASCCC report to Senators

10. Guest Report

- a. Electronic Digital Instrument Performance and Production of Electronic Popular Music Baccalaureate Degree Program, George Wheeler – Attached to Agenda
 - i. G. Wheeler shared that Rio Hondo College has been approved for the above degree by the Chancellor's Office. G. Wheeler provided the rationale for the degree as well as the focus for the degree
 - ii. Motion: To Support the Electronic Digital Instrument Performance and Production of Electronic Popular Music Baccalaureate Degree Program
 - 1. Moved by S. Lynch/ Second by F. Accardo
 - 2. Motion passes (30 aye/0 nay/1 abstain)
- b. Faculty Evaluation Student Surveys, Marie Eckstrom and Viviana Villanueva – Appendix F
 - i. Marie and Viviana are seeking feedback from faculty. Faculty are encouraged to review the faculty evaluation student surveys and to send any feedback to Marie and Viviana
- c. Low-cost Threshold, Michelle Pilati and Sheila Lynch – Appendices G and H

- i. **Motion:** Adopt the resolution passed by ASCCC that urges local academic senates to assert primacy in determining what constitutes “low-cost” and if it includes “instructional materials”
 - 1. Moved by S. Lynch/ Second by M. Koger
 - 2. Motion passes (24 aye/0 nay/0 abstain)
- ii. **Motion:** Adopt a low-cost threshold of \$30 or less for Rio Hondo College
 - 1. Moved by S. Lynch/ Second by M. Koger
 - 2. K. O’Brien asked if this is all inclusive of course materials. S. Lynch replied that is a separate discussion happening statewide. A. Rhodes added that this will create an icon that will appear on the college schedule of classes. K. O’Brien asked if, as an example, an Arts class could be designated LTC because the textbook is low-cost but the materials are not. S. Lynch responded that it only applies to textbooks
 - 3. S. Herzfeld asked that if there is no textbook for their course but if it requires subscription to a program would that constitute a low-cost? Again, this has only to do with textbooks
 - 4. Motion passes (21 aye/2 nay/5 abstain)

11. New Business

- a. AB361 Motion – Appendix I
 - i. There are currently bills in the California state legislature that will allow bodies to continue to meet via teleconferencing. If those bills do not pass, the Academic Senate will have to meet in person in the Fall. This may be an issue because there is currently no space on campus big enough to house an Academic Senate meeting.
 - ii. Moved by T. Baum/ Second by M. Koger
 - iii. Motion passes (28 aye/0 nay/0 abstain)
- b. Conferring Degrees
 - i. Executive Motion: The Academic Senate, on behalf of faculty of Rio Hondo College, recommends that students who have completed the requirements for a degree be conferred that degree with all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities thereunto appertaining
 - 1. Motion passes unanimously (28 aye/0 nay/0 abstain)

12. Announcements

- a. Academic Senate This Year will be emailed to Senators

13. Adjournment

- a. Meeting adjourned at 2:36
- b. A recording of this meeting can be viewed at the following link:
https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/Cw6E5nqUNMeBb_dxVO0M3RtF5kicOpT3ZFwbkS5pfglBxRbQ8LnVqbj4ulhmGb_V.YZoj9vl0i-uy3Eii