



Officers & Executive Committee

Table listing Officers & Executive Committee members including President Christina Gold, Co-VPs Faculty Development Briita Halonen & Moon Ichinaga, and various other roles like VP Compton Educ'I Center, Curriculum Chair, and Secretary.

Senate Mailing List

Main Senate Mailing List table with columns for department (e.g., Adjunct, Health Sci & Athletics/Nursing, Natural Sciences), name, and term year (e.g., 11/12, 12/13).

Dates after names indicate the last academic year of the senator's three year term, or example 11/12 = 2011-2012. *denotes senator from the division who has served on Senate the longest (i.e. the "senior senator")



SENATE'S PURPOSE (from the Senate Constitution)

- A. To provide an organization through which the faculty will have the means for full participation in the formulation of policy on academic and professional matters relating to the college including those in Title 5, Subchapter 2, Sections 53200-53206. *California Code of Regulations*. Specifically, as provided for in Board Policy 2510, and listed below, the "Board of Trustees will normally accept the recommendations of the Academic Senate on academic and professional matters of:
 - 1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
 - 2. Degree and certificate requirements
 - 3. Grading policies
 - 4. Educational program development
 - 5. Standards and policies regarding student preparation and success
 - 6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
 - 7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation process, including self-study and annual reports
 - 8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
 - 9. Processes for program review
 - 10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development, and
 - 11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate."

- B. To facilitate communication among faculty, administration, employee organizations, bargaining agents and the El Camino College Board of Trustees.

ECC ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS (1st and 3rd Tuesdays)

FALL 2011

September 6	Alondra Room
September 20	Alondra Room
October 4	Alondra Room
October 18	Alondra Room
November 1	Alondra Room
November 15	Alondra Room
December 6	Alondra Room

SPRING 2012

February 21	Alondra Room
March 6	Alondra Room
March 20	Alondra Room
April 3	Alondra Room
April 17	Alondra Room
May 1	Compton Educational Center
May 15	Alondra Room
June 5	Alondra Room

CEC ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS (Thursday after ECC Senate, usually)

FALL 2011

September 9	Board Room
September 23	Board Room
October 7	Board Room
October 21	Board Room
November 4	Board Room
November 18	Board Room
December 9	Board Room

SPRING 2012

March 3	Board Room
March 17	Board Room
April 7	Board Room
April 21	Board Room
May 5	Board Room
May 19	Board Room
June 2	Board Room



AGENDA & TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Pages
A. CALL TO ORDER (12:30)		
B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES		6-16
C. OFFICER REPORTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. President B. VP – Compton Education Center C. Chair – Curriculum D. VP – Educational Policies E. Co-VPs – Faculty Development F. VP – Finance G. VP – Academic Technology H. VP – Instructional Effectiveness 	
D. SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS		
E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Nominations: Co-Chair – Faculty Development Committee B. Election – Academic Senate President C. Resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of the Collegial Consultation Process at El Camino College, Torrance Campus. This is a second reading. In December 2011 the Senate directed the creation of a task force to author a resolution of no confidence. It was presented for a first reading to the Senate on Feb. 21, 2012. On March 6, 2012 it was discussed during a plenary session of the Senate. The resolution is accompanied by a listing of supporting evidence and examples. D. BP/AP 4225 Course Repetition This is a second reading of a major revision to the course repetition policy and procedure. The changes are required by Title 5. The Senate made minor revisions during the first reading. 	<p>17-33</p> <p>34-41</p>



F. NEW BUSINESS	A. AP4231 Grade Change Procedure. June 2011, the Senate voted to approve revisions to the Grade Change Policy and Procedure. After Senate approval, minor revisions that did not impact the substance of the policy were made and it was approved by the Board in fall 2011. However, extensive revisions were made to the Grade Change Procedure, requiring further consultation with the Senate. The Education Policies Committee received the revisions on 3/23/12, reviewed the procedure on 3/27/12, and sent it on to the Senate for a first reading with minor revisions. This procedural change allows for grade changes to be initiated by the college in the event of fraud.	42-48
G. INFORMATION ITEMS – DISCUSSION		
H. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS I. PUBLIC COMMENT J. ADJOURN		



Committees

<u>SENATE COMMITTEES</u>	<u>Chair / President</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Location</u>
Academic Technology Comm.	Pete Marcoux, Virginia Rapp			
Assessment of Learning Comm.	Jenny Simon, Kelly Holt, Kaysa Laureano-Ribas, Claudia Lee	2 nd & 4 th Mon.	2:30-4:00	Library 202
Academic Program Review Comm.	Claudia Lee, Christina Gold			
Compton Academic Senate	Saul Panski	1 st & 3 rd Thurs	1:00-2:00	CEC Board Room
Compton Faculty Council	Saul Panski	1 st & 3 rd Thurs	1:00-2:00	CEC Board Room
Curriculum Committee	Jenny Simon	2 nd & 4 th Tues	2:30-4:30	Admin 131
Educational Policies Comm.	Merriel Winfree	2 nd & 4 th Tues	12:30-2:00	SSC 106
Faculty Development Comm.	Briita Halonen, Moon Ichinaga	2 nd & 4 th Tues	1:00-2:00	West. Library Basement

<u>CAMPUS COMMITTEES</u>	<u>Chair</u>	<u>Senate / Faculty Representative/s</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Location</u>
Accreditation	Jean Shankweiler	Christina Gold			
Basic Skills Advisory Group	Elise Geraghty, Arturo Martinez	Jason Suarez			
Board of Trustees	Bill Beverly	Christina Gold	3 rd Mon.	4:00	Board Room
Calendar Committee	Jeanie Nishime	Kelly Holt Christina Gold			
Campus Technology Comm.	John Wagstaff	Pete Marcoux			
College Council	Tom Fallo	Christina Gold David McPatchell	Mondays	1-2:00	Admin 127
Dean's Council	Francisco Arce	Christina Gold	Thursdays	8:30-10:00	Library 202
Distance Education Advisory Committee	Alice Grigsby				
Enrollment Management Comm.	Arvid Spor	Christina Gold Chris Wells Sara Blake Cynthia Mosqueda Juli Soden	2 nd Thurs	2-3:30	Library 202
Facilities Steering Comm.	Tom Fallo	Christina Gold			
Insurance Benefits Comm.			4 th Tues	1-2:30	
Planning & Budgeting Comm.	Arvid Spor	Lance Widman Emily Rader (alt)	1 st & 3 rd Thurs.	1-2:30	Library 202

All of these Senate and campus committee meetings are open, public meetings. Please feel free to attend any meetings that address issues of interest or concern to you.

