

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES
1st November 2011

Adjunct Faculty

Sue Ellen Warren X

Leah Pate

Behavioral & Social Sciences

Firestone, Randy EXC

Gold, Christina X

Moen, Michelle X

Widman, Lance X

Wynne, Michael X

Business

Siddiqui, Junaid X

Lau, Philip S X

VACANT

Counseling

Jackson, Brenda

Pajo, Christina X

Sabio, Sabra X

Vaughn, Dexter X

Key, Ken

Fine Arts

Ahmadpour, Ali X

Bloomberg, Randall X

Crossman, Mark

Schultz, Patrick X

Wells, Chris X

Health Sciences & Athletics

Hazell, Tom EXC

Colunga, Mina X

Baily, Kim X

Holt, Kelly X

VACANT

Humanities

Isaacs, Brent

Marcoux, Pete X

McLaughlin, Kate X

Halonon, Briita X

Simon, Jenny X

Industry & Technology

Gebert, Pat X

Hofmann, Ed X

MacPherson, Lee X

Winfree, Merriel X

Marston, Doug

Learning Resources Unit

Striepe, Claudia X

Ichinaga, Moon X

Mathematical Sciences

Bateman, Michael

Hamza Hamza X

Sheynshteyn, Arkadiy X

Taylor, Susan X

VACANT

Natural Sciences

Doucette, Pete X

Herzig, Chuck X

Jimenez, Miguel

Palos Teresa X

VACANT

Academic Affairs & SCA

Arce, Francisco X

Nishime, Jeanie

Lee, Claudia

Lam, Karen

ECC CEC Members

Evans, Jerome

Norton, Tom

Panski, Saul EXC

Pratt, Estina X

Halligan, Chris

Odanaka, Michael

Assoc. Students Org.

Asher, Rebekka

Valdez, Cindy X

Ex- Officio Positions

Shadish, Elizabeth

Guests, Dean's Rep, Visitors:

Dean Ind & Tech Rodriguez, Carolyn Pineda,
David Vakil

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

The fifth Academic Senate meeting of the Fall 2011 semester was called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:35pm.

Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes of the October 18th meeting were approved, subject to an amendment: pg.8 change **JS** to **Curriculum Committee**.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

Academic Senate President's report – Christina Gold (henceforth CG)

- CG had a follow-up to last week's discussion item on the Functioning of the Senate. The executive committee had subsequently exchanged emails, and it had been suggested to hold a Summit (funding permitting). One portion of the Summit would be devoted to the legal rights of an Academic Senate and the duties of a Senate and senators, and another portion devoted to the direction the Senate should take. This proposed Summit would probably occur in early Spring.
- CG reported that she and Mr. Wells had attended the Area C meeting, where attendees had looked at resolutions to be voted on at the upcoming Plenary session. Cg said she may be asking senators for feedback on various of these resolutions, and asked for rapid feedback. Also presented at the Area C meeting were recommendations from the Chancellor's Office CCC Task Force on Student Success.
- CG noted a Title V change re: student apportionment. This will bring about a change in the way we count students and get apportionment, due to a change in the due date for a W. We now cannot get funding for any student with a notation on their record. ECC uses week 3 for census, then allows drops in the following 2 weeks. This will no longer be the case. Those 3 to 4 % of students who take advantage of this period to drop would no longer be counted for apportionment. CG noted that this might slightly affect retention. Dr. Arce said that a committee will meet to discuss all the issues and implications and figure out the consequences. Mr. Marcoux asked if it was know when students usually drop, figuring it was probably in week 2, and suggested we look at available data.
- CG reported on the last College Council meeting of Oct. 31st [see handout], noting that the discussion had revolved around two issues:
 1. The revisited Smoking on Campus policy - the policy to have designated smoking areas had been reaffirmed, and Facilities will identify some locations to set aside.
 2. The revisiting of eliminating the Winter Session - CG requested that the Council hold off on discussing this item until negotiations are complete, as this is a negotiable item, but her request was denied and so discussions will continue. CG also requested that the discussion then be prioritized along academic and NOT administrative issues as has so far been the case when deciding whether to keep the Winter session. CG also drew attention to the "Recommendations Regarding Alternate Calendars" as compiled by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges [see Handout]

