



March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Location: LR-128

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

Guests: Kenn Pierson-Geiger, Marie Eckstrom

1. Call to order
  - a. Meeting called to order at 1:01pm
2. Agenda Amendment
  - a. Motion to amend the agenda for the day to add item 6c to the President's report
    - i. Moved by R. Rios/ Second by D. Valladares
    - ii. Motion passes unanimously
3. Approval of Minutes from February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2024
  - a. Moved by K. Smith/Second by D. Lindy
    - i. K. O'Brien had requested some minor changes to the Minutes
    - ii. S. Herzfeld pointed out a missing header
  - b. Minutes approved unanimously
4. 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. K. O'Brien shared a public comment. At a previous meeting, Senate had discussed maximum units to take without counselor approval for Winter session. She had two EOP&S students who took 15 units over Winter. The students were not requested to get

approval, yet these students had “red flags” that, had they met with a counselor, may have prevented them from enrolling in that amount of units.

- b. L. Curiel shared two concerns. One concern is that Canvas is closing courses at a certain date when the class ends rather than extending access a few days. The second concern regards how courses are listed in the schedule. The appearance might be confusing/strange to students and cause enrollment issues. Some class times also changed without notice or awareness to them being changed

## 5. Committee Reports

### a. Senate Committees

- i. Academic Rank, Frank Sotelo

- 1.

- ii. Curriculum, Elizabeth Ramirez

- iii. Distance Education, Kenn Pierson-Geiger

- 1. A written report had been submitted to the previous meeting. Kenn gave a verbal report concerning DE Committee reaching consensus on concrete dates
  - 2. At the next meeting, the DEC will vote on the complete document (pre/post term access to Canvas for students) in addition to approving policy for LTIs and to determine compatibility and FERPA concerns
  - 3. Friday is the first of two sessions for the AI focus group. 24 faculty signed up and more are encouraged to attend. Discussion topics will include ChatGPT tools for assignments to be used in a positive way. Faculty will hopefully be grouped by Division to see where each Division is. Faculty will be encouraged to collaborate. The second session will be held in May where they will present assignments they developed that utilize ChatGPT and, if they gave the assignment in class, how it went
  - 4. S. Lynch asked when the pre/post term rules will be implemented. Kenn replied that as soon as the document is adopted by the end of the term. So this should work for late-start classes

- iv. Open Educational Resources (OER), Sheila Lynch

- 1. Meeting on Thursday

- v. Outcomes, Sean Hughes

- 1. F. Nakatani reported that Outcomes met on the 20<sup>th</sup>. Several committee members are no longer involved. Outcomes Work was reviewed and considered “cleaning up” courses. Works is expected to continue and that no active course is without an SLO
  - 2. Outcomes modification process was reviewed
  - 3. Training videos were also reviewed along with data entry on TaskStream
    - a. S. Lynch shared that the training videos are actually quite good and helpful

- vi. Staff Development/FLEX, Katie O’Brien

1. Regarding Item 4. She received an email from President Flores that the Administrative Council are at the point where they feel ready to offer a 2-3 hour training and would like to know when to hold this training
    - a. Potential dates are May 3<sup>rd</sup> or May 10<sup>th</sup>
    - b. L. Curiel asked if this is mandatory training. Right now the answer is unknown. L. Curiel shared that if it is mandatory, it should be held in the Fall
  2. De-Escalation training is on April 5th
- b. Planning & Fiscal Council Committees
- i. Facilities, Scott Jaeggi
    1. No report
  - ii. Institutional Effectiveness (IEC)
  - iii. Planning and Procedural Council, Rudy Rios
    1. PPC meetings have been “exciting.” The hiring AP that has been proposed has been making progress. Every item that was being questioned was being addressed. The back and forth was actually “quite fruitful.” The meeting was going slow, but well.
    2. A. Rhodes shared that in a meeting with Dr. Miller, he will “shut down negative comments.” Because the committee is not a Brown Act committee, they can respond to public comments. Dr. Dixon-Peters noted in a previous meeting that public comments should be shared
    3. Next meeting is on Thursday
    4. S. Lynch questioned their definition of “shared governance”. R. Rios thinks the President views shared governance is just collecting feedback but that she has purview over accepting/rejecting feedback
  - iv. Program Review, Marie Eckstrom
    1. M. Eckstrom began by commending A. Rhodes for the job she has been doing
    2. An in-person meeting had been held. There needs to be clarification on Outcomes and Objectives. What method/systems are used for Outcomes assessment?
    3. Communication was another issue. The college should find a way to text students in order to send vital information. A cloud-based system is also needed to “talk” to Banner
    4. There is significant work needed in IT and questions regarding spending in IT
    5. IT is also encouraged to establish a process for recommended updates and platforms
    6. The District needs to see if they are going to financially support the Pathway to Law program
    7. Risk Management and Emergency Preparedness should be separated in two programs

