

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES  
19<sup>th</sup> October 2010

**Adjunct Faculty**

vacant

**Behavioral & Social Sciences**

<u>Firestone, Randy</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Gold, Christina</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Moen, Michelle</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Widman, Lance</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Wynne, Michael</u>	<u>X</u>

**Business**

<u>Siddiqui, Junaid</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Lau, Philip S</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Hull, Kurt</u>	<u>X</u>

**Counseling**

<u>Jackson, Brenda</u>	<u>EXC</u>
<u>Jeffries, Chris</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Pajo, Christina</u>	<u>X</u>

**Fine Arts**

<u>Ahmadpour, Ali</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Bloomberg, Randall</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Crossman, Mark</u>	
<u>Schultz, Patrick</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Wells, Chris</u>	<u>X</u>

**Health Sciences & Athletics**

<u>Hazell, Tom</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>McGinley, Pat</u>	
<u>Rosales, Kathleen</u>	
<u>Colunga, Mina</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Hicks, Tom</u>	

**Humanities**

<u>Isaacs, Brent</u>	
<u>Marcoux, Pete</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>McLaughlin, Kate</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Halonen, Briita</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Simon, Jenny</u>	<u>X</u>

**Industry & Technology**

<u>Gebert, Pat</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Hofmann, Ed</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>MacPherson, Lee</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Winfree, Merriel</u>	
<u>Marston, Doug</u>	

**Learning Resources Unit**

<u>Striepe, Claudia</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Ichinaga, Moon</u>	<u>X</u>

**Mathematical Sciences**

<u>Bateman, Michael</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Boerger, John</u>	
<u>Fry, Greg</u>	
<u>Taylor, Susan</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Yun, Paul</u>	<u>X</u>

**Natural Sciences**

<u>Doucette, Pete</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Herzig, Chuck</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Jimenez, Miguel</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Palos Teresa</u>	<u>X</u>

vacant

**Academic Affairs & SCA**

<u>Chapman, Quajuana</u>	
<u>Arce, Francisco</u>	
<u>Nishime, Jeanie</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Lee, Claudia</u>	<u>X</u>

**ECC CEC Members**

<u>Evans, Jerome</u>	
<u>Norton, Tom</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Panski, Saul</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Pratt, Estina</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Halligan, Chris</u>	

**Assoc. Students Org.**

<u>Budri, Lala</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Lopez, Jessica</u>	

**Ex- Officio Positions**

<u>Shadish, Elizabeth</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Kjeseth, Lars</u>	<u>X</u>

**Guests, Dean's Rep, Visitors:**

J. Young, K. Key, B. Jaffe, Mediha Din (B&SS)

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

The fourth Academic Senate meeting of the Fall 2010 semester was called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:35pm.

Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes [pp.6 -14 of packet] from the September 21<sup>st</sup> Academic Senate meeting were reviewed. Ms. Jeffries noted an addition to a statement she had made (pg10) and a typo (pg 13). The minutes were approved as amended.

**REPORTS OF OFFICERS**

President's report – Christina Gold (henceforth CG)

[See packet pp.15 – 22]

CG noted that the **College Council** is working on their goals and objectives [see pp15-16 of packet] including the employee morale issue at both the ECC and CEC campuses. CG is also continuing her work on this issue. Talk at Council also revolved around the agenda for the Oct 18<sup>th</sup> Board meeting.

On the **Atlantis Grant cancellation** [see pp. 17-22 of packet] CG included the Daily Breeze article of 10/9/2010, Board Policy 7400 relating to conferences and faculty travel, and Article 16 of the ECC College District and ECC Federation of Teachers Agreement 92007-2010) regarding Professional meetings and Conferences for the senators' information.

The **ECC Board meeting** of the 18<sup>th</sup> October 2010 met from 4pm through 6 pm. CG reported that the Compton Community had sent a delegation to talk on the re-accreditation of the CEC and ask that ECC speed up this process, and also spoke in favor of rehiring Dr. Cox. At the Board meeting CG reported on two items:

A. The Atlantis Grant cancellation SLIDE

**Faculty Concern #1:** The Atlantis Grant offered a wonderful opportunity for 48 child development students to engage in international learning. The amazing experience that these students would have enjoyed was denied for the reason of preventing one faculty-member from engaging in less than a week of international travel. The administrative concerns of the college were clearly placed above the benefit to students.