VP Legal – Chris Wells (CW)

CG noted that CW had another meeting to go to so had been moved up in the agenda to give his report. CW reported that he and CG had attended the Area C meeting where the CCC Task Force on Student Success recommendations had been discussed. CW and Dr. Spor had also attended a Town Hall meeting with 300 other people, where the recommendations had also been commented on. CW highlighted some areas of discussion, noting in particular:

- Ch. 8 - 8.1 Consolidate select categorical programs. CW said that many felt this was a bad idea. The idea was that colleges should be looking at the things these programs do to be successful and instituting these practices through the entire campus. It was noted that the funding for these programs is different from that for other campus programs.
- Ch. 2 – 2.4 Require students showing a lack of college readiness to participate in support resources. The discussion focused on early Basic Skills intervention, and making “suggested prep.” into “required prep.” And perhaps having a common assessment tool for all community colleges
- Ch. 7 – 7.1 Develop and support a strong community college system office. The task force made case for the community colleges to be more equal to the UC’s and CSU, thus gaining the power to get more done.
- Ch. 8 – 8.4 Do not implement outcome-based funding at this time. CW noted that at the Town Hall meeting he had asked a whether this meant that outcome- based funding would be implemented in the future? Some seemed to feel that outcomes based funding was a good idea, and there was a feeling that if done, it would probably be implemented in the pre-collegiate classes first.

CW noted that many views and opinions had been expressed, and suggested we all read the report and go to the website <http://studentsuccess.ideascale.com/> to give feedback and add comments. CW noted that there is to be one more town hall meeting at Saddleback College, adding that some of the presentations will be available as podcasts on the Chancellor’s website. CW said he had been impressed by the panel member’s depth of knowledge on the issues.

CG added re: Ch. 6 – 6.2 Direct professional development resources toward improving basic skills instruction and support services. that many had felt the recommendations to be too directive in how the monies could be spent.

VP Compton Education Center - Estina Pratt (EP) for Saul Panski (SP)

No report. EP will report later in the meeting on the Compton Accreditation meeting

Curriculum Committee – Jenny Simon (JS)

JS reported on the Curriculum Committee meeting where the issue of setting prerequisites had been discussed. JS noted that Title V had loosened requirements for developing pre and co-requisites, as discussed in the last Senate meeting, and she had taken the issue to Curriculum for discussion. Many in the curriculum Committee felt that harder prerequisites should be set, but were of the opinion that just conducting content review was not enough to make an informed decision and felt that some statistical analysis and program review was needed.

Dr. Arce asked who would conduct the statistical analysis, and JS said that some statistics could be obtained from program review and perhaps Institutional Research could provide some. The Committee will look at recommendations from the Student Success Taskforce as well.

Dr. Gold and Merriel Winfree will take the issue to the Dean’s Council.

VP Educational Policies Committee – Merriel Winfree (MW)

MW held off for the second reading and discussion of BP 4020 under Unfinished Business.

VP Faculty Development Committee –Briita Halonen (BH) (Co-VP) and Moon Ichinaga (MI) (Co-VP)

BH reported that there were 12 nominations for the **Outstanding Adjunct Award** and the Committee was moving ahead with the process and reading the nominations.

BH reported that the **Getting the Job workshop series, Part 1 “The Application Process”** workshop, held last Friday had gone well, with good attendance and positive feedback. The Faculty Development Committee has a few extra packets from the workshops should anyone need one.

MI reported on the progress “**California Reads**” project, reminding the Senate that Jeanne Houston, author of Farewell to Manzanar” would be speaking on campus on November 17th in the East Dining Hall. MI asked that faculty please let the Faculty Development committee know if they are considering integrating any of the three books into their course next semester.