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES
20th March 2012

Adjunct Faculty

Sue Ellen Warren
Leah Pate

Behavioral & Social Sciences

Firestone, Randy X
Gold, Christina X
Moen, Michelle X
Widman, Lance X
Wynne, Michael X

Business

Siddiqui, Junaid X
Lau, Philip S
VACANT

Counseling

Pajo, Christina X
Sabio, Sabra X
Vaughn, Dexter X
Key, Ken X

Fine Arts

Ahmadpour, Ali X
Bloomberg, Randall X
Crossman, Mark
Schultz, Patrick X
Wells, Chris X

Health Sciences & Athletics

Hazell, Tom X
Colunga, Mina X
Baily, Kim X
Holt, Kelly X

Humanities

Isaacs, Brent X
Marcoux, Pete X
McLaughlin, Kate X
Halonon, Briita X
Simon, Jenny X

Industry & Technology

Gebert, Pat
Hofmann, Ed X
MacPherson, Lee X
Winfree, Merriel X
Marston, Doug

Learning Resources Unit

Striepe, Claudia X
Ichinaga, Moon X

Mathematical Sciences

Bateman, Michael X
Hamza Hamza X
Sheynshteyn, Arkadiy X
Taylor, Susan X
Barajas, Eduardo X

Natural Sciences

Doucette, Pete X
Herzig, Chuck X
Jimenez, Miguel X
Palos Teresa X
VACANT

Academic Affairs & SCA

Arce, Francisco X
Nishime, Jeanie
Lee, Claudia
Lam, Karen

ECC CEC Members

Evans, Jerome
Norton, Tom X
Panski, Saul X
Pratt, Estina
Halligan, Chris
Odanaka, Michael X

Assoc. Students Org.

Asher, Rebekka
Valdez, Cindy

Ex- Officio Positions

Elizabeth Shadish X

Guests, Dean's Rep, Visitors:

Carolyn Pineda, Arvid Spor, Alice Grigsby

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

The third Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2012 semester was called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:36pm.

Approval of last Minutes:

[See pp.6-10 of packet]The minutes of the 6th March plenary meeting were approved as written.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

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

CG noted that as it was a full agenda she would be moving items along swiftly.

- CG noted that the 2nd reading of the Resolution of No Confidence has been moved forward to the next Academic Senate meeting of April 3rd to allow for fact checking and the inclusion of additional evidence. Mr. Norton had a request, clarified by Mr. Panski, to revise the resolution to make clear that the resolution referred to no confidence in the process of shared governance at the Torrance campus only. CG said that the Taskforce would meet again to look at the draft document.
- CG reminded all that it has been the custom now for a few years to have one Academic Senate meeting at the Compton Campus, and this year it will be the May 1st meeting.
- Student Success Taskforce Recommendations. To work on the recommendations, a committee - headed by Drs. Arce and Nishime - has been selected. The members are Dr. Mosqueda (First Year Experience/Counselor), Ms. Blake (Basic Skills Coordinator), Dr. Soden (Human Development), Mr. Durand (Industry and Technology), Mr. Wells (Academic Senate), and Dr. Gold (Academic Senate).

Ms. Taylor wished to recommend another member – Mr. Martinez, from Math – to represent Math basic Skills. CG regrettably informed her that the group was already considered too large. Dr. Arce suggested a member from the Compton Center should be added as the recommendations would affect that campus as well. Dr. Spor suggested Mr. Martinez (Math) be put on the Enrollment Management Committee as the two groups were going to be working closely together and looking at Basic Skills. .

VP Compton Education Center - Saul Panski (SP)

No report.

Curriculum Committee – Jenny Simon (JS)

No report.

VP Educational Policies Committee – Merriel Winfree (MW)

No report. MW will speak later in Agenda. Note minutes of the Ed. Policies Committee meeting of March 13th on pg 15 of packet.

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

[See pp 17- 25 of packet] MI thanked CG for documenting the emails pertaining to a free parking space for the winner of the Outstanding Adjunct faculty award. MI said that in Sept 2011 it was thought that a free parking spot had been secured as part of the award, but the offer had been revoked as the VP's felt

that procedures had not been adhered to, and they have requested policy guidelines from the Parking Committee and Chief Travis. The Fac. Dev. Committee has sent suggestions re: the requested guidelines to the Parking Committee. There have been no further communications/responses to date.

The full-time faculty winners were never offered a parking space, as they receive a monetary prize, but it was hoped to offer the adjunct faculty winner a plaque and a parking spot for a year. As it stands, the winner just receives a plaque.

Dr. Baily asked, should the matter be resolved favorably, whether there would be 2 spaces next year – one for the last year’s award winner? MI noted that hopefully some arrangement could be made, but we would have to wait and see.

Mr. Marston asked whose idea it was to allow students to park anywhere after 6pm? He asked that this arrangement be at least pushed out to 6:30 or 7pm. CG asked that Mr. Marston email her on the matter and she would pass it on in College Council.

VP Finance – Lance Widman (LW)

LW asked all to spare a moment to consider the plight of those in Mexico who had this morning experienced a 7.4 earthquake.

[See p. 27of packet] This notes the current status (as of 3/1) of revenues and expenditures. Due to “prudent fiscal actions” it is anticipated that any shortfall at this point will be taken from reserves. The numbers are still moving and shifting weekly, if not daily. LW noted that, unlike the quote from his favorite film “Invictus” –“I am the master of my fate...” – we are all at the mercy of Sacramento. LW related that he has served on the Academic Senate for 25 years, and had worked with Senate Presidents D’Amico, Bonano, Marston, Perez, Dever, Marcoux, Vakil, and now Gold, and wanted to express his admiration and thanks to President Gold for her leadership and diplomacy.

