



G R O S S M O N T C O L L E G E



Meeting Minutes of the Academic Senate	
Grossmont College	
October 5, 2026	
11:00 am-12:20 pm	
<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>	
1	Call to Order: 11:10 am
2	<p>Public Comment:</p> <p>J. Yang (Yang): FAHM</p> <p>Dr. Yang presented on Filipino American History Month (FAHM), and the API Committee planned fun, educational events. The national flag of the Philippines was placed around the campus. This presentation shows students a sense of belonging. Many of them beamed with pride when they saw the flags displayed around campus. (Thank you, Nemie Capacia!)</p> <p>Please check Lisa Brlas' library display concerning the four waves of Filipino immigration to the US. Then head over to the book collection of Filipino American</p>

authors curated by Librarian Nadra Farina-Hess, available Wednesday. Thank you so much to our library colleagues!

Also, please mark your calendars for October 12 from 11-1 in the Quad, when we collaboratively celebrate National Coming Out Day. The API Committee will be providing food from Lady G's starting at noon. Activities will celebrate this cultural event.

K. Hern (Hern): Conflict of Interest—Hern addressed the requirement that employees disclose employment interests held outside their primary position and the broader implications this policy has for GC employees, students, and the community. Hern recognized that employers have legitimate interests in preventing conflict of interest and ensuring employees fulfill their professional responsibilities. However, requiring disclosure of outside employment goes beyond those concerns and unnecessarily scrutinizes employees’ personal and financial decisions.

For many employees, outside employment is not a luxury. It is a financial necessity. With rising living expenses, many employees depend on supplemental income to support themselves and their families. Requiring employees to disclose how they earn that income outside their contracted work hours feels intrusive, unfair, and predatory.

This requirement may disproportionately affect adjunct faculty, classified part-time employees, single-income households, and others who may already be financially stretched. Hern noted that if we are serious about DEIA, we also need to consider whether our policies create unnecessary barriers for employees with fewer financial resources or less flexibility to absorb rising costs. There is also a direct impact on our students.

Many faculty and staff maintain outside employment in the very industries we teach about. Those industry connections help keep curriculum current, provide students with real-world examples, and often create pathways to internships, mentorships, networking, and employment opportunities. When employees remain connected to industry, our students gain easier access to people and organizations that can help them move from the classroom into a career.

A policy that discourages or creates unnecessary scrutiny around outside employment risks weakening those connections. That can disproportionately affect students who do not already have professional networks or family connections to industry, the very students our DEIA efforts are intended to support.

When employees feel financially insecure, monitored, or discouraged from seeking supplemental income, we also make it more difficult to retain experienced, committed professionals. Losing those employees affects institutional knowledge,

student support, course availability, industry relationships, and ultimately the quality of the educational experience.

If the concern is a conflict of interest, the policy should be narrowly written to address actual conflicts of interest. If the concern is whether employees are fulfilling their assigned responsibilities, then evaluate employees based on their performance.

GC employees should not be placed in a position where they must justify lawful work performed on their own time simply because their primary employer wants to know about it. GC employees deserve reasonable boundaries, financial dignity, and respect for their lives outside of work. GC students deserve faculty and staff who remain connected to the industries they hope to enter.

Hern respectfully requested that the committee reconsider this requirement and replace it with a narrowly tailored policy focused on genuine conflicts of interest rather than broad disclosure of outside employment.

D. Dillon (Dillon): provided information on National Transfer Week, which takes place Oct 19-23, 2026, and we are celebrating with a variety of events.

