



March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Locations: 3600 Workman Mill Road, Room LR128, Whittier, CA/3000 San Gabriel Blvd., Rosemead, CA 91770/ 7226 Hamner Ave, Eastvale, CA 91752/840 East Whittier Blvd, La Habra, CA. 90631/ 18 W Sierra Madre Blvd # A, Sierra Madre, CA 91024/ 214 W Rt 66, Glendora, CA 91740/ 101 The City Dr., Orange, CA 92868/ 1370 Veteran Avenue # 104, Los Angeles, CA 90024/22 W. Live Oak Ave., Arcadia, CA, 91007

Attendance: Kevin Barman, Marissa Berru-Licon, Brian Brutlag, Libby Curiel, Bill Curington, Melanie Fierro, Shari Herzfeld, Mike Hinze, Jorge Huinquez, Erin Irwin, Shirley Isaac, George Kimber, Michael Koger, Vic Kowalski, David Lindy, Cynthia Lewis, Kelly Lynch, Sheila Lynch, Marina Markossian, Angelica Martinez, Carley Mitchell, Farrah Nakatani, Katie O'Brien, Tyler Okamoto, Doralí Pichardo-Díaz, Dianna Reyes, Angela Medina Rhodes, Rudy Rios, Jasmine Rodriguez, 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: Wendy Carrera, Steve Johnson, Young Lee, Jeannie Liu, Gerson Montiel, Sandra Obenberger, Angela Rhodes, Farrah Nakatani, Kelly Lynch

Guests: Lee Esten, Christina Miranda, Claudia Romo, Kenn Pierson Geiger, Leigh Ann Unger

1. Call to order
  - a. Meeting called to order at 1:04pm
2. Approval of Minutes from March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2023
  - a. Moved by K. Smith/Second by D. Lindy
    - i. M. Koger read that he received requests to amend the Minutes from A. Rhodes, clarifying some of the statements she made
  - b. Minutes approved unanimously
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. S. Lynch commented regarding AP 7259. There is currently an AP in place that is not being followed, specifically the Division of Arts and Cultural Programs has had no say in choosing their Dean and have just been told who their Dean will be. A mandatory meeting was held on a Friday with the HR Director. There will be a reorganization of Arts and Cultural Programs with Business, a Division that does not exist, is being discussed at

PFC. The faculty voice has been eliminated in any discussion of the matter and it may be time to “get tough”. Faculty voice and shared governance are being eroded

4. Guest Report

a. None

5. President’s Report

a. Discussion: AP 7259 Update

- i. PPC has held three special meetings (3/12 – 3/14) reviewing the AP to ensure shared governance is being followed. The committee came to consensus on everything except the committee members. The revised AP went to PFC. A memo was sent out from the PPC co-chairs. A total of six meetings (2 regular, 4 special) to review the AP. There is consensus on the first three rows of the chart. The sticking point is concerning how many faculty representatives may be on the committee. Faculty reps requested 7 with classified expressing similar representation. For Deans and Directors, 40% of FT faculty were requested. No agreement was reached. In essence, they were able to reach consensus on most points except the faculty composition of the committee
- ii. S. Lynch asked why there is a special PFC meeting. S. Lynch believes this is to rush the AP to the Board. An AP regarding Dean hirings exists but is not being followed. Why is this being rushed through and this shows the problem with bargaining
- iii. L. Curiel brought up in the previous meeting that a motion was developed to favor consensus and follow the regular process. Is that being followed. R. Rios replied that he felt, initially, there was a push to get it through, but faculty made enough noise that administration heard. Admin did slow the process down and addressed contentious points of the chart and the process proceeded as it normally would. The language proposed by Rudy, Angela, and Diana was accepted because it clarified what needed to be said. The reasons given is the Board wanted the hiring AP to follow the EEOE Plan that was developed and hiring would be developed based on that plan. R. Rios wanted to negotiate in good faith so that administration would argue in good faith for future AP negotiations. R. Rios said that D. Valladares and A. Rhodes agreed with the approach and outcome
  1. K. O’Brien asked for clarification regarding the committee makeup. A majority of survey respondents allowed for wiggle room on hiring committees, but, from what was mentioned earlier, the wiggle room was not being allowed. R. Rios said that they stuck to the 40% request which is currently in the AP. However, admin did not come back with a counteroffer. This will be discussed at PFC
- iv. K. Smith asked if there has ever been an AP moved out of PPC without consensus. R. Rios replied yes but that it was made clear that items had not been consented