VP Academic Technology Committee – Pete Marcoux (PM)

PM noted that the next Academic Technology Committee meetings would take place on March 29th in the Alondra room 1-2pm, and May 10th in the Stadium Room.

VP Instructional Effectiveness – Kelly Holt (KH)

KH will speak later in agenda.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

CSULB Admission Policy Hearings – Chris Wells (CW)

[See pp 28 – 34 of packet] Mr. Wells reported that CSULB is proposing moving to major-specific admissions criteria. This would have a significant impact on our ECC students. Recent news also indicates that the CSUs may eliminate Spring admissions. In response to a question from GC, CW noted that the Long Beach Promise program will be cut 10%, these students could come to ECC instead. In response to a question from Ms. Winfree, CW noted that different admissions criteria are being proposed based on major, depending also how impacted these majors field become. CW said our AA degrees would become more important, and we should push the majors degrees here.

Mr. Marcoux noted that the state of Connecticut was proposing to eliminate remedial classes from the community college system there, so that was another trend to keep an eye on, what with the number of remedial classes offered here at ECC.

CW also mentioned the Santa Monica College proposal to move to a two-tiered fee system. It appears the SMC Board approved the proposal, but we will have to watch for the Chancellor’s Office reaction.

Mr. Panski requested the Compton Center have input on the majors degrees. Dr. Arce said interested parties should be sure to get onto the Division Curriculum Committees. Discussion followed on which majors degrees are offered at ECC. CG also noted that interested parties should email her and she would send them a link for C-ID, or one could Google the term.

Dr. Arce asked how many transfer degrees have been approved state-wide – Dr. Simon thought around 21 degrees. Dr. Arce noted that we have 3 or 4 approved, and noted how advantageous they were for students applying to a university. Dr. Simon further noted that students with one of these degrees get a grade point boost.

Later, CG forwarded an email from Dr. Simon.

Jenny Simon asked that I forward the following information to the Academic Senate:

Dear Senators—Just to follow up on the conversation from the meeting today. The following transfer degrees have been approved by the CCC:

Communication Studies

Geology

Psychology

Sociology

The following transfer degrees are in progress:

Administration of Justice

Kinesiology

Mathematics

Physics

The following link shows the “TMCs” (transfer model curricula) which have been finalized and are currently being vetted at the state level: <http://www.c-id.net/degreereview.html> .

Calendar Committee Report:

[See packet pp 35-43] CG began with a recap - The Board of Trustees was presented with two calendars. A 2012 – 2013 calendar with a Winter session, which was approved, and a 2013-2014 calendar without a Winter session, which the Board did not approve, saying it needed more information. To this end, Dr. Nishime convened three subcommittees to gather information in the areas of Efficiency, Economy, and Academics. Information compiled by the committees [See packet pp35-39 – with summary on pg 43] was presented at the last Board meeting. After listening to 4 hours of testimony, the Board decided to Keep 2012/2013 Winter session, and eliminate 2013/2014 Winter session. The new calendar can be seen on pp40-41 of packet. The main reason for the decision was budgetary, and to preserve a strong Spring and Fall and those sections.

CG noted that Summer School would still run 6 and 8 week sessions this year, but there were no guarantees thereafter, perhaps we would see two back to back 6 week sessions in the future. Mr. Widman noted the importance of Summer School to high school graduates, and Mr. Panski noted that if Summer School begins in June, the statistics can be used for either fiscal year. Dr. Spor agreed that the start date for Summer sessions was important.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Nominations for Academic Senate President, and Co-VP Faculty Development

- **Co-VP Faculty Development Committee**

Vice Presidents: The vice presidents shall preside over meetings of their respective standing committees, as outlined in *Robert’s Rules*, report to the Senate, interface with the college administration in the appropriate areas, and bring proposals to the Senate for approval by the body.

Vice President of Faculty Development, in coordination with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, shall investigate, monitor and propose policies for faculty professional development activities, and present proposals for use of faculty development funds to the Senate.

Nominations are called for a two year term as Co-VP. Fall 2012-Spring 2014.

CG declared the position open for nominations. Ms. Halonen noted that she was stepping down as the senior VP, and the new VP would be the junior VP, with Ms. Ichinaga stepping up as senior VP. Ms. Halonen said this was part of the reason for having staggered VP’ s so that a new person

had time to learn the ropes from a more seasoned officer. No nominations were heard, so CG said she would field the position again at the April 17th meeting, and also have the vote at that time.

- **Academic Senate President**

The president shall preside over meetings of the Senate as outlined in *Robert's Rules of Order*; chair the Executive Committee; represent the Senate to the administration, the Board of Trustees, and the State Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges (ASCCC); and appoint a parliamentarian, newsletter editor and sergeant-at-arms, as deemed necessary. CG noted that this is a 2 year term running from Fall 2013 through Spring 2015. The first year the incumbent would serve as President Elect. CG opened the floor for nominations. Ms. Ichinaga nominated CG to serve a second term. Ms. Winfree seconded the nomination.

BP/AP 4025 Philosophy for Associate Degree & General Education – Merriel Winfree (MW)

(Second reading)

[See pp44-48 of packet] MW noted that Senate had seen the policy/procedure last Fall, and had approved them in theory, but had asked that the policy be revisited by the Ed. Policies Committee for a reworking of the language regarding who would create the procedure. Thus the Committee has provided 3 options for consideration that the Senate needs to vote on. CG asked that Senate discuss the three options presented. Mr. Wells asked if the options complied with the CCLC template. MW was not sure. Mr. Widman suggested opting for option 2 as it seemed the clearest. Mr. Marston noted that option 3 mentioned both collegial consultation AND mutual agreement...and asked what our arrangement with the Board was. CG said we have mutual agreement with the Board. Ms. Taylor also liked option 3 as having the broadest possibilities. Mr. Widman noted that the second sentence of the options was key, as that is where the crux of the issue lay. CG called for a motion to vote. Mr. Marston moved to vote, seconded by Mr. Norton. CG called to approve BP 4025 with the inclusion of option 2 with the second sentence to be amended to read "*These procedures are developed through a collegial consultation process of mutual agreement between...*" The vote showed all in favor, with no Nays or abstentions.

The BP [see pg 48 of packet] had had no changes requested, so a motion was made to approve the procedures. Mr. Widman moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Marcoux. The vote showed all in favor, with no Nays or abstentions.