- Monday, October 19, 2026 9am-11am: **CSU/UC Application Assistance Session w/SDSU** (Bldg 10 Room 172)
- 2pm-3pm **Transfer 101** (Bldg 10 Room 172)
- Tuesday, October 20, 2026 11am-12:30pm: **Your Path to Medical School** (Bldg 36 Room 225)
- 3pm-4pm **Your Path. Your Purpose. Your PLNU.** (Bldg 10 Room 172)
- Wednesday, October 21, 2026 12pm-1pm: **From Associate Degree to Law School** (Bldg 10 Room 172)
- 4pm-5pm **California Medicine Scholars Program** (Bldg 10 Room 172)
- Thursday, October 22, 2026 10:30am-12:30pm: **CSU/UC Application Assistance Session** (Bldg 10 Room 172)
- 2pm-3:30pm **CSU Transfer Success Pathway** (Bldg 10 Room 172)
- Friday, October 23, 2026 9:30am-11:30am: **CSU/UC Application Assistance Session*** (Bldg 10 Room 172)

A. Deutsch (Deutsch)

Deutsch noted the AS president election timeline. The nomination period is now open for the upcoming Academic Senate presidential election. **Nominations will be accepted until Friday, October 30th, at 5:00 pm.** Any full-time faculty member may serve.

	<p>If faculty are interested in running for the position or would like to nominate another faculty member, AS VP Deutsch requested to have faculty please submit a statement via this form.</p> <p>If you have questions, please contact Academic Senate Vice President Adam Deutsch at Adam.Deutsch@gcccd.edu. If you intend to nominate another faculty member, please do so with their consent.</p> <p>Thank you to our Elections Committee members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lara Braff • Romeo Madrid
3	<p>Approval of minutes from September 21, 2026.</p> <p>VOTE: Minutes approved with no objections</p> <p>Motion: J. VandenEynden/K. Kaires</p>
4	<p>Approval of Agenda</p> <p>VOTE: Agenda approved with no objections</p> <p>Motion: C. Flores/J. VandenEynden</p>
5.	<p>Announcements: Senate representatives were informed that the announcements were posted in the AS Canvas Container.</p>
5.1	<p>New/Newer Faculty Welcome Reception (11.10.26) The Senate announced plans to host a welcome reception for new and newer faculty, with support from the college president. The reception will formally welcome faculty to Grossmont College, foster connections with colleagues, and strengthen their sense of belonging in the campus community. The event was tentatively planned for October.</p>
5.2	<p>Faculty Hiring Committee Volunteers (Timeline 10.6.26) K. Caires/L. Braff provided an updated report on approved faculty hires noted in College Council. Strategic Hires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counselor (CN-00023) • Anthropology faculty (New) • Biology faculty (IN-00134) • BOT faculty (IN-00227) • Theater Arts faculty (IN-00244) • ESL faculty (IN-00152) • Counselor (CN-00032) • Counselor (CN-00027) • Counselor (CN-00017) • Nursing faculty (New) • CVT faculty (New) • Director, MESA

	<p>They also provided an update from College Council on the recent ACCJC accreditation site visit and the visiting team's preliminary recommendations. It was reported that Grossmont College had received a recommendation for institutional improvement related to Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI). The college was expected to address the recommendation and provide a progress report during its midterm accreditation reporting cycle, approximately three years later.</p> <p>Senators discussed the importance of sustaining institutional efforts to strengthen RSI practices and ensure compliance with distance education requirements. It was noted that RSI resources and instructional modules were available to support faculty in implementing consistent practices across online courses.</p> <p>The discussion also emphasized the growing demands associated with instructional accessibility. Senators acknowledged that instructional materials published in Canvas, including documents, videos, and other digital resources, were required to meet accessibility standards. Concerns were expressed regarding the significant workload associated with reviewing, updating, and maintaining accessible instructional content, particularly while balancing teaching responsibilities and other professional obligations. Faculty emphasized the importance of a coordinated institutional approach, professional development, and ongoing support to achieve accessibility goals.</p> <p>A faculty representative also raised concerns regarding Cuyamaca College's preliminary accreditation recommendation related to compliance and the potential implications for Grossmont College, given that both institutions operated within the same district. It was clarified that the visiting team's recommendations were preliminary and subject to final review and approval by the ACCJC Commission at its January meeting. The Commission retained the authority to modify a recommendation, including changing a recommendation for improvement to a compliance requirement.</p> <p>Although no specific indication suggested that Grossmont College's recommendation would be elevated to a compliance finding, the discussion acknowledged the importance of remaining attentive to potential districtwide implications.</p> <p>The discussion reinforced the need for continued faculty engagement, institutional coordination, and sustained support for RSI and accessibility initiatives in preparation for future accreditation reporting requirements.</p>
5.3	ASCCC Area D meeting 10.9.26 (open to all faculty)
5.4	National Hispanic Heritage Month