**Faculty Concern #2:** The policy to disallow international faculty travel that primarily motivated the cancellation of the Atlantis Grant is arbitrary and violates the Academic Senate's collegial consultation Title 5 rights in the areas of faculty development and program development.

Mr. Widman asked if there are any procedures attached to BP 7400 referred to above, and Dr. Nishime said that unless the policy had been recently updated the answer is no. Mr. Widman noted that he then had a concern that the refusal re: the Atlantis Grant was an ad hoc decision. Dr. Nishime pointed out that the policy does require Board approval for international travel. Mr. Widman said that if a proposal is vetoed it would never reach the Board. Mr. Kjeseth said this would then become a 10+1 issue. "Pocket vetoes" are not in compliance with 10+1 and shows that a more direct line is needed between the Academic Senate and the Board, independent of Administration.

CG noted that as Academic Senate President she would like to look more closely at faculty concern #2.

B. The Academic Calendar SLIDE

**Faculty Concern #1:** The suggestion by Administration to eliminate Winter session and add two back-to-back summer sessions is primarily an effort to ease the administrative functioning of the college, and there are serious concerns that this will be detrimental to ECC student success and transfer and will negatively impact students involved in the Honors Transfer Program, athletics and the forensics (debate) team.

**Faculty Concern #2:** The Administration has dismissed faculty input on calendar decisions in the past, and this issue points to a broader concern that Administration often does not truly consult collegially with the faculty, nor does it consistently place student learning as a top priority in decision-making.

**Faculty Concern #3:** The current policies and procedures for making calendar changes do not abide by the collegial consultation required by Title 5 regulations.

CG also showed the Board excerpts from faculty emails and noted/summarized the most common faculty concerns (see above). CG noted that the concerns seemed motivated by larger issues – that there is insufficient collegial consultation on campus, and that the Administration seems to make decisions that favor administrative concerns over student interests.

**SLIDE: Larger Concerns Raised by the two Issues**

#1 They have highlighted the longstanding discontent with insufficient collegial consultation on campus and the related belief that Administration frequently overlooks the voice of the faculty.

#2 The Administration has assumed ultimate decision-making over some academic and professional responsibilities that are granted to the Academic Senate by state law through Title 5.

#3 Administration prioritizes the administrative functioning of the college over student learning. (mostly commonly raised concern)

Mr. Widman said that he had read Dr. Nishime's open email to President Fallo re: the pros and cons of the winter session and felt it to be too vague. Mr. Widman said that he still felt that the issue has been decided and that there has not been enough consultation. Dr. Nishime disagreed, stating that the decision has not yet been made and that all should have the opportunity to have their opinions heard via the planned forums.

CG halted the discussion here, noting that Board member Mr. Gen had asked that the Senate investigate the matter further and come back to the Board with findings. CG said it is important to follow through on this and may be calling on the Senators' help in this matter.

CG noted that the next Academic Senate meeting on Nov. 2<sup>nd</sup> will be held in the Distance Education conference room.

VP Compton Center - Saul Panski (SP)

SP reported on the California Nisei Diploma Project which saw a Nisei Honorary Degree Ceremony take place at the CEC on October 16<sup>th</sup> 2010. Approximately 400- 500 people were there, including the VP's of ECC and President Fallo. SP thanked Ms. Garten for her efforts in marketing the event. A video is being prepared and SP will share that with the Senate when it is done.

SP noted that the aforementioned appearance of a delegation from the CEC at the Board meeting had not been done in consultation with the CEC faculty and in his opinion some of the issues addressed by them were inappropriate.

SP thanked ECC faculty who had volunteered to serve on CEC hiring panels and evaluation committees.

SP noted that the ECC discussion on the winter session calendar had raised interest at the CEC and they will be discussing the issue there on Thursday. SP expects the CEC will vote in favor of the winter session.

SP said that now that the accreditation process issue has hit the newspapers, the CEDC has an embryonic Steering Committee of Accreditation and over the next 12 to 15 months hope to be ready to apply for eligibility.

Curriculum Committee – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

LK noted that the first set of course reviews have been completed through the new CurricuNET system. The Notification system is ready to go, and LK will be sending emails to the effect that faculty should no longer ignore the notifications.

VP Educational Policies Committee – Chris Jeffries (CJ)

CJ noted that she had no report, but she had some items for discussion later in the agenda.

VP Faculty Development – Cristina Pajo (CP) (Co- VP) and Briita Halonen (BH) (Co-VP)

BH said that the Adjunct Award applications were now closed. The ten nominees have been notified and are working on their applications.