VP Finance and Special Projects – Lance Widman (LW)

No report.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Compton Education Center Accreditation Report – Estina Pratt (EP)

[See pp. 24 – 41 of packet] EP reported that the CEC is working toward accreditation and the campus had held an accreditation public forum last week, chaired by Dr. Arce. Dr. Arce had given an outline of the 5 subcommittees’ findings relative to the 21 ACCJC accreditation eligibility criteria, noting that most criteria have been met, except in the financial areas.

EP briefly outlined the findings of some of the subcommittees

Sub-Committee 1 – Organization and Governance – all criteria have been met. Some plans need to be made to transfer some activities from ECC to Compton.

Sub-Committee 2 – Instruction/Faculty – the criteria here have been met as Compton is using ECC curriculum. Compton’s Program SLO’s need to be assessed by 2012.

Sub-Committee 3 – Student Services/Public Information – most criteria have been met.

Sub-Committee 4 - -Financial Integrity – many criteria in this area not met.

EP noted that with reference to criteria 21, that relations with the Accrediting Commission are good. EP felt Compton was making progress.

Dr. Arce noted that no dates are mentioned on the status report as no-one wants to commit to dates as yet.

ECCFT Report – Elizabeth Shadish (ES)

Report postponed as Dr. Shadish had a meeting conflict.

Calendar Committee Report – Kelly Holt (KH)

KH reported that the Committee met last week re: tow proposals on the Winter session. KH reported that there was no strong voice in favor of keeping the Winter session. KH reported that Dr. B. Perez speculated on some possible new IRS ruling re: slaries, which could mean faculty would have to change their contract – however having no Winter session meant the contract could remain as is. If it was decided not to have a Winter session, the Spring session could be moved up, allowing for the possibility of two back to back 6 week Summer sessions with an 8 week Summer session, that is, a longer Summer session. KH said that comments/opinions had to get back to the November 17th Calendar Committeemeeting as a decision had to be made to move the process along.

CG noted that the Academic Senate would be meeting again on November 15th and the matter would be discussed then.

Mr. Widman asked KH if the Committee meeting had featured a discussion, or a presentation of a decision already made, as had happened last time? KH said that it had been argued that the short Winter session limits the number of courses that can participate, so the feeling is that Winter is “hijacked” by special courses, and that was seen as not fair to all. It had been suggested that if there is a need for these desirable short courses, they be offered in the Spring as special short courses.

Mr Ahmadapour asked why this issue was being discussed again, when the campus had already decided to keep Winter. He asked who had put it on the agenda, noting that when we shut one door, the dissenters come through another.

It was also felt that Dr. Perez should not speculate on issues that may not come to pass.

Mr. Widman noted that the focus of the issue should be student success not administration convenience.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

BP and AP 4020 Program, Curriculum and Course Development. (Second Reading) – Merriel

Winfree (MW)

[see pp. 42-43 of packet] Explanation: A This revision is a minor change to edit Program Review to a 4 year cycle, and to add CTE as a 2 year cycle. The Academic Senate had already agreed to the change to a 4 year Program Review cycle.

Mr. Widman moved to approve the change and was seconded by Ms. Winfree.

CG opened the floor for comments.

Ms. Taylor noted that she felt something should be changed in the document and asked if it was possible at this stage. CG said it would mean revisiting the policy.

Ms Taylor said her concern was the statement re: “the Superintendent/President shall establish procedures for the development and review of all...”, noting that that statement was not always there in the past and now appeared in all policies.

CG said that had been commented on, and she had been told “that is what we do”. CG thought it should read “...the Superintendent/President, in consultation with the Academic Senate, shall establish procedures....”

Dr. Arce said that the Board is charged with making policy, and the president is charged with putting the policies into effect.