	<p>Día de Muertos Event (10.22.26) Senate will host a table. Senate volunteers are needed on the day of the event.</p>
5.5	ASCCC Site Visit on Equivalency (Joint AS-Monday 10.26.26)
5.6	Sabbatical Application Timeline (Submission Deadline 11.4.26)
5.7	<p>AB 2017 – Recognition of Eid as a California State Holiday</p> <p>Information was provided on Assembly Bill (AB) 2017, which the Governor of California signed into law and established Eid as a recognized state holiday. The legislation added Eid to the list of designated state holidays, excluded it from classification as a judicial holiday, and authorized California community colleges and public schools to close in observance of the holiday under specified conditions.</p> <p>The significance of the legislation in advancing religious inclusion, cultural awareness, and equity for students and employees who observed Eid. While acknowledging that the college's academic calendar was established through negotiations between AFT and the District. Discussions regarding future implementation and recognition of the holiday were underway.</p> <p>Given that changes to the current academic calendar were not feasible, faculty are encouraged to consider reasonable accommodations and supportive instructional practices for students observing Eid. Particular attention was directed toward ensuring that students were not academically disadvantaged or subjected to unnecessary stress when missing classes to participate in religious observances.</p> <p>Senate representatives were encouraged to engage their respective departments and divisions in discussions regarding how the college could better support students and colleagues observing religious holidays. It was noted that these conversations were essential to fostering an inclusive campus environment that respected the diverse cultural and religious identities of the college community.</p> <p>Senators were directed to the legislative information linked in the Senate agenda, which provided additional details regarding the bill's provisions, authorship, and legislative support.</p> <p>During the discussion, a Senator raised a question regarding the distinction between Native American Day and Indigenous Peoples' Day. It was acknowledged that the observances differed and that recognition dates could vary by jurisdiction. The AS President agreed to conduct additional research and provide clarification to Senate representatives through a follow-up email.</p>

	<p>The discussion concluded with an acknowledgment of the importance of advancing institutional practices that reflected the college's commitment to equity, inclusion, and respect for the diverse communities it served.</p>
6	<p>President's Report</p>
6.1	<p>Academic Senate Canvas Container Update</p> <p>An update was provided on the newly launched Academic Senate Canvas container, which was developed to improve communication, transparency, and access to information requiring faculty review and constituent follow-up. The container remained under development, with ongoing efforts to organize materials, improve accessibility, and remove outdated or unnecessary content.</p> <p>It was highlighted that Senators should review the Constituent Follow-Up modules, which were organized by meeting and month, to assist Senate representatives in communicating important agenda items to their respective departments and constituent groups. The September module included follow-up items related to Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI), the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) process, the EEOAC annual certification, and AP 7211.</p> <p>Each module provided a high-level overview, followed by more detailed information outlining specific questions, discussion points, and areas requiring faculty feedback. This structure was intended to support representatives in facilitating departmental discussions, particularly when faculty were unable to attend Senate meetings.</p> <p>It was emphasized that the Canvas container served as an additional communication platform to address gaps in information sharing and ensure that faculty had access to relevant materials in advance of discussions. Rather than</p>
6.2	<p>Administrative Procedure (AP) 7211 – Minimum Qualifications and Equivalency</p> <p>AP 7211, Minimum Qualifications and Equivalency, was revisited, and Senate representatives were encouraged to thoroughly review the proposed revisions and solicit feedback from their respective departments. The Senate noted that research had been conducted on practices at other institutions, particularly regarding faculty service areas and the structure of equivalency review processes. Although AP 7211 referenced an Equivalency Committee, Grossmont College did not have an active committee. It was further explained that Cuyamaca College had expressed a preference for establishing an equivalency task force rather than a standing committee. Senators were encouraged to consider both approaches and provide</p>

