



Academic Senate Minutes
February 20th, 2024
Location: LR128

Attendance: Kevin Barman, Brian Brutlag, Wendy Carrera, Libby Curiel, Bill Curington, Melanie Fierro, Shari Herzfeld, Mike Hinze, Jorge Huinquez, Erin Irwin, Steve Johnson, George Kimber, Michael Koger, Vic Kowalski, David Lindy, Cynthia Lewis, Jeannie Liu, Kelly Lynch, Sheila Lynch, Marina Markossian, Angelica Martinez, Carley Mitchell, Farrah Nakatani, Katie O'Brien, Sandra Obenberger, Tyler Okamoto, Dorali Pichardo-Diaz, Dianna Reyes, Angela Medina Rhodes, Rudy Rios, Mutsuno Ryan, Aditi Sapra, Diego Silva, Kevin Smith, Shelly Spencer, Diana Valladares, Viviana Villanueva, George Wheeler

Ad Hoc Members Present: Diana Valladares, Elizabeth Ramirez

Members Absent: Marissa Berru-Licon, Shirley Isaac, Young Lee, Gerson Montiel, Oyenbhen Omotese

Guests: Adam Wetsman, Cesar Romero, Kenn Pierson-Geiger

1. Call to order
 - a. Meeting called to order at 1:01pm
2. Approval of Minutes from February 6th, 2024 meeting
 - a. Moved by D. Lindy/Second by K. Smith
 - i. M. Koger received only one request to amend a public comment
 - b. Minutes approved (28 aye/0 nay/1 abstain)
3. 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. No public comment
4. Guest Report
 - a. LEGACIE+ Program, Cesar Romero
 - i. LEGACIE+ is a program designed to improve degree completion and transfer rates of Latino males and men of color
 1. Students receive counseling, a bookstore voucher, and networking opportunities
 2. There are also two field trips planned: Men of Color Transfer Day with Cal Poly Pomona (March 15th) and MOC Conference at LBCC

- ii. Goals are: complete a comprehensive ed plan, complete transfer level math and english in their first year, and earn an ADT and transfer within three years
- iii. Students who are interested are encouraged to fill out an interest form
- iv. S. Spencer asked if African American males are welcome to apply. C. Romero replied that they are welcome to apply
- v. K. O'Brien asked if there is a minimum counseling contact requirement. C. Romero replied that right now there is only one contact required with C. Romero
- vi. L. Curiel asked if students have been contacted about this. C. Romero replied that there have been blasts on the Rio Hondo College homepage, social media, and Canvas

5. President's Report

- a. Announcement: Drop for non-payment will begin in Fall 2024
 - i. President Dr. Flores informed A. Rhodes that non-payment drops will begin in Fall 2024. This development is currently being investigated with an email sent to L. Unger with questions and concerns
- b. Discussion: Staff Development/FLEX Committee Structure and Reporting
 - i. Background: A. Rhodes shared that this is coming from an equality (not equity) lens. Classified staff voiced that the needed focus and support to plan and participate in professional development has been lacking at the college and questioned whether a committee that is supposed to promote PD for all employees should only report to the Academic Senate. The move from a Flex Day towards Professional Development Day is to be more inclusive of staff and managers as is the committee restructuring recommendation
 - 1. This recommendation comes directly from the Staff Development/Flex Committee. The request is to change the name of the committee to the Professional Development/FLEX Committee as well as restructure the committee to include a tri-chair model that includes the Assistant Director of HR, a Classified designee, and the Faculty PD/FLEX coordinator
 - 2. The committee currently only reports to the Senate. The request adds a report to PFC
 - 3. The committee also requests greater control over release time and funding allocation, specifically to ensure an equal focus on classified professional development
 - ii. Motion: To Approve the Changes to the Staff Development/Flex Committee
 - 1. Moved by D. Silva/ Second S. Johnson
 - a. Discussion:
 - i. S. Spencer asked about the HR position on the committee. A. Rhodes replied there would not be "cross contamination". S. Spencer asked for clarification on the title