VP Finance and Special Projects – Lance Widman (LW)

[see pp. 23- 24 of packet]

LW reported on the PBC Minutes of 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010 which saw the conclusion of 2010-2011 Final Budget review, endorsed by the Committee and sent to the President. LW urged those with questions on what revenue comes into the college to read these minutes, and the minutes from the last two PBC meetings, especially the meeting where the committee was joined by President Fallo who stepped through the budget in detail. The information on the budget is freely available, and senators can contact Mr. Spor or Ms. Ely for copied of the budget. The meeting also dealt with an update on planning activities as the PBC refocuses its attention from budgeting (at least until January) to planning, especially Plan Builder and program review.

VP Legal – Chris Wells (CW)

[see pg.25 of packet]

CW reported a letter from CSU Long Beach is in the packet re: accepting transfers, and the removal of impaction status for five majors.

**REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

Report on Deans' Council – Moon Ichinaga (MI)

[see handout distributed at meeting] for a summary of the minutes of the October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

MI reported that Dr. Nishime had gone over the calendar options discussions and had emphasized that the matter was not a done deal. Informational forums have been planned for November, as the discussion needs to be more wide-ranging and some issues need more understanding. MI reported on the graph presented by Mr. Kjeseth at the last Academic Senate meeting and noted that this data needs to be taken into account.

There was a discussion on the need for improving communication and various strategies on how to achieve this. This will be an ongoing issue.

The CEC Fall 2010 registration survey provided some interesting statistics, and attempts will be made to rectify some issues, like those relating to Financial Aid.

As a possible action item Mr. Warriar is going to investigate having ITS send email alerts to students during registration when changes are made to their schedules.

Dr. Nishime also discussed the Title V grant for \$3 million (approx) that has been awarded to ECC to improve graduation and completion rates. It was noted that the grant is not renewable.

Dr. Nishime noted that she would be speaking on this last item later on in the meeting.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**A. Curriculum Committee – Ex- Officio membership By-Laws – Lars Kjeseth (LK)**

[See pp. 26-32 of packet]

Action item: second reading. LK noted that all of the proposed changes actually appear on pg. 27 of the packet, and had been discussed at the last meeting. LK brought the motion that we approve the changes. This motion was seconded by Ms. Jeffries. The floor was opened for discussion. Mr. Panski had a concern about 1.6 #5 Dean – Compton Center, Academic Affairs and asked that it

be changed to read Dean/Assistant Dean. LK said that it was understood that it would be the noted members OR DESIGNEE, so the members could appoint someone in their stead. There was a call to vote on the motion to approve the changes and it was passed/approved unanimously.

**B. BP 5055 and AP 5055 Priority Registration - Chris Jeffries (CJ)**

[See pp.33-40 of packet]

Action item: second reading. CJ said that Mr. Mulrooney had forwarded a list of the current priority registration groups (EOPS, DSPS, veterans) and that these would retain priority registration rights, but all others will have to apply for priority registration status - these "others" including Honors students, athletes, international students, student government, Puente, Project Success, MESA, nursing students, debate students, etc.

Priority registration would begin on the first day of registration and every 15 minutes there would be an allotted slot for the groups to forward their applications. This will continue until 7pm on the second day of registration. It was noted that some groups are larger than other, but it had been observed that only about 10% of priority registration students take advantage of it.

The floor was opened for discussion. Mr. Ahmadapour asked if any groups other than the Academic Senate and the Educational Policies Committee had had any input into the issue. CJ said that in the past the issue has been at the whim of the Admissions director. I was also noted that students who have a higher number of units completed get a higher priority based on seniority. The question was raised whether students are TOLD they have this higher priority, or whether they get earlier registration dates without being told why? CJ was not sure. It was remarked that if they were told they might better understand how to use the priority registration system better. Dr. Nishime was of the understanding that students ARE informed. Ms. Budri (Student Government) was not sure that students understood, noting that students are just notified of a registration date and that she had not been aware that she had priority registration by virtue of being a member of student government.