- v. Safety, Brian Brutlag
- c. Additional Committees
  - i. Enterprise Systems Advisory, Colin Young
    - 1. No report
  - ii. Holistic Support and Academic Skills (formerly FSIS), Tyler Okamoto
    - 1. The committee discussed the location of the WRC. Since it moved into the LAC, attendance has dropped. There is a proposal to return the WRC to the LR-125 vestibule pending Institutional Effectiveness moving out of that space
    - 2. There will be a demo on text messaging support that can serve multiple departments and services
  - iii. Online Education Initiative (OEI), TBD
  - iv. ASCCC Open Educational Resources Initiative (OERI), Sheila Lynch
    - 1. Workshop and webinar info is coming out via email
  - v. Student Equity, TBD
  - vi. Student Success and Support Services Program (SSSP), Bill Curington
    - 1. The committee has been talking about the Math and English placement tools
    - 2. They he also discussed Vision Aligned Reporting where the Chancellor's Office has changed data collection processes. Implementation is likely in Fall 2024 with the first report due in Fall 2025
      - a. A. Rhodes shared that Dr. Dixon Peters said the plan is to collect the data through Cranium Cafe
  - vii. AI Taskforce, Kenn Pierson-Geiger
    - 1. The taskforce has not yet met. A survey had been sent out to determine whether or not to continue the taskforce. Only six people responded. Four said they wanted to continue and two did not care.
    - 2. All members have been invited to join the ChatGPT demonstration
- 6. President's Report
  - a. Announcement: IEC Appointment, Janet Cha-Business
  - b. Announcement: Part-time Representative, Jasmine Rodriguez
  - c. Discussion: AP7259 Administrative Hiring
    - i. A. Rhodes provided an update. She has been in meetings all day meeting with Drs Miller and Flores, Toni Traster (HR) and to make headway on the AP. The most important info was from Dr. Flores. She said that she "cannot give more time" to work on this AP. The first actual reading at PPC was on February 22<sup>nd</sup>. A special meeting was held on February 29<sup>th</sup>. It will be pulled after the March 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, regardless of any progress at PPC and will go to PFC without co-chair A. Rhodes's consent. She does not agree that the AP should be added to the PFC meeting. The co-chairs are to agree on items to be placed on the agenda. Dr. Miller is putting the AP on the agenda without her consent. It will be on the PFC Agenda for March 12<sup>th</sup> and then the Board meeting for March 13<sup>th</sup>

