

## Academic Senate Minutes

October 16, 2012

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

The third meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Claudia Striepe (CS) at 12:34pm on Tuesday, October 16, 2012. Academic Senate President Chris Gold was on medical leave. The meeting was held in the Alondra Room.

### **Approval of Minutes**

[See pp.5-9 of packet] for minutes of the October 2nd meeting. As there were no corrections, the minutes were approved as written.

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

Pg. 10 – Report from the President was provided in writing since CG was out on medical leave. CG specifically wrote about the upcoming Measure E that will be on the November ballot and whether or not the Academic Senate and/or the Senate President can or should take a public opinion on Measure E or any other political measures. She included in the packet on pages 46-58 relevant documents outlining the regulations regarding faculty endorsements of political measures and candidates and a part of our faculty contract. It was her intent for the Senate to discuss the documents and decide whether to support or not support the measure or to form a task force to explore a way to develop ECC Senate guidelines for dealing with political issues. Lance Widman (LW) stated we should do nothing at this time and would discuss it further after Dr. Nishime's report later in the meeting.

### **College Council – Moon Ichinaga** (MI)

Pgs. 11-13 included the Minutes of the College Council meetings of October 1<sup>st</sup> and October 8<sup>th</sup>. The College Council goals for 2012-13 were finalized at the October 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Council will continue to discuss the list of Collegial Consultation Committees that was provided by Chris Gold at the October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. This will be brought back to the Senate after this discussion.

### **VP - Compton Educational Plan report – Michael Odanaka** (MO)

A search committee for the new CEO of the Compton Center has been formed and Chris Wells has agreed to be the Torrance Campus representative. There is an item on the upcoming CEC Board Agenda to hire a consultant for that committee.

A 2<sup>nd</sup> groundbreaking will be held today for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase of their facilities reconstruction. Susie Dever will be retiring at the end of the semester, so a reception is being planned for Thursday, December 6<sup>th</sup> between 1-3pm. MO will notify us of the exact time as the date approaches.

### **Curriculum Committee report – Jenny Simon** (JS)

No report.

### **VP - Educational Policies Committee report – Merriel Winfree** (MW)

MW announced that at the next meeting, we will be looking at policies and procedures for Philosophy for AA/AS Degree and Pre-requisites. Program Discontinuance will also be on an agenda soon.

**CO-VPs – Faculty Development report – Moon Ichinaga and Claudia Striepe(MI and CS)**

See pgs. 22-24 for minutes of the October 9<sup>th</sup> Faculty Development Committee meeting.

They have extended the deadline for the Adjunct Faculty Award to this Friday, October 19<sup>th</sup>.

The Reading Apprenticeship for Community College Professors will be November 9<sup>th</sup> from 9am to 4pm with a follow up on November 30<sup>th</sup> for half a day. This workshop helps non-English teaching faculty to help their students with reading comprehension in their own discipline. Past attendees have said there is lots of practical advice given.

**VP – Finance report – Lance Widman (LW)**

No report.

**VP – Academic Technology report – Pete Marcoux (PM)**

Please see pgs. 25-27 for minutes of the September 25<sup>th</sup> Academic Technology Committee meeting. There will be a meeting of the College Technology Committee today where there will be a discussion regarding the upcoming student survey. Google may be hired to run the student email accounts.

**VP Instructional Effectiveness report – Vacant (Christina Gold reporting)**

No report.

**Special Committee Reports**

**Accreditation Report – Jeanie Nishime (JN)**

The accreditation site meeting has been changed from November 13<sup>th</sup> to Wednesday, November 14<sup>th</sup>. They will be focusing on the 5 recommendations from the previous accreditation report.

These include once again, 1) linking program review and planning with budget allocations; 2) SLO progress; 3) the quality and consistency of Distance Education classes; 4) the integration of SLO assessment into the faculty evaluation process; and 5) the fiscal management plan especially at the Compton Center. The SLO report was turned in about one month ago. JN gave credit to faculty and the SLO coordinators for their work in this area. The key now is to continue the momentum.

The next full team accreditation will be held in Fall 2014, but the report is very comprehensive and the work on writing it will begin now. There are four standards and other sub standards in which there will be a management and classified or faculty co-chair. Co-chairs have been selected except there is still a need for a co-chair for Academic Programs.

JN and Dr. Arce went to San Bernardino Valley College last Friday for an orientation for community colleges. There is a change of focus in Distance Education courses in where there will be more scrutiny involved including validation of who is enrolled and taking these classes. There needs to be a distinction between correspondence classes and distance education classes. If there is not sufficient instructor contact, the District cannot collect financial aid for those students. The District will make sure our distance education courses meet that scrutiny. More information regarding how to evaluate Distance Education courses can be found at

[www.ACCJC.org](http://www.ACCJC.org), click on publications and it is titled Guide to Evaluating Distance Education Courses.

Once co-chairs meet on November 1<sup>st</sup>, they will be asking faculty and staff to join a team. We need to be very thorough and document all of our dialogue on these standards and sub standards in order to meet the accreditation needs. This includes any dialogue on program review and SLO's. We don't want to just rely on minutes that these discussions have taken place, but actually document specific times and events.