NEW BUSINESS

BP/AP 4225 Course Repetition – Merriel Winfree(MW) (First reading)

[See pp 49-56 of packet – Policy 49-50, Procedures 51-56] MW noted that the changes are extensive, but required by law – a Title V change. Changes are being made in response to changes to the law which allows students to attempt a course only three times.

Students can attempt a course three times, but the third attempt will trigger a request for intervention and a plan. W's will count as attempts, as will an F grade. It was noted that the Policy has been slimmed down to the basics. Further changes to the law are anticipated and these changes will be reflected in the Procedures.

Ms. Taylor requested that similar changes be made in the wording of the first paragraph as had been requested for BP/AP 4025.

Mr. Panski noted a typo pg 49 – designate should be designee.

Mr. Wells asked whether we should not approve the process later when all changes had been made. Mr. Natividad said no, as we have to be in compliance. Mr. Marcoux asked if we would be voting on this at the next meeting. CG replied in the affirmative, noting that this would give the Ed. Policies committee time to make the suggested changes to language.

INFORMATION ITEMS –DISCUSSION

Planning and Budgeting – Arvid Spor (AS)

AS said he wanted to get input on possible changing due dates on PlanBuild reports. AS noted that December end is the current due date for plans, and wondered whether people felt this was too early/late.

He pointed out that some Divisions had moved the date up internally, and come up with their own dates more suitable to their operations. AS noted that the plans are really due in February, but many worked ahead as they did not necessarily work during Winter. AS asked for comment.

Ms. McLaughlin noted that Journalism liked their Jan/Feb deadline as they were often too busy to attend to the plans during the semester. Mr. Wells asked if the college could not leave matters as they are, up to the discretion of the Divisions? AS noted that he would like something more formal as some areas had a habit of procrastinating, and with a firmer plan we might see better continuity. Mr. Norton suggested a deadline of the Friday before classes begin in January. AS noted that many folks do not like working over the Christmas period. CG asked if eliminating the Winter session would make the January deadline more feasible? AS said it might give more flexibility, but not much. He noted the college would like to have a consistent system for Accreditation purposes. CG asked AS what he would recommend? AS suggested working toward an October deadline, noting there had been many late submissions at the CEC. Mr. Norton said he would “nag” the Compton faculty. Mr. Panski noted that the late submissions may have been due to unclear instructions – people were waiting for approvals. Mr. Wells noted that part of the problem lay with the software and instructions should be clearer. Mr. Widman said he would vote for Dec 31st.

AS said that the Accreditation teams look at what is actually done.

AS went on to talk about the ACCJC noting that he had received a letter on 1st February re: Rubric status, noting that ECC is required to meet all standards pertaining thereto. Six recommendations were made and we must be sure to link them to planning and comment on them in Program Reviews. We are at risk of failing in some areas. Some training for managers has been mandated to try to remedy the situation.

AS said he was thinking of having a planning workshop for faculty on how to write content for the Goals, Evaluation, and Objectives sections and helping with fine-tuning plans could be included in the workshop

Core Competency Assessment Results – Assessment of Learning Committee – Kelly Holt (KH) and Carolyn Pineda (CP)

KH stepped Senate through the following slides re: ECC’s Second Core Competency Assessment: “Critical, Creative, and Analytical Thinking”

The full core competency statement reads: **Critical, Creative, and Analytical Thinking:**

Students solve problems, make judgments and reach decisions using critical, creative and analytical skills.

KH noted that a student survey had been prepared to allow students the opportunity for

Self-assessment of 6 discrete skills in critical, creative, and analytical thinking.

- 1) Draw conclusion based on evidence or information
- 2) Evaluate quality and credibility of a source or evidence
- 3) Create a work that meets defined standards
- 4) Use standards to make judgment
- 5) Apply theory to analyze data or solve a problem
- 6) Create solution or approach to a problem

The survey compared student’s assessment of the competency at the beginning of education at El Camino College against their current rating and an overall rating.

KH showed the survey

Activity/Skill	Student Mean	Faculty Mean
Draw conclusion based on evidence or information	4.01	3.45
Evaluate quality and credibility of a source or evidence	3.99	3.56
Create a work that meets defined standards	4.11	3.72
Use standards to make judgment	4.07	3.73
Apply theory to analyze data or solve a problem	3.95	3.57
Create solution or approach to a problem	3.97	3.63

Along with the Overall mean scores – it was noted that students continue to self-assess higher than faculty rate them. But it was noted that students do seem to note an improvement in skills based on their time at the college

Critical Thinking Skills Rating	Student Mean	Faculty Mean
Beginning of education at El Camino College	3.42	N/A
Current	4.06	3.59

LP also discussed the student self-assessment mean scores by gender, noting both groups feel they have improved.

Activity/Skill	Female Mean (n=167)	Male Mean (n=119)
Draw conclusion based on evidence or information	3.93	4.14
Evaluate quality and credibility of a source or evidence	3.98	4.04
Create a work that meets defined standards	4.07	4.13
Use standards to make judgment	4.00	4.17
Apply theory to analyze data or solve a problem	3.50	3.78
Create solution or approach to a problem	3.66	3.82
Critical Thinking Skills Rating	Female Mean	Male Mean
Beginning of education at El Camino College	3.24	3.46
Current	3.99	4.08

And Student self-assessment mean scores by ethnicity

Activity/Skill	Asian (n=40)	African Amer. (n=86)	Latino (n=88)	White (n=45)
Draw conclusion based on evidence or information	3.73	3.88	3.94	4.47
Evaluate quality and credibility of a source or evidence	3.70	3.94	3.99	4.44
Create a work that meets defined standards	3.70	3.93	4.20	4.60

Use standards to make judgment	3.65	3.95	4.15	4.42
Apply theory to analyze data or solve a problem	3.05	3.71	3.64	4.02
Create solution or approach to a problem	3.25	3.78	3.63	4.07

Critical Thinking Skills Rating	Asian	African Amer.	Latino	White
Beginning of education at El Camino College	3.00	3.4	3.36	3.47
Current	3.63	3.95	4.08	4.44

LP discussed course grades at both campuses

- **Course grades in “critical, analytical, and creative thinking” courses—Torrance**
 - GPA=3.00
 - Average number of courses taken=7.5
 - Success=76%; Retention=87%
- **Course grades in critical, analytical, and creative thinking” courses—Compton**
 - GPA=3.14
 - Average number of courses taken=4.1
 - Success=75%; Retention=87%

And provided a summary of the data before opening the floor to questions to herself and KH.

