

# **Academic Senate - SUMMARY**

Location: Sequoia Room 1, Visalia Campus and Zoom Teleconference Location: 9694 Mimbres Court, Gold Canyon, AZ 85118

### Wednesday, April 30, 2025 4:10 – 5:30 pm

## 1. Call to Order 4:11 pm

Executive Members Juan Arzola - present David Hurst - present Teresa Mendoza - present Ramyar Alavi-Moghaddam - present Samantha Brookshire - present Joshua Geist - present Octavio Barajas - present Liana Craven - present Elise Baker - absent Sarah Harris - present

#### Senators

<u>AG (1)</u> Russell McKeith - present IT (2) Chris Huff - absent Shane Baesemann - absent Business (2) vacant Kevin Picciuto - absent Consumer Family Studies (1) Kyran Wiley - present FEC Liana Craven - present Fine Arts (1) Chris Mangels - present Library (1) Milena Seyed - present English (3) Joshua Geist - present Lucia Tejeda - absent Greg Turner - present Comm/Lang (1) vacant Math/Engineering (2) Tracy Redden - absent vacant Nursing/Health Science (2) Kim Felsted - present vacant **Physical Education (2)** Michelle Bolt - present Lisa Lorenzi - present Science (2) Chiara MacPherson - present Courtney Traugh - present Social Science (3) Octavio Barajas - present C Quesada - absent Esther Villegas-Sandoval - present Student Services (3) Mai Her - absent Robyn Noves - absent Marvin Turk - present Adiunct Faculty (2) Danielle Alberti - present Samantha Brookshire - present Classified (1) Crystal Salazar - absent Student Rep (1) Steven Walker - present

Also present: Kelly Diaz

- 2. **Public Comment** limited to a combined total of 15 minutes (3 minutes per public speaker)
  - a. Regarding items not on the Agenda None
  - b. Regarding items on the Agenda None

#### 3. Consent Calendar

All items listed on the Consent Calendar are considered routine and will be enacted by one motion. An item may be removed from the Consent Calendar at the request of any Senator or any person in the audience and considered as a separate agenda item. *Motion to approve made by Samantha Brookshire. Approved.* 

ion to approve made by Samanina Brooks

- a. Meeting Minutes
- b. Approval of Agenda
- c. Faculty appointments: none

#### 4. Action

a. Proposed amendment for the Bylaws – DECOS (Joshua Geist) *Motion to approve made by Russell McKeith, 2<sup>nd</sup>/ David Hurst. MSA.* 

#### 5. Information

a. Student Senate Update

Steven Walker --

- There were 79 voters that participated in student senate officer election
- 18 students have registered for the incoming leadership class
- The creation of a coupon book is underway which will consist of 28 most popular establishments.

b. COS Master Plan 2025-2035

David Hurst – The 2025-2035 Master Plan has been finalized and submitted DGS. It will be presented to the Board in May. Program reviews will align with the new outcomes and objectives in the plan. David advised senators to read the document.

c. Accreditation Report - Core Inquiries

Sarah Harris – presented the accreditation report, highlighting three core inquiries for the upcoming site visit in September. She also noted the need for examples of processes that have led to student success (core inquiry #3). The report includes a list of specific groups the accreditation team wishes to interview during their site visit. Individuals in some of these groups may be contacted to schedule interviews before the team visit.

# d. FEC Midyear Report

Any questions regarding the report should be directed to Liana Craven.

An information item can be brought back for discussion at a future meeting. Please email Juan Arzola and Teresa Mendoza.

# 6. Discussion

a. Committee C - Committee Work (Danielle Alberti)

Danielle Alberti – asked two questions: whether Senate votes represent recommendations or facts, and how to proceed with the current Committee C bylaws.

Octavio Barajas – Members of Committee C began their work by deciding that the first step would be to establish bylaws. As more part-time faculty members join the committee, there would be opportunities to discuss the bylaws, which would be a standing item on Committee C's agendas. The committee requested assistance in spreading the word to those interested in serving. The next Committee C meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 7th, at 4 PM in Hospital Rock 133.

Senators discussed potential actions to change Committee C's bylaws. Suggestions included making a motion to amend the bylaws, bringing an action item to the next meeting, re-establishing the Committee C taskforce to amend the recommendations, or passing a resolution.

Sarah Harris – Committee C can set their own bylaws and change them.

While no senators made a motion, it was suggested that an action item could be added to the agenda for the next meeting.

b. AP 7211

David Hurst summarized the changes made to AP 7211, highlighting how they reflect the current functions and processes of the Equivalency Committee. He noted that the committee has faced challenges in meeting tight timelines and that the reconsideration process for denied applicants was problematic. David clarified that the committee's decisions are communicated to HR who then informs equivalency applicants.

Danielle Alberti asked who would be responsible for uploading the flowchart to the HR website and expressed concern about leaving HR in charge of these documents. She suggested including a list of documents in the AP instead. David Hurst noted that the committee would prefer the ability to revise future documents without needing to amend the AP. Joshua Geist proposed that the documents be hosted on the equivalency committee website, with a link provided on the HR page.

David Hurst – The reconsideration process deleted under section 7 had flaws. The equivalency committee could not figure out language for a process. David Hurst stated that very few colleges have a reconsideration process. Acceptance or denial of equivalency would be communicated to HR by the committee—the committee does not communicate with the applicant or level 1 hiring committee these details.

Octavio Barajas made several suggestions, including seeking outside perspectives on the AP from individuals not on the committee, particularly from divisions that receive a high number of equivalency applicants or from members of hiring committees, to help improve processes. He also recommended establishing a reconsideration process, noting that if HR was responsible for this process, there was currently no written documentation. Nor was there a process outlined in the faculty hiring procedures. The removal of specific language from the AP would eliminate any reference to the reconsideration process. Also, Octavio pointed out that the emphasis on working quickly was removed from the document and suggested it could be reintegrated into the AP.
Courtney Traugh proposed that the Equivalency Committee Taskforce review this AP.
Senators were asked to share the document with their constituents, as the equivalency committee was open to suggestions and changes to the AP. The AP had already been submitted to DGS for an initial review, and feedback from John Bratsch was still pending. Item 6b will be presented as an action item at the next Senate meeting.
Meeting adjourned: 5:26 pm

# Cloud Recording:

https://cos-edu.zoom.us/rec/share/53QT\_nSCpcXsGqQnoqalmlvrD14H9RRgjkhiB85hU7XzSxXaNC-CToyPWb0o5jTJ.sXMuI7EoObhmPyFt

Passcode: 1#ih^Kd0

# Submitted by Teresa Mendoza