- ii. K. O'Brien wanted to provide background on why the Assistant Director of HR was listed as one of the tri-chairs. The job description mentioned developing staff professional development opportunities
- iii. K. Smith looked at the current process for faculty to request funding for travel. He asked if there would be an increase in overall funding for travel or if management would be included (currently they are separate). K. O'Brien replied that while some admin have their own funds, not all do and the committee has always accepted applications from any employee. The current committee has heard from Classified staff that they currently receive no release time for the planning and implementation for their professional development
- iv. K. Lynch asked if The Leadership Academy will receive more funds. K. O'Brien responded that program is already inclusive of staff and the budget is currently "healthy", so the idea is to increase funding for additional existing and new programs
- v. S. Lynch suggested there should be clarification provided on the funding. K. O'Brien mentioned that classified staff want to ensure that the need for release time and additional funding is included in the recommendation. It is a request but not a guarantee
- vi. A. Rhodes added that this request was not "created on a whim" and is a result of months of dialogue between constituent groups. The proposal is "leaps and bounds" over other possibilities
- vii. K. Smith asked how Senate's role might change. K. O'Brien replied that the Senate would continue to have purview over Faculty professional development but not have purview over Classified Staff and Management professional development, which is why a report to the PFC is recommended for those groups. K. O'Brien also added that the tri-chair model might be the best model for the committee

b. Motion passes with seven abstentions

6. Vice President's Report

a. 1st Vice President, Kelly Lynch

i. Fellow of the College

1. Several nominees have been received. K. Lynch asked if several folks could stick around after the meeting to vote

- ii. Distinguished Service Award
 - 1. No nominees were received but one of the Fellow candidates could be nominated
 - iii. Distinguished Faculty Award
 - 1. One nominee was received, but this is not due until March 15th
 - b. 2nd Vice President, Aditi Sapra
 - i. ASRHC has a new President, Christina Miranda
7. Unfinished Business
- a. Discussion: AP 7259 Employment Procedures for Administrators/Confidential
 - i. This was introduced at the previous meeting. The Senate had voted the proposal down. Administration asked if Senate could provide feedback on what the specific issues were with the AP. A. Rhodes replied that this would also help PPC and PFC when reviewing the AP to properly represent the will of Senate
 - ii. Motion to identify specific issues with the AP. Moved by B. Brutlag/ Second by M. Hinze
 - 1. Discussion:
 - a. A. Rhodes shared that she received “lengthy” comments from D. Pichardo-Diaz. D. Pichardo-Diaz shared some of her comments: A major priority for D. Pichard-Diaz is not limiting faculty voice on these hiring committees
 - i. B. Brutlag shared that this AP has been on every agenda for certain groups but that there is no discussion about it in these other committees (for a variety of reasons) including holding meeting times at unorthodox times when faculty might not be able to attend and include a public comment. B. Brutlag feels this is admin trying to get the AP passed faculty and it is in faculty’s interest in getting into the details because this is chipping away at shared governance
 - ii. A. Rhodes noted that, as an example, the remote work AP that was discussed at the previous meeting. It also received a big “push” to get through. If groups don’t agree, then the status quo remains. The final say, though, is had by the superintendent/president. A. Rhodes shared with President Dr. Flores that faculty is losing confidence in the administration’s ability to effectively manage the college. Dr. Flores replied that she was directed by the Board (n.b., it is Board Goal number one)
 - iii. S. Lynch shared that the anybody from the faculty from the Division should be allowed to serve on the hiring committee, as evidenced by “deeds done in the dark”

like having meetings that faculty cannot make. Loose terminology needs to be specified in an AP

- iv. A. Rhodes shared that faculty are trying to work with administration in good faith, as evidenced by the Remote Work AP which faculty long advocated for
 - v. K. Lynch shared that when Exec reviewed the AP in PFC, many Exec members were uncomfortable pushing through the AP but administration felt that faculty should have known what was implied within the language of the AP. The remote work AP applies to every staff member except when superseded by a CBA
 - vi. K. Smith moved for a friendly amendment to the motion to include “addition of any faculty from the Division to serve on the committee”. B. Brutlag and M. Hinze accepted.
 - vii. D. Pichardo-Diaz asked that the text in red be removed and stricken text on page five be re-included. Student voices are also being limited from hiring committees with the new language. A new addition would give the President purview over the Chair of the committee whereas currently the hiring committee chooses the hiring committee chair. On Page 7, “consensus” is being redefined to two-thirds of the committee (n.b., the revised language would mean two-thirds of the committee is management, so faculty voice would be further reduced). “Advisory” Committee also reduces faculty voice, especially at the second-level interview
 - viii. A. Rhodes asked Senate how they feel about student representation on hiring committees. A. Rhodes shared what admin saw as the student role on the committee. A. Sapa asked if students are voting members. A. Rhodes replied that she believed they would have a “say” but not necessarily a vote. Hiring is a Student 9+1 right
 - b. Friendly amendment: to maintain the current composition of the hiring committee structure. Friendly amendment is adopted
 - c. Motion passes unanimously
2. Priority Number Two: Changes made in red do not include IDEAA language
- a. The committee should have purview over choosing the Chair of the hiring committee. The idea is to strike the red text (including the chart) and to re-include the stricken text on page 12 and 13