- Students indicated their critical thinking skills have improved since they began ECC or CEC.
- Overall, faculty ratings of their students’ critical thinking skills were lower than the student self-assessment.
- Students demonstrate high performance in success, retention, and GPAs in courses with a greater emphasis on critical thinking.

The presenters noted that feedback is important especially in the following areas

After reading and reflecting about the Critical, Creative and Analytical Thinking Core

Competency assessment results, please answer the following questions:

- 1) **What are your general observations of the data?**
- 2) **What are the implications/recommendations for the college?**
- 3) **What are the implications/recommendations for your area/program?**

Do you have any specific questions or concerns about this core competency or its assessment?

Comments:

Ms. Halonen questioned the validity of self-assessment data. LP acknowledged that this is an on-going discussion at the ALC. There has been talk of administering a test, but this would be very time-consuming. KH agreed, saying that the ALC is actively looking for feedback, and understands that we need to work on authentic assessment, but are faced with enormous time constraints. Many faculty do not want to give up the classroom time. The whole college should be involved in the effort to think up better assessment methods. KH noted there are some plans to get a focus group together and have faculty design an assessment tool and move away from student self- assessment.

Another idea is to have a guest speaker on Flex Day, partnering with Faculty Development, on this topic. Mr. Marcoux asked if we had data from other schools to compare? KH said no, no schools had an identical statement that would provide a meaningful comparison. Dr. Simon pointed out that not many schools do institutional assessments at this point in time. CG asked if we could take program level assessment data to use in considering core competencies. KH said this was a good idea and would be considered.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of Collegial Consultation – April 3rd.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 2:01pm.

CS/ECC2012

**Resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of the Collegial Consultation Process
at El Camino College, Torrance Campus**
El Camino College Academic Senate
Spring 2012

Whereas, shared governance and collegial consultation are deeply rooted in American higher education because they provide for the most effective and efficient operation of a college by delegating “academic decisions to the faculty and administrative decisions to the administration, leaving the governing board to focus on public policy and accountability;” and

Whereas, California state laws and regulations contained within Education Code and Title 5 require collegial consultation and grant primary responsibility over academic and professional matters to the faculty through Academic Senates; and

Whereas, ECC Board Policy 2510 states that “if the District Governing Board of Trustees disagrees with the recommendation of the Academic Senate, representatives of the two bodies shall have the obligation to meet and reach mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation, or policy of the Governing Board;” and,

Whereas, although the infrastructure of collegial consultation exists at ECC (including the necessary policies, procedures and committees), its operation does not effectively honor faculty primacy in academic and professional matters and is hindered by poor communication and a lack of transparency in decision-making by administrative leadership; and,

Whereas, the ECC President and the Vice President of Academic Affairs have demonstrated a disregard for faculty concerns and expertise, leading to a routine prioritization of administrative concerns over academic ones, which jeopardizes the advancement of the college academic mission; and,

Whereas, the Academic Senate seeks to repair the collegial consultation process by requesting the problem-solving “issue resolution” service from a neutral, joint Community College League of California and Academic Senate of California Community Colleges technical assistance program, and the ECC President has blocked this effort by agreeing only to an informational presentation designed for campuses that need an “orientation or refresher.”¹

RESOLVED, the ECC Academic Senate and faculty have no confidence in the implementation of the collegial consultation process and shared governance at El Camino College; and,

RESOLVED, the ECC Academic Senate requests that the ECC Board of Trustees direct its designees to work alongside the Senate to request the problem-solving “issue resolution” service from the Community College League of California and Academic Senate of California Community Colleges technical assistance program.

¹ The CCLC/ASCCC technical assistance services are not tiered. They do not begin with a first step and proceed from there. Instead, a campus selects what it needs from a choice of services. Issue resolution is recommended for campuses in which “the parties have reached a stalemate and are unable to resolve their differences.” See Appendix A.

APPENDIX A

ASSISTANCE TO ASSURE EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION IN DISTRICT AND COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

(A Joint Program of the Academic Senate and Community College League)

The Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges and the Community College League of California have joined together to offer a program of assistance for local colleges and districts. The purpose of the program is to help districts and colleges successfully implement state law and regulations that call for effective participation by faculty, staff and students in district and college governance. The services offered will be most effective if used before major conflicts arise and prior to a heightened level of local unilateral action by any the parties involved in the local decision-making process.

The jointly-sponsored program does not replace the individual services offered by the League to trustees and chief executive officers and by the Academic Senate to local faculty. Yet it is recognized that challenges to improve local decision making processes can be aided by the mutual support of the statewide organizations. Because the services are carried out by volunteers of the League and Academic Senate, the services will not always be available on short notice and scheduled assistance should be arranged well in advance.

The program includes four distinct services that are available. Local college and district CEOs and faculty leaders who are interested in assistance should meet together to consider the services and to agree mutually on what assistance would be most beneficial. Although the program is intended to be flexible so that a mix of the four services or optional services may be available, the League and Academic Senate may not be able to help with some requests which vary too much from the four defined services or from the goal of improving the effectiveness of participation in governance.

The president of the Academic Senate and executive director of the League are available at this early stage to answer questions and to help in identifying the best approach. These two persons will reach agreement as to whether the mutual request for assistance can be carried out. No joint service will be provided unless there is a written request for assistance signed by the college president or district chancellor and local academic senate president.

This joint program is coordinated and implemented by the Executive Director of the League and President of the Academic Senate under policies established by their respective boards.

Each district or college using the service is expected to reimburse the travel expenses for the assistance team members.

The following provides a summary of the four services available within the assistance program: 1) informational presentation, 2) advisory assistance, 3) issue resolution and 4) special workshops and presentations.

INFORMATION PRESENTATION

The informational presentation service is intended to provide a basic overview of the state law, state regulations and guidelines concerning shared governance. The presentation is done by a representative of

the League and Academic Senate and takes approximately two hours. Handouts are provided, good practices highlighted and questions answered.