- v. L. Curiel replied that the faculty request for greater representation better reflects the EEO plan than limiting faculty voice. R. Rios said there was discussion on some of the language and that it did not impact the committee composition and that the revised language aligns better with the EEO plan. R. Rios said the most diverse groups are the ones being cut out of the discussion. L. Curiel also asked about the student voice being reduced. R. Rios replied that the student representative agreed that bigger Divisions should have greater faculty representation. M. Koger clarified L. Curiel's comment and R. Rios replied that they increased student representation from one to "up to 3". L. Curiel's biggest concern is faculty voice matching administration's. Will there ever be a case where faculty voice be diminished in comparison to admin's? R. Rios said for smaller Divisions, no, since it says "no less than 4 and up to 40%"
- vi. K. O'Brien said at PFC there is no guarantee there will be consensus on the number. If PFC does not consent, the dissensus is sent to the President in writing. The term "consensus" in the hiring AP did revert to the original understood definition of "consensus"
- vii. L. Curiel said, depending on how the PFC meeting goes will determine whether or not the Senate moves forward with a vote of No Confidence. How does reducing faculty voice facilitate the EEO plan of increasing diversity?
- viii. S. Lynch agreed with L. Curiel and attended the meetings. From her understanding, the reasoning is that the size of the hiring committees is so big that they don't work, despite them having and continuing to work. If the size is the issue, why did they add managers and reduce faculty? The argument is insincere
- ix. D. Silva said that it seems to him when he was on the Dean of Counseling committee, there were almost 20 people on the committee and that most were faculty and could overshadow administration voice. L. Curiel replied that we were willing to compromise and make the numbers equal. R. Rios said that what D. Silva brought up was a big argument and that admin believe faculty should have a strong say in faculty committees and Deans on Dean committees. The argument is that the current Dean diversity is not diverse, but faculty are very diverse. R. Rios replied that if faculty are the most diverse, then that should facilitate the diversity in hiring. Once the Dean pool is more diverse, then there can be more Deans on the committees
- x. S. Lynch said no matter what, it goes to the second and third levels. Faculty voice is only represented on the first level interview
- xi. K. Smith sees no problem with large hiring committees because it helps with buy-in. When your boss comes to you, there is a greater willingness to engage. In his experience on admin hiring committees, you come to consensus and faculty have never overridden admin voice on these committees
- xii. R. Rios shared that cutting faculty may have backfired because classified felt they need to increase their presence on the hiring committee. D. Pichardo-Diaz

said that it has been unframed that is unfair to have unlimited faculty, but that is not the idea. The idea is that whomever in the Division wants to serve on the committee may serve.

- xiii. L. Curiel believes admin is operating on inferences and a lack of transparency and miscommunication. Unless if we have all the facts, faculty is operating blindly and need to be transparent with their motives and goals. What is trying to be accomplished and then maybe we can come to a conclusion. D. Pichardo-Diaz said they were told a Black candidate had to be overly qualified to be considered. If that's true, there is an EEO monitor charged with ensuring a diverse committee. We can only screen candidates at the paper process, so it seems there may be an issue with HR's screening process
- xiv. S. Lynch believes the ultimate motivation is to limit faculty voice. Administration reports to the Board and their supervisors. They have to do what they are told. Also, faculty are not paid to participate on hiring committees but administration are paid for their service.
- xv. R. Rios said the idea "there is not enough diversity in the hiring pool" was brought up and discussed. If the same net is being cast in the same pool, you're going to catch the same fish. Administration appeared to accept the fact that recruiting efforts need to be expanded. D. Pichardo-Diaz said the EEO plan mentions not listing applicant names on applications being screened but that is not being followed. L. Curiel said when HR deems what is appropriate for qualifications, and despite having qualifications they are not invited. R. Rios replied that this is being addressed and that there is professional development looking into this
- xvi. K. O'Brien shared that no administrators have come to Senate to discuss this

## 6. Vice President's Report

- a. 1st Vice President, Kelly Lynch
- b. 2nd Vice President, Aditi Sapra
  - i. A. Sapra introduced ASRHC President Christina Miranda. C. Miranda spoke briefly to Senate and appreciated being invited to and observing Senate. C. Miranda has heard the Admin perspective so that it was helpful to learn the faculty position. C. Miranda has been holding Information Booth presentations and invited multiple programs to present to ASRHC. Interested orgs can contact C. Miranda

## 7. Unfinished Business

- a. Discussion: BP 4020 Program, Curriculum, and Course Development
  - i. Motion by B. Brutlag/ Second by K. Smith
    - 1. E. Ramirez shared that Curriculum recommended making changes to some added language that was confusing. Curriculum recommended *not* adding the suggested language
    - 2. S. Lynch recommended that there be indication between State and Federal policies