- ii. L. Curiel asked if PFC is a voting body. A. Rhodes shared that PPC and PFC are recommending bodies. Voting is done via consensus. The fear is that the consensus process will not be honored. A. Rhodes asked why we did not receive the APs sooner. Dr. Flores shared that she had to do research and go through processes. The policy was written by Dr. Flores and she has the final say on it. This is not shared governance. Dr. Flores has the power to accept/reject recommendations. She said that she will look at the comments and forward her recommendations to the Board. A. Rhodes is seeking direction from Senate
- iii. Major issues: Number of faculty on hiring committees, the definition of consensus, and appointment of hiring committee chair
- iv. D. Pichardo-Diaz asked what the current process is not achieving that the new process will achieve. A. Rhodes replied that Dr. Flores said she is working based on the EEO Plan provided by a consultant hired by administration. One thing sticking out to Dr. Flores is that in order for an applicant who is Black to get an interview is highly unlikely because of the current processes. A. Rhodes does not recall seeing this reflected in the EEO Plan. Admin feels like they are doing the right thing
- v. R. Rios asked if Flores has met with VP of Student Services and Finance
- vi. L. Curiel shared that applicants might meet minimum quals but do not get through the HR screening process. M. Koger shared that on a recent English hiring committee, several applicants made it through the HR screening process who did not meet the minimum quals and that maybe this speaks to inconsistencies in HR's screening processes
- vii. K. O'Brien asked if they are concerned about faculty bias in hiring committees. The answer is yes
- viii. A. Rhodes is seeking direction because the President intends to push this through
- ix. Priority 1: Faculty on hiring committees
  - 1. If faculty drop it, the number of faculty on hiring committees will be three. Or, Senate could request status quo be maintained or a number/percentage of the department/division
  - 2. B. Curington asked what their concern is on having more faculty on the hiring committee
  - 3. D. Pichardo-Diaz shared that one Division might have only one full-time faculty member but a bigger Division might have 20 full-time faculty, so that is not equitable
  - 4. R. Rios shared that in conversations is that they're fighting status quo. Admin does not want "unlimited." The negotiation they are offering is three. If faculty digs their heels in, optically that does not look good
  - 5. L. Curiel asked for balance so as to respect faculty voice, matching faculty voice with non-faculty voice. Right now, it's seven admin to three faculty.

6. D. Pichardo-Diaz responded that does it depend on the level of the candidate being hired (e.g., VP, president, Dean, etc.). How many faculty actually participate on a committee. Could we look at the history to determine that average?
7. K. O'Brien is concerned with the breadth of voices being heard, especially in bigger divisions. Maybe one per department
8. R. Rios replied that the EEO Plan being referenced says the *minimum* is three. R. Rios is in favor of the percentage of the full-time faculty within the Division
9. K. Smith shared from the chat that S. Spencer is in favor of the status quo. His own comment is that while 7 administrators sounds like a lot, when considering the amount of administrators hired recently, it may not be that much. Other colleges have Senate Presidents determine the admin composition of the committee. But there is a reason this has not been changed before
10. S. Lynch believes the real issue for faculty is that we know our programs and disciplines. To have several administrators, some who are not experts in the discipline, makes no sense but goes with the trend of limiting faculty voice, especially in smaller Divisions. Divisions that are being merged will be further impacted. Mega-divisions further restrict faculty voice
11. A. Rhodes is contacting Toni Traster to answer D. Pichardo-Diaz's earlier question
12. K. Smith shared S. Spencer's comment if faculty should give public comment at the next Board meeting. A. Rhodes said yes
13. D. Pichardo-Diaz asked if the body would consider a vote of No Confidence. After this AP is Classified and then Faculty hiring APs. A compromise on this one may lead to problems with the other APs
14. A. Rhodes shared that PPC has five meetings left before Summer. Admin, Classified, and Faculty hiring APs will be pushed through by the end of the semester, per Dr. Flores
15. L. Curiel asked if there is a perception that the faculty will vote no confidence or if they think faculty will work with admin. R. Rios replied yes. This meant they don't care
16. K. Smith had two questions. First, has anything been rushed through PPC in the past. Second, the whole purpose of PPC/PFC is shared governance. Taking away shared governance then why do those bodies exist? Is the next step no showing to meetings? The dilemma is that either gives credence to admin's claims but it also does not permit progress. L. Curiel shared that the No Confidence vote should go first because right now there is a stalemate