6.3	<p>recommendations through comments on the document or within the Academic Senate Canvas container. The procedure remained under review and had not been finalized.</p> <p>During the discussion, a Senator requested clarification regarding previous work on minimum qualifications (MQs) and where the resulting decisions could be accessed. The Curriculum Committee Chair clarified that the college's previous work involved assigning courses to disciplines rather than revising statewide minimum qualifications. The Chair explained that MQs were established through a statewide process and published in the Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges handbook. Faculty interested in proposing revisions to statewide MQs could participate in the established statewide review process. The Chair further noted that the course-to-discipline assignments approved by departments during the spring semester had been entered into the Curriculum Management System and were available for faculty review.</p> <p>Senators were also reminded of the upcoming ASCCC workshop addressing minimum qualifications and equivalency. It was emphasized that an equivalency procedure was legally required and that AP 7211 outlined the responsibilities and requirements associated with equivalency determinations. Senate representatives were encouraged to share the proposed procedure with their constituents, facilitate departmental discussions, and submit recommendations to inform the ongoing review and revision process.</p> <p>Safety Emergency Preparedness (Great California ShakeOut 10.15.26): The Academic Senate President highlighted the importance of campus safety and emergency preparedness in anticipation of the Great California ShakeOut scheduled for October 15, 2026. Senators were encouraged to inquire about the college's participation and emergency preparedness plans during the administration's scheduled presentation.</p> <p>The importance of ensuring that all employees, particularly newly hired faculty and classified professionals, were informed of established campus evacuation procedures was emphasized. While the District provided employee orientation, it was stressed that individual departments should maintain comprehensive emergency evacuation plans that addressed various scenarios, including fires, earthquakes, and other natural disasters. These plans should extend beyond reliance on a single designated individual, recognizing that the person might be unavailable during an emergency.</p> <p>It was further emphasized that faculty and students should understand evacuation routes and procedures, particularly given the college's hillside location and the fact that faculty taught in multiple buildings. Departments were encouraged to review</p>
-----	---

<p>6.4</p> <p>6.5</p>	<p>their existing emergency protocols, identify potential gaps, and ensure that safety information was consistently communicated to employees and students.</p> <p>Concerns were also raised regarding limitations in the campus emergency communication infrastructure. Specifically, it was the fact that PA announcements in Building 31 were not consistently audible inside classrooms unless doors were opened. This raised concerns about the effectiveness of emergency notifications and the ability of faculty and students to receive timely instructions during a campus emergency.</p> <p>Senators were encouraged to remain proactive in reviewing departmental evacuation procedures, communicating safety expectations, and identifying infrastructure concerns that warranted administrative attention to strengthen campuswide emergency preparedness.</p> <p>Faculty Hire Timeline—Faculty volunteers are needed to serve on upcoming hiring committees.</p> <p>Camera Protocol: The Camera Operating Protocol had undergone review, and the District was in the first phase of camera installations. The District had indicated that the cameras were intended to enhance campus safety and security rather than serve as intrusive surveillance of students, faculty, or classified professionals. The cameras were designed to provide recorded footage that could be reviewed when necessary in response to safety or security incidents.</p> <p>It was further clarified that access to recorded footage was restricted and subject to established procedures. Requests from law enforcement for camera footage were to be directed through Vice Chancellor Sahar, who was identified as the authorized administrator responsible for access to the recordings. It was emphasized that footage would not be available for unrestricted viewing or informal requests.</p> <p>Faculty were encouraged to review the protocol and installation map and provide feedback or seek clarification regarding camera placement, privacy protections, access restrictions, and the implementation process.</p>
<p>7</p> <p>7.1</p>	<p>Information Items</p> <p>MOU Process: The Academic Senate President revisited the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) process, which had been presented at a previous Senate meeting. The importance of faculty review and feedback before the document advanced to an action item for Senate consideration was emphasized.</p>