CJ noted that the concept could still be made clearer to students, and she still had a concern for the athletes, but felt comfortable knowing that they would be able to petition for priority registration. CJ also noted that the updated BP and AP would not go into effect immediately as there were still some issues to iron out, and that gave the groups time to get organized. Dr. Nishime agreed, saying Mr. Mulrooney had indicated it would take about a year to implement. Ms. Taylor asked if so few take advantage of the opportunity, why offer it at all, as it is fundamentally unfair to others – citing concerns with VII #1 & 2 specifically and extra-curricular activities. Ms. Taylor felt it would be better to have no priority registration at all. Mr. Ahmadapour agreed, noting perhaps an exception for seniors needing to graduate. Mr. Kjeseth said that he, too, had questions about VII. Firstly that the language used suggests that the burden of proof is on the student group. And while some groups like the athletes and nurses may have concerned faculty who will speak for them, there are others who would not have this advantage. Mr. Kjeseth felt the playing field should be level for all. Secondly, the terms groups is weak, and there should be a basic principles description of what constitutes a group.

Mr. Key noted that at-risk populations seemed to always qualify for priority registration, so asked if that was part of the definition? At least this would be something concrete, and if there are no concrete terms the definitions are too vague and it becomes harder to assess eligibility.

CJ said that was a good point and said she would take these concerns to the College Council. Mr. Marcoux agreed, noting that this was a 5000 policy which did not need Academic Senate approval. CG decided to bring the issue back to Mr. Mulrooney and to the College Council which next meets in November.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**A. BP & AP 4055 – Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities – Chris Jeffries (CJ)**

[See pp.41-46 of packet]

Action Item: First Reading. CJ noted that she was speaking for Dipte Patel – Director Special Resource Center, who could not be present.

It was noted that the Academic Senate had seen something of this policy in May. Math had had some concerns, and so the Math department had looked at it and the policy had then returned to the Ed. Policies Committee.

CJ noted that pg. 41 referenced State regulations, and changes to the Policy could be seen on pg. 42. There used to be three levels of accommodations and now there are two – the course waiver has been removed, and has been incorporated into Level 2 Course Substitution #7 - pg. 44. This was done because it occurred so rarely. CJ noted that the Director of Staff and Student Diversity have also looked at this.

CJ opened the floor for questions.

Mr. Kjeseth noted that re: Level 2 #7 course waiver, it was most often a math requirement that was at issue. Mr. Kjeseth noted that it seemed misleading to term it a course waiver when it was really a degree requirement waiver. CJ noted that this issue is addressed in the middle of pg.42 "...reasonable accommodations, which may include course substitution of degree requirements."

Mr. Panski had two questions. Could it be validated that all the Level 1 services mentioned were also available at the CEC? Mr. Panski noted that if the Policy is adopted it must apply to the CEC as well as ECC. Dr. Nishime noted that meetings on the issue have included ECC and CEC staff. Also Ms. Patel does accommodations for Compton but Dr. Nishime will raise the issue with her again to be certain. Mr. Panski next asked if there was an ADA compliance officer only at ECC? The answer was that Ms. Biggers oversees both campuses in this regard. CJ noted that the second reading of the AP and BP would take place in two weeks.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS – DISCUSSION**

### **A. ECC Federation of Teachers Report – Elizabeth Shadish (ES)**

ES reported that the faculty contracts have expired and the Federation wants to go into negotiation.

ES noted that the Federation is closely watching the discussion of the Winter Calendar. From the Federation's perspective if the changes go through this would mean a change in working conditions, and possibly a breach of contract.

Dr. Ahmadapour asked who to go to if one had concerns on issues. ES said faculty could email her or Mr. Don Brown - [eshadish@elcamino.edu](mailto:eshadish@elcamino.edu), [dbrown@elcamino.edu](mailto:dbrown@elcamino.edu)

Mr. Wells asked if the Federation or District had set any deadlines and ES said no. Mr.

Ahmadapour commented that the faculty did not seem very involved with the Federation and felt that more support and involvement were needed to make demands felt. ES agreed.

### **B. Winter Session Information/Proposed Calendar Changes – Chris Gold (CG)**

[See pp. 47 – 75 of packet]

CG noted that she understood the calendar to be a negotiable item, and in the packet had included the Board Policy (pg 47), a letter from Dr. Nishime to President Fallo (pgs 48-49), Article 7 of the Contract (pgs 50-52), and a document "Alternative Calendars" 9pgs. 53- 75) from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges which offers recommendations and advice on the issues. CG thanked Mr. Marcoux for forwarding this last mentioned document to her. CG opened the floor for discussion.

Ms. Jeffries asked Mr. Panski for comments on his CEC experience with two summer sessions.