- b. Motion: Keep what is on page 12 and page 13 which outlines the composition of the committee and to strike the red text and chart on page 5. Moved by D. Pichardo-Diaz/ Second by K. Lynch
 - i. Discussion:
 - 1. K. Smith asked if the previous motion covers this motion. Several senators spoke in favor to err on the side of caution
 - 2. B. Brutlag wanted the faculty to consider what faculty might do if the President/Superintendent goes against the wishes of the faculty
 - ii. Motion passes unanimously
 - 3. Priority Three: The Senate opposes changes to the definition of “consensus” (i.e., instead of unanimous agreement, only 2/3 agreement is needed), use of the word “advisory” on the committee and the Removal of “Strengths and Weaknesses” activity
 - a. Moved by D. Pichardo-Diaz/Second by L. Curiel
 - i. D. Silva shared that the “Strengths and Weaknesses” activity can sometimes be like pulling teeth and maybe it can just be redeveloped
 - ii. K. O’Brien shared that she has had positive experiences where on a hiring committee they have had strong and weak candidates
 - iii. L. Curiel shared that “qualified” candidate is a bit ambiguous and could be an IDEAA issue and wonders why the inclusion of the word was necessary. D. Picardo-Diaz shared that there is other ambiguous terminology throughout
 - b. Motion passes unanimously
 - iii. A. Rhodes asked for more feedback and details to be emailed to her, D. Valladares and R. Rios
 - iv. L. Curiel also commented on the rushed nature of reviewing these, and A. Rhodes shared that she has made the feelings of the body known to administration
- b. Discussion: BP 4010-Academic Calendar
 - i. Motion to approve BP 4010. Moved by K. O’Brien/Second by F. Nakatani
 - 1. Discussion:
 - a. The Union wanted the original wording including the “appropriate bargaining unit” to be put back
 - i. Rejecting the red and re-include the stricken text
 - b. A. Rhodes shared that the Union already has a calendar committee for this

- c. Motion to retain the status quo of the BP
 - i. Motion passes unanimously
 - c. Discussion: BP 4110-Honorary Degrees
 - i. Motion to approve: D. Lindy/ Second by B. Brutlag
 - 1. Discussion
 - a. K. Smith asked to define “appropriate involvement.” The language implies that Senate is involved and to include “approval” language
 - b. K. O’Brien asked if this was even a thing. A. Rhodes shared an example of a firefighter who passed away one-unit short of earning the degree
 - c. This language seems to hint that the Academic Senate will establish procedures and criteria and that might be all encompassing
 - d. D. Pichardo-Diaz asked if “with the involvement of appropriate discipline faculty” might be better since the discipline faculty might have better knowledge of the requirements
 - e. Friendly amendment: “with the involvement of appropriate discipline faculty and the approval of Academic Senate” moved by L. Curiel. Approved by D. Pichardo-Diaz
 - 2. Motion passes unanimously
- d. Discussion: BP 4220-Standards of Scholarship
 - i. Motion to accept the BP. Moved by K. O’Brien/ Seconded by D. Valladares
 - 1. Discussion
 - a. No Discussion
 - 2. Motion passes unanimously
- e. Discussion: BP 4225-Course Repetition
 - i. Motion to accept the BP. Moved by B. Brutlag/ Second by K. O’Brien
 - 1. Discussion
 - a. There was concern about what an “FW” is because it’s not in the catalog. The recommendation was to leave the stricken text as was. “NP” and “W” are not considered “substandard” grades
 - b. K. Lynch asked if the “FW” was in the appropriate AP. The AP was not reviewed. The AP includes “D”, “F”, and “NP”. A “W” does count as an attempt but not as a substandard grade
 - c. D. Reyes shared that “W” should have a classification on its own because it is an attempt but it is not a “substandard” grade
 - d. K. O’Brien shared that the BP seems to read as how many attempts a student has to reattempt a class. L. Curiel shared that the “substandard” is the crux of the issue
 - e. S. Herzfeld asked if “an attempt is not earning a passing grade” would be sufficient