	<p>The collaborative work of the Articulation Officer and Transfer Specialist in developing the comprehensive document and encouraging Senate representatives to share it with their respective departments for discussion and recommendations was acknowledged. Faculty were reminded that the document was available in the Academic Senate Canvas container under the September 2026 Constituent Follow-Up module, where comments and feedback could be submitted directly.</p> <p>A demonstration of how to navigate the Canvas container was given, and it was explained that materials had been organized into accessible sections consistent with Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles. The container also provided downloadable documents and opportunities for faculty engagement. It was noted that future constituent follow-up items would be organized by meeting month to improve accessibility, communication, and transparency.</p> <p>Faculty were encouraged to thoroughly review the proposed MOU process and submit feedback before the item returned to the Senate for action.</p>
7.2	<p>AP 7211 and Minimum Qualifications: The previous discussion of AP 7211, Minimum Qualifications and Equivalency, was referenced, and the importance of thoroughly reviewing the proposed administrative procedure was reiterated. Senate representatives were encouraged to share the document with their constituents and provide feedback on the proposed language, committee structure, and equivalency review process before the procedure advanced for further consideration.</p>
7.3	<p>AP/BP 7333-Return to Work Procedure: Concerns were shared regarding the absence of faculty feedback on the proposed Return-to-Work Administrative Procedure. The procedure had significant implications for all employees, regardless of their current health or employment circumstances, and encouraged faculty to review the document proactively.</p> <p>The District's stated commitment to retaining employees and preserving their skills, knowledge, and experience by facilitating their return to work following industrial or nonindustrial injuries or illnesses was highlighted. The proposed procedure outlined provisions for temporary modified duties, alternative assignments, eligibility requirements, and medical authorization.</p> <p>Particular attention was directed to the provisions addressing long-term work restrictions, the interactive process, reasonable accommodations, and potential employment consequences. The importance of understanding how the proposed</p>

7.4	<p>timelines and eligibility requirements could affect employees experiencing temporary or chronic medical conditions, which was emphasized.</p> <p>During the discussion, a Senator requested clarification regarding language addressing intermittent absences exceeding 120 days annually for three consecutive years. The provision indicated that such circumstances would immediately initiate the interactive process and a meeting to discuss reasonable accommodations.</p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding the potential impact of this language on employees managing chronic or recurring medical conditions, including migraines and other conditions requiring intermittent leave. Faculty questioned whether the procedure sufficiently addressed protections under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and other applicable leave provisions and whether automatically initiating the interactive process could be perceived as punitive.</p> <p>C. Flores (Senate representative on HRC) noted that similar concerns had been raised by classified employee representatives during prior discussions of the procedure. Senate representatives were encouraged to examine the language carefully and recommend revisions that promoted equitable treatment, clarity, and appropriate protections for employees.</p> <p>Also highlighted were provisions addressing the exhaustion of available leave, potential separation from employment, and subsequent placement on a reemployment list. Faculty were encouraged to consider the implications of these provisions and contribute their professional expertise to ensure that the procedure was comprehensive, equitable, and responsive to employee circumstances.</p> <p>The discussion concluded with a request for Senate representatives to engage their departments in reviewing the proposed procedure and submit substantive feedback for consideration by Human Resources.</p> <p>Administrative Procedures: AP 7333, and AP 7150: the proposed administrative procedure addressing the Safe and Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI). The work of the District AI Task Force and the contributions of faculty representatives, including Felicia and Jonathan, in reviewing the proposed language were acknowledged .</p> <p>It was explained that the procedure established processes and responsibilities for implementing the District's Board Policy on the safe and ethical use of AI technologies. The proposed administrative procedure was informed by the District's Responsible AI Guiding Principles and was intended to promote responsible</p>
-----	--