This service is best used at a college or district where there are no significant issues of conflict but a recognition that many participants in local shared governance roles are new and need an orientation or refresher on the required processes.

ADVISORY ASSISTANCE

The advisory assistance service is intended to provide a facilitated and structured opportunity to identify possible areas of conflict or different interpretations of the law and regulations and to develop ways to resolve the differences.

The service is conducted by one to two representatives of the Academic Senate and League over four to six hours. The time includes a basic overview presentation for all interested parties and separate meetings with the faculty and with the trustees and administration.

A written advisory report is provided by the assistance team to the district or college within six weeks of the visit. The advisory report seeks to clarify the key issues identified by the team in its visit, makes recommendations for addressing the issues and suggests who might be responsible for embarking on the solutions.

ISSUE RESOLUTION

The purpose of the issue resolution service is to provide mediation assistance to a college or district when the parties have reached a stalemate and are unable to resolve their differences on a major issue. This service will not be provided unless the local board, chief executive officer and academic senate agree in advance and are committed and open to address seriously the recommendations of the assistance team.

Prior to the six to eight hour visit of one to two representatives from the League and Academic Senate, focused discussions and investigation occur to clearly delineate in writing the issue to be resolved and the approach to be used. During the visit there will be focused interviews with individuals and groups.

A written advisory report is provided by the assistance team within eight weeks of the visit. Prior to the formal presentation of the written report, the local parties involved will be given an opportunity to clarify, correct or refine the recommendations or statements in the report. The assistance team will return to the college or district to present the report and to answer questions publicly. In addition a follow-up training session to provide guidance on implementing the recommendations will be provided if requested.

SPECIAL WORKSHOPS AND PRESENTATIONS

The fourth service involves special workshops and presentations on topics that help local personnel better understand particular issues and various aspects of effective decision-making processes. These jointly presented workshops are designed under the direction of the President of the Academic Senate and the Executive Director of the League, working with local college representatives.

(<http://www.asccc.org/services/technical-assistance>)

Senate first reading: February 21, 2012

Discussion at Senate plenary meeting: March 6, 2012

Senate second reading: April 3, 2012

EXAMPLES, EVIDENCE AND EXPLANATION:

Resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of the Collegial Consultation Process At El Camino College, Torrance Campus

Overview

This resolution is the result of years of frustration with a poor and deteriorating collegial consultation process on the ECC campus. Faculty members who engage in campus-wide committee work and have assumed leadership positions find that their expertise in academic and professional matters often is not sought and/or goes unheeded, confounding their attempts to work on behalf of student success. On the division level, collegial consultation is uneven. Some divisions enjoy a remarkably strong collegial consultation process, while faculty expertise is routinely ignored in other divisions.

The ineffective collegial consultation process on the ECC Torrance Campus is the result of a continuous compilation of problems, both big and small, over the years. This document provides examples, evidence and explanations to support the claims in the body of the resolution. The examples and evidence are organized to offer support for each of the “whereas statements.” Please note that this is not an exhaustive list of the problems; it is a list of big and small examples of how the problem exhibits itself.

Whereas, shared governance and collegial consultation are deeply rooted in American higher education because they provide for the most effective and efficient operation of a college by delegating “academic decisions to the faculty and administrative decisions to the administration, leaving the governing board to focus on public policy and accountability.”

Shared governance and collegial consultation are used by colleges and universities across the nation, because they make best use of the expertise of faculty, administrators and governing boards for the most effective operation of an academic institution on behalf of student learning. The definition used in the above whereas statement is drawn from the *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* which was jointly authored by faculty and administrators on the national level who belong to the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities [James Duderstadt, “Governing the Twenty-First Century University,” in William G. Tierney, *Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance*,” 2004, p. 140.].

Whereas, California state laws and regulations contained within Education Code and Title 5 require collegial consultation and grant primary responsibility over academic and professional matters to faculty through Academic Senates.

State laws and regulations, contained in Education Code and Title 5, require that California Community College Boards of Trustees consult collegially with Academic Senates on the following eleven items: 1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines. 2. Degree and

certificate requirements. 3. Grading policies. 4. Educational program development. 5. Standards or policies regarding student success and preparation. 6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles. 7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports. 8. Policies for faculty professional development activities. 9. Processes for program review. 10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development. 11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate.

Whereas, ECC Board Policy 2510 states that “if the District Governing Board of Trustees disagrees with the recommendation of the Academic Senate, representatives of the two bodies shall have the obligation to meet and reach mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation, or policy of the Governing Board.”

ECC Board Policy 2510 *Participation in Local Decision Making* lays out the collegial consultation process on our campus. It states that in the eleven areas listed above “The Board or its designees will consult collegially with the Academic Senate, as duly constituted with respect to the academic and professional matters, as defined by law” and that “the Board will normally accept the recommendations of the Academic Senate on academic and professional matters.” Furthermore, “if the District Board of Trustees disagrees with the recommendation of the Academic Senate, representatives of the two bodies shall have the obligation to meet and reach mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation, or policy of the Governing Board.” The Board or its designees cannot independently override a recommendation of the Senate in the eleven academic and professional areas, and instead the two groups must act together in mutual agreement. If administration does not adopt the recommendation of a campus-wide consultation committee, a written response explaining the reasons for the decision must be provided.

Strategic Initiative C, one of the seven initiatives that guide campus planning and budgeting, asserts the college’s intention to engage in collegial consultation. It states that the campus will “foster a positive learning environment and sense of community and cooperation through an effective process of collaboration and collegial consultation.” *The Resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of the Collegial Consultation Process at El Camino College, Torrance Campus* attempts to move the campus towards the achievement of Strategic Initiative C.

Whereas, although the infrastructure of collegial consultation exists at ECC (including the necessary policies, procedures and committees), its operation does not effectively honor faculty primacy in academic and professional matters and is hindered by poor communication and a lack of transparency in decision-making by administrative leadership.