- a. S. Lynch replied that in the past, PFC/PPC have had jams, but they have been able to work it out and present workable solutions
  - b. K. O'Brien is concerned about the appearance of negotiating in bad faith and that we need to maintain negotiating in good faith. What are the Board's thoughts?
    - i. A. Rhodes answered that the Board knows but they have not spoken with faculty
- 17. D. Lindy feels that faculty are being bullied
- 18. S. Lynch feels that we should appeal to their "higher selves" and that this group enforces this with an appeal and is not sure if the threat is necessary. Three faculty on a committee seems insincere.
  - a. L. Curiel agrees that appeals to tradition are not going to work because this is a state-wide and nation-wide issue
- 19. Two special meetings held on AP 7901 which were pushed in good faith. One special meeting has been held on AP 7259 and is not being argued in good faith. A. Rhodes said that it's too much to keep holding these special meetings. In a meeting from Dr. Miller, he said that they will not go line by line
- 20. B. Curington asked if it's worth inviting admin to Senate to hear the concerns from Senate. D. Lindy replied that, according to his Dean, it "bogs down the hiring process"
- x. The next PPC meeting is on Thursday.
- xi. L. Curiel asked if Senate should put forth a Motion To craft a vote of no confidence or to allow faculty to continue the work on the AP
  - 1. A. Rhodes replied that a special meeting of the Academic Senate could be called to craft that vote. However, A. Rhodes warned about the seriousness of a vote of no confidence and wants to ensure that all possibilities are exhausted before putting forth a vote of no confidence
  - 2. If PPC moves forward with the AP, then the Senate could have the justification to craft the vote of No Confidence
  - 3. B. Brutlag replied that faculty should remind the college is not a corporation. While this may be a negotiation, this is a public institution. If Senate creates a counteroffer, that plays into the idea of the college as a corporation
  - 4. The consensus process should be allowed to happen. Senate is not asking for status quo but to have the discussion to move through the consensus
  - 5. K. Barman replied in favor of the discussion being had
- xii. D. Pichardo-Diaz moved: Given that functional APs are in place for hiring, we move to continue the process of shared governance at PPC and PFC to allow consensus to prevail, holding all APs to the same process

1. Second by K. Smith
  2. Discussion
    - a. K. Smith asked for a friendly amendment to include PFC
    - b. K. O'Brien saw a veiled threat in Dr. Miller's email that is not real that hiring will be stalled. This is not as true as hiring is continue. APs are not the Board's purview
    - c. L. Curiel asked for a friendly amendment: Given that a functional AP is in process
  3. Motion passes unanimously
7. Vice President's Report
- a. 1st Vice President, Kelly Lynch
    - i. A fellow of the college was selected but the recommendation was not received well: Mary Becerill
    - ii. No distinguished service award will be granted. Dr. Flores didn't feel the applications met the policy
    - iii. Distinguished Faculty Awards are due by March 18th
  - b. 2nd Vice President, Aditi Sapra
    - i. Christina Miranda has started an initiative to have an information booth for students. Faculty are welcomed to present information about their programs/services at 3pm on Mondays
8. Unfinished Business
- a. None
9. Guest Report
- a. No guest report
10. New Business
- a. Academic Senate Executive Council Nominations
    - i. ASCCC Representative
      1. V. Villanueva nominated D. Pichardo-Diaz
    - ii. Parliamentarian
      1. V. Villanueva nominated A. Martinez
    - iii. Secretary
      1. No nominations
    - iv. 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President
      1. D. Pichardo-Diaz nominated A. Sapra
    - v. 1<sup>st</sup> Vice President
      1. D. Pichardo-Diaz nominated F. Nakatani
    - vi. President
      1. K. Lynch nominated B. Brutlag
  - b. Discussion: BP 4020 Program, Curriculum, and Course Development
  - c. Discussion: BP 4040 Library and Learning Support Services
  - d. Discussion: BP 4050 Articulation
  - e. Discussion: BP 4106 Nursing Programs



- f. Discussion: BP 4231 Grade Changes
  - g. Discussion: BP 4245 Academic Rank
  - h. Discussion: BP 4260 Prerequisites and Co-requisites
11. Announcements
12. Adjournment
- a. Meeting adjourned at 2:25pm