

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

November 4th , 2008

Attendance (X indicates present, exc indicates excused, pre-arranged absence)

Behavioral & Social Sciences
Brown, Maria
Widman, Lance X
Wynne, Michael X

MacPherson, Lee X
Marston, Doug X
Rodriguez, George

Business
Halamka, Dagmar
Saddiqui, Junaid X

Learning Resources Unit
Striepe, Claudia X
Robles, Vince (sharing)
Ichinaga, Moon (sharing) X

Counseling
Beley, Kate X
Gallucci, Linda X
Jackson, Brenda X

Mathematical Sciences
Scott, Greg
Glucksman, Marc X
Boerger, John
Fry, Greg
Yun, Paul

Fine Arts
Ahmadpour, Ali X
Davidson, Jason X
Wells, Chris X
Crossman, Mark
Berney, Daniel
Jeremy Estrella X

Natural Sciences
Cowell, Chas X
Herzig, Chuck X
Palos Teresa X
Vakil, David X

Health Sciences & Athletics
Hazell, Tom X
Orton, Tory/Victoria (sharing)
Stanbury, Corey
McGinley, Pat X
Moon, Mary (sharing)

Adjunct Faculty
Kate McLaughlin X
Owens, Annette

Humanities
Hong, Lyman X
Marcoux, Pete X
Uyemura, Evelyn X
Kline, Matt X
Adrienne Sharp X

ECC CEC Members
Panski, Saul X
Pratt, Estina
Smith, Darwin
Evans, Jerome
Norton, Tom

Industry & Technology
Gebert, Pat X
Hofmann, Ed X

Ex Officio Attendees: Francisco Arce, Jeanie Nashime, Janet Young,
Guests and/Other Officers: Regina Smith (Deans Rep.), Quajuana Chapman, Bill Mulrooney, Chris Gold, Joe Udeochu (ASO Rep), Barabra Perez, Barbara Jaffe

Unless noted otherwise, all page numbers refer to the packet used during the meeting, not the current packet you are reading now.

The sixth Academic Senate meeting of the Fall 2008 semester was called to order at 12:35pm.

Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes were approved with an update from Dr. Nishime as follows. The last minutes had Dr. Nishime stating that “a course cannot be transferred back to alleviate a poor GPA”. Dr. Nishime wanted it to be noted that she has subsequently found that this is not consistently applied and that further investigation on this point is needed.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

President’s report – Pete Marcoux (henceforth PM)

College Council [pg 15 of packet] shows 14 possible cuts discussed for implementation in 2003. These will serve as a model for possible cuts during the present crisis, although some of the items from 2003 are no longer applicable. El Camino may be facing a \$5million cut. [pg 16 of packet] shows a detailed breakdown of the 2003 cuts. [pgs 22-23 of packet] show a listing of the El Camino College Committees. PM asked AS members to go back to their Divisions and help ensure that the Committee membership rosters are up to date, and that the latest minutes are posted in good time.

Program Review. {pg 65-67 of packet} shows an updated list of Divisional Departments and programs re: Program Review cycles.

Credit Matriculation Expenditure Report. [pg 68-75 of packet] shows a copy of the report PM recently signed.

Basic Skills Initiative Action Plan. [pg 76 – 101 of packet] shows a copy of the plan PM recently signed.

Student E-Mail Campaign. PM reminded the Senate that students will be receiving information on registration via e-mail and phone.

Compton Education Center report - Saul Panski (SP)

[pg 25, and 43-52 of packet]. The **Area C Meeting** was held at the Compton Campus on Saturday from 8 am to 2pm. The meeting went well, with approximately 37 attendees from about 7 area colleges, and colleges as far away as Questa and Alan Hancock. SP noted that all attendees seemed nervous on the question of accreditation, and particularly the accreditation team stance on SLO’s. SP noted that we at ECC and the CEC should feel good regarding our recent accreditation visit.

Curriculum Committee report – Janet Young (JY)

[pg 26-39 of packet] JY noted that courses from Behavioral and Social Sciences, Fine Arts, and Health Sciences and Athletics had been approved. The Vocational Nursing Program Major and Certificate had been approved. The Committee had voted to “roll

back” the A.S. Degree G.E. Requirements for the Social and Behavioral Sciences Area to 3 units instead of 6 units. The AA degree requirements will remain the same. At the next meeting on November 11th, the Committee will discuss Curriculum Review, the revised Math competencies based on the new Math requirements, and will continue their discussion of the General Studies Major.

A question was asked as to whether the SLO’s were on the Course Outline of Record (COR). JY noted that Curricunet will have an SLO component that will allow us to add the SLO’s, but they will not be an “official” part of the COR, as these cannot easily be altered. The Curriculum Committee will not be reviewing SLO’s, as this will be done by each Division. Ms. Gallucci said that while the SLO’s would be noted on the Curricunet software, it would still be a good practice for faculty to put the SLO’s on their syllabus, where it was easily available to students. Mr. Panski said that it had been noted at the Area 5 meeting, that the official position of the State Senate was that this matter was up to the discretion of the individual colleges at this time, and that the confusion came in when different Accreditation teams gave different advice. Dr. Arce disagreed, saying that the Commission overrides any Accreditation teams, and that the Commission’s regulations on the matter are very clear. It was decided to review the matter at the next meeting.