ECC has the requisite Board Policies and committees to support an effective collegial consultation process between the Academic Senate and Board of Trustees. Board Policy 2510 *Participation in Local Decision Making* and Board Policy 4027 *Administration of Relations with the Academic Senate* describe the consultation process and establish mutual agreement as the method of consultation in academic and

professional areas. Campus committees are charged with specific responsibilities in these areas. Despite the existence of requisite policies and committees, effective consultation does not consistently occur.

Sample Problems with the Operation of ECC's Infrastructure of Collegial Consultation on the Torrance Campus

1. BP2510 *Participation in Local Decision Making*, which provides the central description of ECC's Collegial Consultation process, was revised over the objection of the Academic Senate expressed in the November 2007 *Resolution to Amend BP2510*. The Senate asserted that the language in the ECC policy differs from Title 5 language in a way that disempowers the Senate. In that same year, President Fallo refused the Senate request to engage in ASCCC/CCLC technical assistance with BP2510. No action was taken by administration to address Senate opposition to the revisions of BP2510. The presentation of the revisions to the Board and their subsequent passage, ironically violates the process of mutual agreement that was instituted by that very same policy. Continued concerns with ECC's structures for consultation were expressed in the 2005 *Focused Midterm Report*, which explains the Senate objection that cross campus consultation set up through College Council "does not adequately recognize the legal mandate giving the Senate a status different from that given other consultation groups." The 2005 report also found that "process proposals and policy changes affecting various areas and departments still occasionally by pass the full consultation process."
2. Persisting problems with collegial consultation on the Torrance Campus have been noted in accreditation and other campus reports:
 - A 1996 report by the ECC Shared Governance Review Team concluded that "shared governance does not currently exist in any meaningful (comprehensive) way at ECC."
 - The 2005 *Midterm Accreditation Report* noted a stream of problems that still exist today, including poor communication, the lack of written responses to Senate recommendations, and a weak and ineffective system of collegial consultation.
 - The 2008 accreditation report noted the Senate's continued "dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of college consultation."
 - The 2011 *Midterm Accreditation Report* states that "there continues to be disagreement between the administration and the Academic Senate on the faculty role in consultation and over the extent to which the administration is forthcoming in its communication regarding decisions... Further work is needed to ensure that both groups understand and abide by the spirit of mutual agreement."
3. The Academic Senate has reported problems with collegial consultation at the ECC, Torrance Campus in resolutions and other actions. For example:
 - Oct. 2006. Senate Resolution, *Compliance with Title 5 Regulations Section 70902* states that in regards to the unilateral administrative decision to move forward with the establishment of the Compton partnership "the Academic Senate of El Camino College deplors this lack of

consultation and urges the Board and its designees to be more inclusive concerning matters of curriculum and academic standards in the future.”

- Oct. 2006. Senate Resolution, *Collegial Consultation (2006-07 Final Budget Supplement)* states that the failure of the college President to bring the final 2006-07 budget to the Planning and Budgeting Committee before presentation to and adoption by the Board of Trustees was “a serious violation of the letter and spirit of collegial consultation contained in the Title 5 Code of Regulations and Administrative Procedure 2510 concerning shared governance at El Camino College.”
- Nov. 27, 2006. College Council Minutes. In a discussion of communication problems and the role of College Council, the Senate representative explained that “many in Administration believe that they are collegially consulting but many faculty do not. There are numerous examples of communications that are ignored.”
- Feb. 20, 2007. Senate Resolution, *Consultation with Academic Senate to Ensure Provision of Comprehensive Educational Programs at a Formally Designated Center* reminded administration that Title 5 requires consultation with the Senate about the possible elimination of educational programs and courses at Compton.
- Nov. 20, 2007. Senate Resolution, *Resolution to Amend BP2510*. The Senate asserted its disagreement with aspects of this board policy, which provides the central description of ECC’s collegial consultation process.
- In 2007 the Senate requested technical assistance from the CCLC/ASCCC with our collegial consultation process. The ECC President refused to participate.
- During the Senate report to the Board on May 15, 2011, the Senate president discussed the “deep and abiding” problem with collegial consultation and explained that “many faculty members on campus, particularly senior faculty and past faculty leadership are concerned that our campus administrators shirk the legal responsibility of collegial consultation.”

4. The campus has failed to enact an effective and efficient process for collegial consultation on board policies and procedures. According to the 2011 *Midterm Accreditation Report*, collegial consultation is hampered by the lack of clearly defined and implemented paths for Board policies and procedures to pass through the collegial consultation process, resulting in unnecessary delays, wasted time and resources, and the perception that consultative input is being dismissed or ignored. The lack of clear pathways for consultation on board policies and procedures is an inefficient use of time that diminishes faculty’s trust in collegial consultation as they contribute time and expertise to the development of policies and procedures that may never reach fruition. In December 2006, College Council discussions noted the problems with the circuitous decision-making process which resulted in some input not being taken into account. It was suggested that a plan to provide an explanation of the decision-making process be discussed. None was implemented. The 2011 accreditation report notes that a transmittal form was developed to alleviate this problem, but it is not in use. Examples of three delayed policies/procedures include:

- BP3750 *Use of Copyrighted Materials* underwent years of revisions and consultation before being brought to the Board.