CG noted the clause “in consultation with”, should still be added. Mr. Ahmadapour asked whose language this was, and Dr. Arce said it is the language of the law.

Ms. Taylor thought it came from the president without a directive from the Board. Mr. Ahmadapour felt the Senate should show the statement to an attorney and get advice.

CG said that the second paragraph [pg. 42 of packet} DID state that procedures are developed jointly by the Academic Senate and Vice president of Academic Affairs”

Mr. Ahmadapour suggested showing the Policy to an attorney and then discussing whether to accept or deny the policy. Mr. Marcoux was against that idea. Mr. Ahmadapour reminded the Senators that at the last Senate meeting, it had been decided not to rush decisions and seek the advice of experts. So as to educate ourselves to make good decisions. Mr. Marcoux felt the time for Seantors to educate themselves and get input from colleagues is between the first and second readings of an item.

CG suggested tha Seante vote on whether to approve the Policy as is or take it back and look at it again. A vote was conducted with the majority voting aye, one nay , and no abstentions. The Policy passed as is.

NEW BUSINESS

BP 4245 Student Progress Early Alert and Referrals (First Reading)

[See pg. 44 of packet]

Explanation: This Policy is being renumbered and a statement had been added to require the creation of a related Procedure.

CG noted that this had been BP 4255, and was now being renumbered BP4245. CG noted that now there was time to amend the language if desired. Mr. Marcoux recommended that the statement “The Superintendent/President shall establish procedures...”, be changed to include “jointly with the Academic Senate”.

Ms. Taylor asked if this would be considered a 10=1 issue, and was assured that it was. Ms. Taylor said that would imply that the Academic Senate has primacy. CG said that we have mutual agreement – that is, we must both agree before moving forward or the status quo stays, according to BP 2510. CG said that this empowers Senates more than the alternative whereby Senates make recommendations that may/may not be accepted.

Mr. Vakil asked if BP2510 actually had the words “mutual agreement’ written into it. CG said she would check.

It was decided to take BP 4245 back to the Educational Policies Committee for more discussion.

BP/AP 4025 Philosophy for Associate Degree and General Education (First Reading)

[See pp.46 – 48 of packet.

Explanation: This Policy was edited by a small task force of senators. A Procedure was created since it is listed as legally required by the CCLC.

CG noted that pg. 47 shows the original philosophy. CG said that a task force of senators CG, Ms. Winfree, Striepe, and Pate had edited the original , and the edits were shown in the philosophy on pg. 46. PM suggested also taking this back to amend the same statement re: President ...jointly with the Academic Senate, and recommended a strong final paragraph re: Senate involvement. CG said she will try and get clarification on the issue of “mutual agreement”

CG noted that the team had felt it appropriate to insert the core competencies as these are what we are assessing across campus.

CG moved on to the Procedures pg. 48 of packet]noting that ECC did not have a procedure and that this had been put together by the aforementioned task force.

Mr. Ahmadapour asked how one went about revisiting Policies and Procedures.

CG said normally they went through a first and second reading at Senate, College Council, and the Board, so one is usually looking at 2 months, then one can initiate another change to a Policy or Procedure.

PM noted that one could also go to a Board meeting and argue the points there.

Ms. Halonen asked what the purpose of AP 4025 was? CG said it states how the Policy would be implemented and is a legally required document.

Dr. Arce said that the CCLC requires that Policies and Procedures be created and updated. They are required by the Education Code and Title V, or by a legal opinion at the Chancellor’s office that requires colleges to take these steps.

Mr. Vakil noted that the Procedures noted in the second sentence that “the processes for Program Review shall be included in the Curriculum Handbook” and asked if this were indeed the case. JS noted that the Curriculum Handbook is being revised to include them.

CG asked if this item should be brought back to the next meeting for a second reading, or if the Senators needed more time to consult with their Divisions? Mr. Widman said comments and questions could also be circulated via email.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

None

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:36pm.

CS/ECC2011