<p>7.5</p> <p>7.6</p>	<p>innovation while maintaining transparency, accountability, and protections for students and employees.</p> <p>Several areas addressed in the proposed procedure were highlighted, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Privacy, data security, and the protection of sensitive information. ● Responsible and secure use of AI technologies. ● Training and awareness regarding AI applications. ● Mitigation of misinformation and inaccurate AI-generated content. ● Identification and reduction of bias in AI outputs. ● Protection of intellectual property rights, copyright, and academic integrity. ● Prevention of plagiarism and other inappropriate uses of AI. <p>During the discussion, a Senator clarified that the proposed procedure had undergone review by a Districtwide group and encouraged Senate representatives to share the document with their departments for additional consideration.</p> <p>It was emphasized that faculty feedback was essential to ensuring that the procedure reflected instructional needs, academic freedom, ethical considerations, and the practical implications of AI use across the institution.</p> <p>The proposed procedure would be included in the October Constituent Follow-Up module within the Academic Senate Canvas container. The document would be organized into accessible sections, with a downloadable version available for reference. Faculty would also have the opportunity to submit comments and recommendations directly through the Canvas platform.</p> <p>Senate representatives were encouraged to engage their constituents in reviewing the proposed procedure and emphasized the importance of providing feedback before the item advanced for action. Additional reminders would be distributed to ensure faculty had sufficient opportunity to participate in the review process.</p> <p>The discussion concluded with an invitation for additional questions, comments, and recommendations regarding the proposed administrative procedure.</p> <p>Peer-to-Peer and Hierarchical Anonymous Reporting Forms</p> <p>The proposed Peer-to-Peer and Hierarchical Anonymous Reporting Forms, which had been introduced during the previous semester revisited. It was explained that the forms were developed in response to ongoing faculty concerns regarding interpersonal conflicts, workplace challenges, inequitable treatment, and the need for additional institutional support and accountability. It was noted that limited feedback had been received and encouraged Senate representatives to thoroughly</p>
-----------------------	--

review the proposed forms and submit recommendations through the Academic Senate Canvas container.

Historical context regarding previous efforts to establish a faculty-led collegial mediation process was provided. Although discussions had occurred regarding reinstating a mediation structure, those efforts had not resulted in an active committee. Professional development opportunities previously offered through AFT to prepare faculty to serve as mediators and expressed interest in restoring a campus-supported mediation process was referenced. Such a structure could provide a supportive environment for addressing interpersonal concerns before they escalated into formal grievances or other institutional proceedings.

It was emphasized that the proposed reporting forms were not intended to replace or circumvent established AFT representation, Human Resources procedures, Title IX reporting, or other contractual and legal processes. Rather, the forms were intended to provide an additional avenue for faculty to share experiences, identify recurring concerns, and inform recommendations for institutional improvements. It was explained that anonymity was intended to reduce barriers to reporting, particularly for faculty who feared retaliation or were uncomfortable identifying themselves.

It was further noted that the information collected could help identify systemic patterns, inform policy recommendations, and support the development of additional resources, including the potential establishment of an institutional ombudsperson. Also referenced the District's Employee Assistance Program (EAP) and emphasized the importance of evaluating whether existing services adequately addressed faculty needs.

Additionally, the recommendations developed by Dr. Frank Harris III during his consultation with the college's antiracism task force was referenced. The College President had reportedly been exploring opportunities to incorporate those recommendations into institutional practices to strengthen employee support, equity, and accountability.

Faculty Discussion and Recommendations

During the discussion, a Senator raised concerns regarding the purpose, administration, and confidentiality of the proposed anonymous reporting forms. Questions centered on how responses would be collected, who would have access to the information, and how the Senate would distinguish between concerns appropriate for collegial mediation and matters requiring formal Human Resources or union intervention. The representative cautioned that the forms could create

confusion regarding established reporting pathways and potentially place the Academic Senate in matters outside its designated responsibilities.