Mr. Panski felt that two summer sessions were beneficial, noting that they got two different groups. Some took both sessions, and noted that CEC had run a winter session as well. Ms.

Jeffries asked if the summer sessions were back to back. Mr. Panski said that last summer they

were, but now the trend was to do the same as the ECC campus, which is a six and an eight week

session overlapping. Mr. Panski noted that the classes had been full in both five week summer sessions, saying that while the students were selective, they did not seem to mind which class was in which session so long as they could take the classes. Mr. Panski believes CEC will go along with the ECC format, but felt that the winter session was vital. Ms. Jeffries asked if ECC could do a similar schedule to CEC, but Dr. Nishime said there was no interest in 5 week summer sessions. Mr. Panski said that ECC thought that these sessions did not have enough academic rigor. Mr. Wells felt that no decision should be made without more research and data and suggested the IR begin the research and data collection. Mr. Wells distributed a handout, and noted that 38 of 54 colleges did offer winter sessions.

Mr. Ahmadapour noted that Senate had spoken on the issue before and it was his understanding that the issue had been tabled and asked why Senate was debating it again.

CG said it was because the proposed change had been brought to the Calendar Committee.

Mr. Kjeseth felt it appropriate to go back to the Board Policy at this point, stating that the Calendar Committee had never before been tasked with proposing new calendar patterns. He noted that as this is a 4000policy an argument could be made that developing calendar patterns is a 10+1 issue. The question is - Is the Board Policy in compliance with Title V, and can the Calendar Committee be tasked with developing new calendar patterns..

Mr. Yun noted that he had polled the math department and had found 25 faculty support the Winter , but other emails quoted different figures, and he felt the figures we were being shown were not valid. Dr. Nishime said the figures were based on faculty and staff surveys. Mr. Wells asked if the figures could be broken down to show faculty and staff votes separately, and Dr. Nishime said that could be done.

Mr. Ahmadapour raised another aspect re: teachers needing growth and development time to research, read and prepare for classes. Teachers were another aspect of the issue, besides students and retention, that should be looked at.

Ms. Colunga said that the end aim of some programs was employment, not transfer and these students, for instance, radiology, felt that two summer sessions and no winter would get them finished and into the market earlier.

Ms. Taylor said she had heard hints about a possible reason that the Administration might wish to make the change regarding shifting FTES, and asked that Dr. Nishime elaborate. Dr. Nishime said that there will be informational forums coming up and FTES would be discussed, but it was important to look at all of the information.

Ms. Budri requested that students be kept in the loop to, otherwise they just hear rumors. Drs. Gold and Nishime said that the forums would include all parties.

Ms. Gebert noted that winter sessions help graduation in her field of Cosmetology. The winter session helps the students complete the hours they need to finish the program and leave. Winter helps with growth in their program.

Mr. Key noted that he deals with high-unit majors, and they feel that it would be harsh to lose the winter session as they use it to complete general education courses and so be able to concentrate on their majors in the spring and fall semesters. No winter means they would be here longer, and the students view it as the removal of an opportunity.

Ms. Simon asked what was the rationale for originally moving to a compressed calendar?

Mr. Isaacs noted that we went from 18 to 16 week semesters, and that there had been resistance from Math and Science departments at the time, but we were losing students to colleges like Santa Monica and Harbor, that had already made the switch, and once there the students stayed at those schools and ECC needed to stay competitive.

Ms. Simon asked if that would not happen again?

Mr. Isaacs said probably so, and it would also impact part-time faculty.

**C. Title V Grant –“Get Ready, Get Set, Go for the Associate’s Degree” – Dr. Nishime**

[see pp. 76-77 of packet]

Dr. Nishime reported that the college has received a grant for \$ over a 5 year period. The grant has three components:

Get Ready – gets students ready to study for placement exams, brush up on math and other basic skills, and gain financial aid awareness.

Get Steady – involves getting students through the developmental classes and into the transfer courses. The focus here will be on developmental students and faculty development in this area.

Go for the Associate’s Degree – the college is moving on this and as a first step is hiring two evaluators to do pre-degree checking.

Dr. Nishime said the most important step right now is to hire a project director. The college is working on the details of a job description. The college will advertise internally and outside for this five year position.

### **AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

None

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

### **ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00pm with a reminder that the next Academic Senate meeting on Nov. 2<sup>nd</sup> will be held in the Distance Education conference room.

Cs/ecc2010