### **Academic Affairs – Francisco Arce (FA)**

FA announced that accreditation is changing dramatically and that he is personally surprised by the levels of accounting and scrutiny that are being asked of colleges. More disclosure will be involved including more reports on fiscal management, Distance Education and SLO's. Once again he talked about needing to distinguish Distance Education classes from correspondence courses. We will need to come up with standards and not use canned courses. Academic Affairs will be going to the Senate, the Academic Technology Committee, and the Distance Education Committee to monitor these classes. There has been a reduction from 90 to 60 sections of Distance Education courses due to low retention and success rates.

Program review has been moving forward and meeting deadlines. The problems with the SLO component on CurricUNET have been resolved and faculty has worked hard to get these issues resolved. Claudia Lee is definitely missed when it comes to this area. Her position will be replaced and is currently being flown.

The new repeatability policy will be implemented starting Fall 2013. Mark Lipe gave a report to the Board at the last meeting and about 400 courses will be affected especially in Fine Arts, Industry and Technology and PE/Athletics.

C. Wells asked about the new priority registration procedures and JN said they would be implemented starting Fall 2014.

A. Martinez asked what the definition of an on-line course is and FA said we would need to look at new math hybrid courses once the standards have been developed.

P. Marcoux said the Chronicle of Higher Education has been talking about accreditation and the community colleges and how San Francisco City College is teetering on the edge. It is well known that our commission is very out of whack for putting schools on warning compared to other regions across the United States.

### **CSULB Resolution – Chris Wells (CW)**

C. Gold had suggested we vote on it, table it or vote that there be no resolution. CW provided us with more information in the packet pgs. 29-45. He pointed out that pg. 30 shows that even CSULA allows local area admission to even Santa Monica, but we have no priority at any of the local CSU's. L. Widman asked what the thrust of the resolution is and CW responded that it is only trying to get a legal opinion to see if this should be allowed. The motion was put to the vote and A. Martinez seconded it. Discussion followed. G. Castro pointed out that CSULB now says that local admission area is only for local high schools and not local community colleges, so not even sure if the resolution applies any longer. CW stated that legislative analysis said this is discriminatory, but they are still allowing it to happen and he thinks this is a problem. M. Ichinaga asked if the resolution is voted on and passes who is going to file the complaint with the Office of Civil Rights. CW said he would be willing to file it and monitor it. M. Odanaka said it does discriminate for low performing high schools because not everyone can go away to college,

so maybe it makes sense to offer priority to local high schools. A. Martinez said we should not discount those schools that have no CSU's designated such as El Camino since they need to be included somewhere. C. Jeffries asked if we could find out what the resolutions already voted on by the State-wide Academic Senate have produced and no one could really answer that. A vote was taken and the resolution passed unanimously with two abstentions.

### **Information Items – Measure E – Jeanie Nishime (JN)**

JN stated that the Administration is not asking the Senate to endorse Measure E, but to share information with students. A publication explaining Measure E was handed out to the body. JN went through a history of our previous bond and where we are today. In 2002, a bond was approved by the voters to modernize and build new buildings. We have used \$225 million of that bond and are only half way thru construction with still the field and football stadium to be completed. Other projects in the works are the Fine Arts/Music building, the Behavior and Social Science building, the Student Activities Center and renovation of the library. The new bond would continue this modernization and it is seen as building towards the future. The new buildings are projected to save about \$1 million a year in energy since they will be more energy efficient much like the new Central Plant is saving roughly \$100,000/year. K. Baily asked if there was anything in the new bond towards a nursing project and F. Arce said no since they are moving into the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the new building. The new bond actually has no plans for new buildings, but to modernize current buildings. M. Ichinaga asked if there were any specific plans in the old bond or this new bond to include an indoor dining area since students think its okay to bring food into the library. The answer was yes, the new bond includes improvements to the Student Center that won't actually have an indoor cafeteria, but would include a place for students to eat. C. Striepe asked if the new wing of the library would be torn down and FA said no, that it is complicated and they would be working around two of the earlier extensions. It would be labeled more under facilities construction renovation. C. Wells asked how the bonds compared to other districts. JN said that in 2002 only \$16.88 per \$100,000 of assessed value was charged to the local residents. The new bond would bring that up to about \$25 or about a \$7-8 increase. This figure is mid-range for all schools and much lower than Santa Monica's which comes out to about \$74 per \$100,000 assessed. Everyone was directed to the Measure E Website on our main page for more information and additional documents. C. Striepe asked what will happen with funding if Proposition 30 doesn't pass and FA stated he wasn't sure what the legislature would do. JN stated that planning takes years and from the 2002 bond we are still building and this will continue on thru 2014 with the new Student Services building. P. Marcoux asked about the future of athletics and whether we can change the scope of the projects even to some degree. L. Widman said that we have to say what we are going to do with the bond monies, but there is some latitude. JN gave the example of the parking structure which in the original bond called for a 2<sup>nd</sup> structure, but instead we just did repairs to the old one, so yes, there is some latitude. L. Widman asked the question if this body can endorse the bond. FA again reiterated that the Administration is not asking for a vote from the Senate, but just to give information much like we are doing with Proposition 30. P. Marcoux wondered if it even makes a difference if we endorse it or not and why we should even do it if it has no impact. K. Baily suggested we not take a vote, but having this information is important. L. Widman said that the endorsement can be made as long as it doesn't take place on campus during working hours. It was agreed that if C. Gold wants to endorse it as an individual, she is fine to do so. P. Marcoux

said that any endorsement can include a person's title say if they wanted to write something in the Easy Rider, so it was agreed that C. Gold too can include her title if she so chooses.

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 1:43pm

CJ/ECCFall2012