- ii. Motion passes unanimously
  - b. Discussion: BP 4040 Library and Learning Support Services
    - i. Motion by M. Fierro/ Second by K. Smith
      - 1. No discussion
    - ii. Motion passes unanimously
  - c. Discussion: BP 4050 Articulation
    - i. Motion by B. Brutlag/ Second by K. O'Brien
      - 1. E. Ramirez shared that are some minor recommendations for adding a couple of words to the BP
    - ii. Motion passes unanimously
  - d. Discussion: BP 4106 Nursing Programs
    - i. Motion by B. Brutlag/ Second by K. Smith
      - 1. S. Herzfeld reviewed this with HSN faculty and suggested adding "associate degree" language to clarify and that some language could be removed because it wasn't necessary. The Dean of HSN suggested the loan section be deleted as well and HSN faculty agreed
    - ii. Motion passes unanimously
  - e. Discussion: BP 4231 Grade Changes
    - i. Motion by M. Fierro/ Second by B. Brutlag
      - 1. No Discussion
    - ii. Motion passes unanimously
  - f. Discussion: BP 4245 Academic Rank
    - i. Motion by B. Brutlag/ Second by V. Kowalski
      - 1. K. Smith moved to table the discussion/ second by B. Brutlag
      - 2. Motion to table passes
  - g. Discussion: BP 4260 Prerequisites and Co-requisites
    - i. Motion by K. O'Brien/ Second by K. Smith
      - 1. E. Ramirez shared there were no suggestions from Curriculum
      - 2. L. Curiel shared that "vocational" programs have been changed to "Career and Technical Education" programs in other policies, so it should remain consistent
    - ii. Motion passes unanimously
- 8. New Business
  - a. Discussion: AP 4235 Credit for Prior Learning
    - i. C. Romo came to Senate to discuss the AP. This will be serving adult students and for individuals who have learned and acquired skills comparable to what is learned outside of the classroom (e.g., industry certificates and military training). This does not apply to first time students and all GE classes. It is very industry focused and to remove barriers. There are references to AP 4236 that have been added, along with ROP programs. There is some clarifying Title V language. The AP was also developed with the CPL Coordinator for Palomar College, along with E. Ramirez and Senate Exec. There are no fees for this

process. Specific deadlines will need to be met in order to be evaluated and to ensure credit posting in a timely fashion. A landing page will be developed for the new Rio Hondo website.

- ii. D. Lindy asked what the timeline is. C. Romo said that students can submit the documents when they want, but ideally three weeks before the end of the semester. L. Unger replied that this will also be for pre-requisite clearing for the following semester
- iii. K. O'Brien asked if a student could put the paperwork through without taking a class here. C. Romo said it would be to earn college credit and that this will not negatively impact enrollment. K. Smith asked if the credits are transferable. C. Romo replied that they are transferable and if students transfer CPL units, Rio Hondo College will accept the units. There will be no CPL for Speech
- iv. S. Herzfeld asked if students can decline credit, and C. Romo said only for Credit by Exam
- v. Motion to approve moved by D. Lindy/ Second by L. Curiel
  - 1. Motion passes unanimously
- b. Discussion: AP 4236 Credit through Non-Collegiate Programs
  - i. Motion to table AP 4236 moved by K. Smith/ Second by B. Brutlag
  - ii. Motion passes unanimously
- c. Election Update: Angelica Martinez
  - i. D. Pichardo-Diaz shared that less than 50% of the Senate body voted in the Election. The elections will be run again after Spring Break. M. Fierro will be included as a candidate for Secretary and discussions will be held for nominations for President.

## 9. Committee Reports

- a. Senate Committees
  - i. Academic Rank, Frank Sotelo
  - ii. Curriculum, Elizabeth Ramirez
  - iii. Distance Education, Kenn Pierson-Geiger
    - 1. The DE Committee made a recommendation for pre/post term student access to Canvas. The entire process, along with LTI, has been approved
  - iv. Open Educational Resources (OER), Sheila Lynch
    - 1. There is a vacancy on the committee from KDA and Counseling
  - v. Outcomes, Sean Hughes
  - vi. Staff Development/FLEX, Katie O'Brien
- b. Planning & Fiscal Council Committees
  - i. Facilities, Scott Jaeggi
  - ii. Institutional Effectiveness (IEC), TBD
  - iii. Planning and Procedural Council, Rudy Rios
  - iv. Program Review, Marie Eckstrom
  - v. Safety, Brian Brutlag
- c. Additional Committees

- i. Enterprise Systems Advisory, Colin Young
- ii. Holistic Support and Academic Skills (HSAS), Tyler Okamoto
  - 1. We had an informative demo about Penji, a tutoring platform for students to easily book appointments, receive reminders, and collect data. IT staff (Tim and Steven) was in attendance and reported that he saw no problems with Penji integrating smoothly with Conex/Cranium Cafe. Tyler will meet with representatives to find out more about costs and implementation
- iii. Online Education Initiative (OEI), TBD
- iv. ASCCC Open Educational Resources Initiative (OERI), Sheila Lynch
- v. Student Equity, TBD
- vi. Student Success and Support Services Program (SSSP), Bill Curington
- vii. AI Focus Group, Kenn Pierson-Geiger
  - 1. The focus group has met once with a follow-up meeting to be held in May. Participants will share how their ChatGPT assignment went

10. Announcements

11. Adjournment

- a. Meeting adjourned at 2:22