In response, it was clarified that anonymity was optional and that the primary purpose of the forms was to collect information, identify institutional concerns, and develop recommendations rather than investigate individual complaints. The complexity of navigating workplace concerns and emphasized that faculty, particularly newly hired colleagues, often lacked clear guidance regarding available reporting procedures and institutional resources was acknowledged. It was reiterated that the forms remained in draft status and that faculty feedback was essential to clarifying their purpose, scope, and implementation.

Another Senator recommended incorporating a resource and referral section at the conclusion of each form. This section could direct employees to appropriate institutional contacts, including Human Resources, AFT, Title IX, and other support services, based on the nature of their concerns. The recommendation was intended to ensure that faculty who submitted reports received meaningful guidance, particularly when anonymous submissions prevented direct follow-up.

The Senate welcomed the recommendation and explained that the Academic Senate Canvas container was being expanded to include an orientation and resource module for new employees. The proposed module would provide guidance on institutional processes, available services, and appropriate contacts for addressing workplace concerns. It was emphasized that these resources would be developed collaboratively and informed by faculty feedback.

Additional faculty comments expressed support for the overall concept, particularly as an informal avenue for individuals who needed assistance but were not prepared to initiate formal reporting or grievance procedures. A faculty representative suggested that the questions be carefully structured to help respondents reflect on and articulate their concerns while distinguishing between requests for support, mediation, and formal intervention.

The importance of providing timely and compassionate support to faculty experiencing workplace distress was reinforced. Referencing a recent situation involving faculty who received correspondence perceived as threatening to their professional standing and livelihood, the Senate emphasized that colleagues often required immediate emotional support and assistance navigating institutional procedures. The Senate acknowledged the critical role of AFT in addressing contractual matters while emphasizing the Senate's responsibility to advocate for a supportive and equitable institutional culture.

7.7	<p>Senators also raised concerns regarding the accessibility and transparency of the draft forms. One representative noted that reviewers were required to complete preliminary demographic questions before accessing subsequent sections, limiting their ability to evaluate the forms in their entirety. Suggestions included providing a complete preview or collaborator access so that faculty could review all questions without submitting responses. The Senate acknowledged the concern and agreed that the review process should allow faculty to examine the full documents while maintaining accessibility standards.</p> <p>Another faculty representative requested clarification regarding how the forms would be communicated and made available to the broader college community if approved. The Senate explained that the forms remained information items and had not been adopted or authorized for implementation. Following constituent review and revisions, the proposed forms would return to the Academic Senate as action items for formal consideration and a vote. If approved, the forms could subsequently be made available through the Academic Senate website and Canvas container.</p> <p>The Senate concluded by emphasizing the importance of collecting meaningful faculty feedback before advancing the proposals. Senate representatives were encouraged to review the forms with their constituents, identify language requiring clarification, and recommend improvements regarding confidentiality, accessibility, reporting pathways, referral resources, and institutional accountability.</p> <p>The proposed forms remained under review, with no final action taken.</p> <p>District Phone System Replacement</p> <p>The Academic Senate President revisited the District's planned phone system replacement, referencing the previous presentation by District Information Technology (IT) regarding the existing Mitel system and the proposed transition to a new telecommunications platform.</p> <p>Senate representatives were informed that the District IT had provided a feedback form to solicit faculty input on the replacement process. The link was included in the Senate agenda and was also to be made available through the Academic Senate Canvas container.</p> <p>Senate representatives were encouraged to complete the feedback form and share it with their respective departments to ensure that faculty perspectives, operational needs, and concerns were considered during the planning and implementation</p>
-----	---