Educational Policies Committee report – Evelyn Uyemura (EU)

[pg 40 of packet]

The Committee is continuing to revise BP 4225 Course Repetition Policy. Now the Committee is looking at the repeatable classes with small letters – like Drawing *abcd*. It seems that Title V says that if a course is *abcd*, a student can only take the course four times. The Committee is trying to get some clarification on this. So if a student takes the course four times and fails once there is no option to alleviate the grade. Dr. Nishime felt that the Title V rule only kicked in after the first class. PM said the discussion would continue later.

Bill Mulrooney said that after the three strikes a petition process may be needed. A repeatable course cannot alleviate a substandard grade – one would need extenuating circumstances or the lapse of a certain time.

Faculty Development – Dave Vakil (DV)

[pg 41-42 of packet] show minutes from the October 14th meeting. The Committees’ last meeting was in conjunction with the Basic Skills Taskforce and the Committee did not take minutes. DV reported that he has been receiving some good feedback regarding the Distinguished Faculty Award as applying to Librarians and Counselors.

Legislative Action – Chris Wells (CW)

[pg 24, 43-54 of packet]

CW reported that he had attended the Area C meeting.

CW noted that LA City College are querying the number of hours their students are putting in compared to the number of units/credits they earn.

West LA College is offering online instructors a stipend if they accept a class size of 80 students.

The legality of the 61 minute how is being questioned.

The question of whether all departments should have basic Skills courses is being raised. Mr. Panski brought up the question of verifying the identification of online students. Ms. Striepe reported that UCLA has picture of each student on the class rosters/roll sheets for each class. DV noted that Mr. Satish had said this would be possible for us to do at ECC.

Finance and Special Projects/ PBC (Planning and Budgeting Committee) – Lance Widman (LW)

No Report

ASO Representative Report - Joe Udeochu (JU)

At their last meeting the ASO had been involved in planning for Homecoming.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Vice President Nominations/Elections.

These elections need to occur this semester for the Fall 2009 schedule. Nominations were taken for the positions of:

- VP- Compton Center – Saul Panski
- VP-Educational Policies – Chris Wells, Chris Jeffries
- VP-Faculty Development – Matt Kline
- VP-Finance – Lance Widman
- VP-Legislative Action (position in question)
- Secretary – Claudia Striepe

Nominations will be accepted at the next meeting as well.

Elections will take place on November 18th. Mr. Wells is in charge of the process.

NEW BUSINESS

Constitutional Change.

[pg 55-56 of packet]

Mr. Vakil proposed making a possible amendment to the Constitution that would eliminate the position of VP Legislative Action, and replace it with the position of VP Instructional Effectiveness. The E-Board recommends this move as it feels it would forge closer ties between the Academic Senate and the work of the SLO Committees. Pg 56 of packet is merely informational, a restatement of the amendment. This has not gone out to the faculty at large yet although it was approved by the Senate in 2006.

The second reading will be held at the next Academic Senate meeting.

Mr. Wells asked, if the motion were to be passed after the next reading, how long the process would take? The answer was that the process should be completed by the end of the academic year, when the new Academic Senate executive takes control.

Mr. Widman noted that evaluations mentioned are a negotiable item. Mr. Widman also opined that the workload for this proposed position seemed very heavy. Ms. Uyemura asked how much assigned time would be given to the position, and was told that this would be negotiated. The Legislative VP position was seen to be increasingly minimal as most of the information was available via e-mail and easily disseminated by the AS president, if necessary.

Mr. Ahmadpour was of the opinion that this position was unnecessary, and opened the way for more classroom/teacher interference. He queried the justification for this position. Mr. Ahmadpour also was against the concept of opening classrooms to visitation for the same reasons of control and interference. Mr. Vakil replied that classroom visits would be on a voluntary basis only. Mr. Wells felt that the position would actually strengthen the faculty position vis a vis instructional effectiveness as the Senate could rely on someone bringing reports back from the different Committees. Ms. Uyemura agreed saying that the position would be a faculty position, representing faculty to the administration on instructional issues.