- f. D. Reyes asked if we could add another line that addresses the "W". A. Rhodes felt that "W" could be separated to clarify that it is not a "substandard" grade: "substandard grades (less than a "C" ...) and a withdraw"
 - g. Friendly amendment: "substandard grades or a W was earned" approved by K. O'Brien and B. Brutlag
 - 2. Motion with the friendly amendment passes unanimously
- f. Discussion: BP 4300-Field Trips and Excursions
 - i. Motion to accept the BP. Moved by S. Spencer/ Seconded by F. Nakatani
 - ii. Discussion:
 - 1. Only the grey text was stricken because the law changed. No language was added. BP reflects the status quo
 - iii. Motion passes with one abstention
- g. Discussion: BP 4401-Visitors on Campus
 - i. Motion to approve. Moved by D. Valladares/ Second by A. Martinez
 - ii. Discussion:
 - 1. Only a change to strike "he/she" and to replace with "they"
 - 2. S. Herzfeld asked if the "must approve" could be changed to "can approve"
 - 3. Friendly amendment to contain the following language. "Instructors retain authority to approve all visitors"
 - iii. Motion passes with two abstentions

8. New Business

- a. No new business

9. Committee Reports

- a. Senate Committees

- i. Academic Rank, Frank Sotelo

- 1. F. Sotelo forwarded for approval of academic rank. F. Sotelo reached out to certain individuals for missing paperwork to receive the appropriate requested rank
- 2. Motion to approve the individuals for academic rank
 - a. Moved by S. Lynch and Seconded by L. Curiel
- 3. Motion passes unanimously

- ii. Curriculum, Elizabeth Ramirez

- 1. Meeting will be held tomorrow

- iii. Distance Education, Kenn Pierson-Geiger

- 1. The DEC held its first meeting for spring semester on February 12, 2024. After several months discussing "Pre-term and Post-term Access to Canvas for Students," we agreed to the following language:
 - a. Pre-Term Access: Faculty have the ability to publish their courses prior to the start of a term to provide students read-only access to the course and to familiarize themselves with

course requirements. Faculty may consider publishing courses 7 days prior to the start of a semester to give students time to explore the class.

- b. Post-Term Access: At the instructor's discretion, students may be given an extra 5 days after the end of the term to provide access to the course solely for the purpose of submitting late work. After those 5 days, course access will be limited to read-only.

- 2. While these specific advisories have been finalized, the overall pre-term/post-term process description (which includes this language) is pending final approval.
- 3. Our spring schedule of DE-related professional development training continues on Friday, Feb. 23 with two demonstrations of automated proctoring services. Faculty can still sign up. A future AI-related focus group meeting in March and May invites all members of the Academic Senate's Artificial Intelligence Task Force to participate in its focus on designing AI-related classroom assignments in various disciplines.

- iv. Open Educational Resources (OER), Sheila Lynch
- v. Outcomes, Sean Hughes
- vi. Staff Development/FLEX, Katie O'Brien

b. Planning & Fiscal Council Committees

- i. Facilities, Scott Jaeggi
- ii. Institutional Effectiveness (IEC), Julio Flores
- iii. Planning and Procedural Council, Rudy Rios
- iv. Program Review, Marie Eckstrom
- v. Safety, Brian Brutlag

- 1. Meeting on Friday at 10am

c. Additional Committees

- i. Enterprise Systems Advisory, Colin Young
- ii. Foundational Skills & Instructional Support, Tyler Okamoto
 - 1. The committee has re-branded as the Holistic Support and Academic Skills (HSAS) committee
 - 2. HSAS discussed moving the WRC out of the LAC to increase its campus presence. With Institutional Effectiveness moving to the L-Tower pending completion, there was discussion of returning the WRC to its original location
 - 3. Tutoring incentives, such as stamp cards, were also discussed
- iii. Online Education Initiative (OEI), TBD
- iv. ASCCC Open Educational Resources Initiative (OERI), Sheila Lynch
- v. Student Equity, Julio Flores
- vi. Student Success and Support Services Program (SSSP), Bill Curington
- vii. AI Taskforce, Oyenbhen Omotese

viii. Institutional Ethics, Civility, and Anti-Bullying Taskforce

10. Announcements

11. Adjournment

a. Meeting adjourned at 2:26pm