	<p>process. The Senate emphasized the importance of broad faculty participation in informing decisions regarding the District's future telecommunications system.</p>
<p>8</p> <p>8.1</p>	<p>Presentations</p> <p>E. Wirig (Wirig)</p> <p>Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) – Faculty Engagement and Implementation</p> <p>The Academic Senate received a presentation from Wirig regarding the status of Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) implementation and the need to accelerate institutional progress. Evan reported that the college was approximately four and a half years behind in advancing CPL initiatives, despite having received a \$50,000 grant during the previous year to support expansion efforts. He emphasized that statewide expectations for CPL implementation had increased and that the college needed to take immediate steps to advance the process.</p> <p>Wirig stressed that CPL implementation was a faculty-driven process, with faculty retaining primary responsibility for determining course eligibility, assessment methods, and the alignment of prior learning with established curriculum standards. He explained that CPL provided students with opportunities to earn college credit for knowledge and skills acquired outside traditional classroom settings, including military training, industry-recognized certifications, examinations, and portfolio assessments. He emphasized that expanding CPL represented an important opportunity to improve equitable student access, recognize existing competencies, and accelerate educational attainment.</p> <p>The presentation highlighted the need to establish a coordinated CPL implementation team consisting of a dean, faculty CPL coordinators, departmental and program representatives, counselors, administrators, Admissions and Records personnel, and Financial Aid representatives. Wirig emphasized the importance of developing a centralized, student-friendly process that eliminated the need for students to navigate multiple websites or offices to access CPL opportunities.</p> <p>Wirig referenced the San Diego Community College District's CPL model, which provided a centralized resource for military and nonmilitary students. He noted that the district had received approximately \$1 million in state funding to support its CPL initiatives and encouraged Grossmont College to pursue similar opportunities.</p> <p>The presentation also identified several statewide CPL credit recommendations that had already undergone review and could potentially be adopted locally through the appropriate faculty and departmental approval processes. These included opportunities in Administration of Justice, Computer Information Systems,</p>

	<p>Kinesiology, and World Languages. Wirig emphasized that these existing recommendations provided an opportunity to accelerate implementation without duplicating work already completed at the statewide level.</p> <p>Faculty Responsibilities and Next Steps</p> <p>Wirig outlined several actions needed to advance CPL implementation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify Departmental Representatives: Each department or program was asked to designate a faculty representative to participate in CPL planning and implementation. 2. Identify Eligible Courses: Faculty were asked to determine which courses within their disciplines were appropriate for CPL consideration. 3. Determine Assessment Methods: Departments were encouraged to identify appropriate faculty-approved assessment methods, including examinations, portfolios, military training evaluations, and industry certifications. 4. Develop Student-Facing Information: The Academic Senate intended to develop a repository of standardized syllabus statements to inform students about CPL opportunities and available assessment pathways. 5. Submit Departmental Recommendations: Departments were asked to submit their designated representatives, proposed courses, and assessment methods to the CPL leadership team by the end of the semester to support implementation planning. <p>Wirig emphasized that faculty participation was essential to maintaining academic rigor, ensuring curricular alignment, and establishing equitable and consistent CPL practices. He reiterated that decisions regarding the awarding of academic credit required faculty expertise and could not be determined solely through administrative processes.</p> <p>The Senate thanked Wiring for the presentation and reiterated the importance of faculty engagement in advancing CPL opportunities. Senate representatives were informed that the presentation materials, statewide-approved course recommendations, and departmental action items would be made available through the Academic Senate Canvas container and Senate website.</p> <p>The discussion concluded with a call for departments to review existing CPL opportunities, identify faculty representatives, and submit recommendations to support the college's continued expansion of Credit for Prior Learning.</p>
9	Action Items

9.1	None
10.1 10.2	Vice-President's Report/Unfinished Business Participatory Governance (open active recruitments) Senators (updating dept/division reps, specifically counseling)
11 11.1	Future Agenda Items Presentation on Instructional Effectiveness- PIEC
12	ASCCC Webinars, Announcements, and Resources October 9, Area D Meeting
13	Adjournment: VOTE: Motion to adjourn (M. Molina & J. VandenEynden) The meeting adjourned at 12:21. Next meeting: October 19, 2026

Committee Representative Communication & Feedback Form (Responses) 6/1/26