BP & AP 4300 Field Trips

[pg 57-58 of packet] contains OLD material. Dr. Nishime handed out a packet of new materials on this issue at the meeting. This item was for discussion only – the first official reading will be at the November 18th meeting, giving Senate members a chance to read the new material. Dr. Nishime noted that the Board Policy incorporates some feedback from various meetings, but there are still issues of concern to be worked through and discussed; for instance, the possibility that increased driver training may increase the College's liability. The Administrative Procedures are old, but were never implemented. They seem, and are, detailed, but this is how the Board likes it, so the level of detail will likely remain, though some details may be changed. Mr. Wells inquired whether the policies of other schools on this matter had been examined. Dr. Nishime said yes, but noted that most do not have a comparable level of detail. Mr. Widman suggested talking to those faculty on campus who are heavily involved in field trips, and Mr. Marcoux said that this was being done. Ms. Uyemura asked whether the Board was going to pass the procedures directly? The answer was no, but they would pass the policy and the procedures would be added. The procedures need an overhaul, and Dr. Nishime noted that the new materials handout notes via highlights the areas that may need particular attention. It was asked whether a 12 passenger vehicle needed a Class B license. Dr. Nishime said no, but the drivers needed to go through the safe driver training offered by the campus. Mr. Wells asked whether there was any evidence that such training helped prevent accidents. Dr. Nishime answered that student safety is a priority. The question was raised whether there should be a more rigorous training for drivers, but it seems that the insurance carriers do not think that necessary, and this might affect insurance rates. Asked whether the insurance company could not just check the driver's record without mandating training, Dr Nishime answered that that could be done, but the act of driving a van is very different from driving a car and the campus wanted to give potential van drivers hands-on experience. We will vote on this issue on December 4th.

BP 4225 Course Repetition Policy.

[pg 59 – 62 of packet] This continued earlier discussion.

Ms. Uyemura noted that it appears that we cannot allow students to take repeatable courses designated with lower-case letters (eg: Dance 10 *abcd*) more than the number designated, regardless of circumstances. What are the repercussions?

4 times is the total amount of times we can receive apportionment. Repeatable courses are treated differently from non-repeatable courses. Mr. Mulrooney noted that extenuating circumstances do not apply to repeatable courses. Mr. Mulrooney reported

that if a W preceded a substandard grade, the W would not count and one could get apportionment, however, once a grade is given every subsequent grade counts. If a student fails a repeatable class there is no alleviation. The only exceptions are classes/courses for occupational training or disability, where there are unlimited opportunities for apportionment and repeats. Title V excepts classes needed for legally mandated training like police, fire, and CPR. The question was asked whether the College could allow a student to repeat the course and NOT take the apportionment. The answer was no. Mr. Mulrooney drew attention to a grid [pg 60 of packet] which details the track the College must follow if a course is repeatable, and when a course is non-repeatable. It was asked whether an *ab* class could add and become *abcd*? Yes, but it would have to go through the Curriculum Committee. Could a class become *abcdef*? No, there is a limit of 4 repeats.

Recency Policy.

[pg 63 of packet]

Title V allows us to provide for course repetition in classes that were passed on the basis of "recency." We need to create a policy that defines how non-recent is sufficient to *allow* (not require) a student to re-take a class that s/he passed, when it is a prerequisite. In order for a student to take a class again due to the passage of time we need a policy that would need to spell out what the passage/period of time would be. Ms. Uyemura also noted that it was important to note that the policy would allow for NOT require this opportunity. Ms. Uyemura called for suggestions. El Camino College does not currently have a concrete time period. The Chancellor's example is three years, but there have been reports of colleges varying this example from one semester to five years. The time period might also vary within disciplines and areas of study, as in areas of rapid change like electronics, and certain vocational areas. It was suggested the College should err on the side of a shorter time requirement. Please email ideas to Ms. Uyemura.

Minimum Qualifications:

Dr. Perez distributed a new handout on State Minimum Qualifications versus Local Qualifications. This handout was based on feedback received from Divisions. The shaded areas on the handout is what the divisions require. Areas not shaded are not required. There seems to an error in the real Estate portion. Dr. Perez will email Dr. Grogan regarding this. Please look this over and email Dr. Perez with any concerns/corrections. Dr. Perez will compile a single list for the next Academic Senate packet. Mr. Wells felt there may be some error in the Speech Communications area. Dr. Perez noted that she had received no communication from that division although Mr. Wells recalled that the issue had been discussed. It was noted that the terminology Speech Communications is no longer used, and has been replaced by Communications Studies. The first reading will be at the next meeting, and voting will be held at the December 4th meeting. The goal is to get the minimum qualifications set in time for January hiring.

PRESENTATIONS

Great Shake Out (Don Treat)

[pg 106-107 of packet]

Mr. Treat gave a presentation on the Great Shake Out drill planned for November 13th 2008 at 10:00am. The campus will practice evacuating the buildings in an orderly manner under the direction of the building captains.

This is part of a four day, state-wide “Golden Guardian” project. The scenario is a 7.8 magnitude earthquake occurring on the San Andreas fault line. Such an earthquake is felt to be overdue. The fault line runs from the Newhall Pass to the Salton Sea, and is about 200 miles long. Such an earthquake could generate one to two minutes of shaking. Most buildings in the Los Angeles area have been replaced or retrofitted, but older buildings elsewhere would have a 100% failure rate. The worst disruption would be the water supply which could take six months to repair in the event of such a large earthquake. Mr. Treat went through the instructions for all staff, which have been emailed to all on campus. Asked how long the drill might last, Mr. Treat said he had no way of knowing, it would depend on how quickly the buildings were evacuated, and the campus given the all clear. Part- time faculty and those faculty who do not read their email should be informed.

The agenda item SLO Model (Dr. Barbara Jaffe) could not be addressed due to time constraints and will be held over to the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05pm

CS/ecc2008