- AP6160 *District Computer and Network Use Policy*, underwent years of revision and consultation before being brought to the Board.
 - Following the careful faculty development of a new board policy and procedure for program discontinuance, it has been stalled in consultation for well over a year, leaving the college without a legally required board policy.
5. The Academic Senate lacks the ability to fully inform the Board about academic and professional matters because there is no articulated mechanism at ECC for the Senate to bring action items directly to the Board, contradicting Title 5 subsection 53203, which states that “the Academic Senate still retains its right to place issues on the board agenda and to present its views to the Board.” For instance, in the Sept. 10, 2007 College Council meeting, the Academic Senate President was chastised for bringing his concerns regarding BP2510 directly to the Board during the Senate report without first seeking the approval of the VPAA. The ECC President closely controls the Board agenda. In addition, during the ECC Board of Trustees meetings, the Senate report comes at the end of the meeting after the Board has deliberated and voted on action items. Senate reports also do not appear in the Board minutes and the presence of the Senate President at the meetings is not recorded in meeting minutes.
 6. The ECC President included a draft form of the *Resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of Collegial Consultation* in the Board of Trustees supplementary readings for the March 12, 2012 meeting. The Senate had not completed its careful vetting process and had not voted on whether or not to formally bring this resolution to the Board. Although it may not be a formal violation, this action by the ECC President reflects a broader disregard for Senate processes and undermines the Senate’s direct relationship with the Board as described in Title 5.
 7. The Faculty Development Committee and the Academic Senate are not granted appropriate control over flex day activities or the faculty development budget. The Senate Constitution stipulates the following: "The Vice President of Faculty Development in coordination with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, shall investigate, monitor and propose policies for faculty professional development activities, and present proposals for use of faculty development funds to the Senate." This coordination and consultation is not occurring. For example, planning of the general session flex day activities is spearheaded by administration, rather than the Faculty Development Committee and the Senate. SLO programming specifically has been routinely imposed by the ECC President and the VPAA as flex day programming. The VPs of Faculty Development and the Senate are not given oversight of the budget for faculty development activities.
 8. The Academic Affairs Area Council, which is cited in accreditation reports as a body for high-level collegial consultation with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, meets irregularly and sporadically, not holding a single meeting in fall 2011.
 9. Faculty and other constituent group opinions expressed in some consultative committees are not consistently recorded in votes and minutes, suggesting a resistance to transparency. For instance,

there is an historical lack of vote taking in College Council and the Calendar Committee. Also, the insistence by the ECC President on action minutes for College Council means that the minutes are an insufficient record of important discussions amongst faculty, staff, student and administrative leaders about critical topics such as collegial consultation, Board agendas and the calendar. Inaccurate minutes also contradict College Council's goal to improve communication. These concerns were expressed in and have persisted since the 2005 *Focused Midterm Accreditation Report*. The insistence on action minutes diminishes trust and leads to the suspicion that the input of consultative groups are not recorded in case they run contrary to administrative leadership decisions.

10. Collegial consultation at ECC is further hampered by poor communication. Communication has been identified as a major problem area across campus.

- The 2002 *Accreditation Self-Study* indicates that the campus needed to improve its channels for communication.
- The 2005 *Focused Midterm Accreditation Report* notes that “emphasis on improving the communication process among consulting groups also continues to require attention” and warns that “lapses in communication, however inadvertent, foster the impression among some college constituencies, including faculty classified employees, and management, that consultation after the fact undermines the spirit of BP2510.”
- In the 2010 *Employee Campus Climate Survey*, faculty gave the statement that “ECC communicates openly” the second lowest score out of forty-four items (2.47 on a 4 point scale). Staff ranked it even lower at 2.38. Both groups believe that ECC is failing in this area and also indicated that it is one of the most important issues facing the campus. Furthermore, 47% of employees felt that ECC administrators do not communicate openly and honestly with its employees.
- In the 2009-2010 College Council self-evaluation survey all respondents agreed that the committee had not met its goal of improving communication. In addition, comments on the survey indicate that College Council had not made sufficient progress in improving communication about the governance process and had not sought new avenues to improve communication.
- The 2011 *Midterm Accreditation Report* noted that in regards to the College Council goal to improve internal communication, “there was little discussion in the 2010-11 school year meetings about how to accomplish this and no articulated related action plans.”

11. In fall 2011, the VPAA refused to compensate some Senate leaders based on an arbitrary decision that stipends will not be paid to librarians or counselors, despite the fact that compensation for Senate leadership is currently and routinely accounted for in the college budget. In response to the request that the librarians receive a stipend (since reassign time had not been granted) the VPAA flatly responded with “no stipends” and has not waived from that position. Instructional faculty routinely receive overload pay as compensation for Senate work without objection by the VPAA. This arbitrary distinction between stipends and overload violates Board Policy 4027 that requires the Board to fairly compensate Senate leaders. Also, this decision hinders the inclusiveness of the Senate and its ability to utilize the unique expertise of counselors and librarians.

Lack of Written Responses or Delayed Written Responses Explaining the Rejection of Campus-wide College Consultation Committee Recommendations

In the collegial consultation process, the Board designees must provide written explanations when they reject the recommendations of collegial consultation committees. This rarely occurs at ECC and in the past three years has mostly occurred only when the Senate or other consultative bodies strongly insist on an explanation. Even then, the responses are typically delayed and/or excessively brief. The 2011 *Midterm Accreditation Report* recognized the problem with insufficient written responses, explaining that “more needs to be done to ensure that such rational is provided in a timely manner.”

1. Between fall 2010 and spring 2012 the Academic Senate and the Associated Students Organization strongly asserted their desire to retain winter session. No written responses were provided to the four related resolutions or to a student petition. Also, after the Calendar Committee voted unanimously on Dec. 1, 2011 to maintain winter session, administration then presented the Board with a 2013/14 calendar that eliminated winter session and failed to provide a written explanation for the decision.
2. In spring 2011, the ECC President chose to override a PBC recommendation to defer further funding of GASB. A written explanation was provided only after repeated requests, and the response was delayed by months.
3. Explanations of changes made by the ECC President to the decisions of the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee in spring 2011 were excessively brief and insufficient. Some of the changes were not explained at all.
4. In 2003/04 the Calendar Committee was asked by administration to investigate the possibility of having an exam week. After spending nearly a year collecting opinions, doing surveys and writing reports, their recommendation to have an exam week was denied and written explanation was not provided.
5. In spring 2012, administration’s response to the implementation of AP5055 Enrollment Priorities violated the procedure and ignored the carefully considered recommendations of the committee without providing a written response. A complex, seven page procedure for enrollment priorities (AP5055) passed through the collegial consultation process and was implemented in fall 2011. As directed in the procedure, a cross-campus committee of faculty, staff, students and administrators developed application questions and a timeline. Student groups submitted application packets (some of them quite lengthy) that were considered by the committee during multiple email exchanges and several long meetings. Several student groups were invited to give presentations to the committee to further inform the decision. After careful deliberation and voting, recommendations were made and a seven page report was written and reviewed by the committee. This report was presented to Cabinet, which chose to dismiss the recommendations of the committee and to leave enrollment priorities status quo. AP5055 states that “the decision of the Priority Registration Committee is final” and that its decision will be presented directly to the Board. The procedure does not state that its decisions go to Cabinet for approval. By considering and ignoring the recommendations of the

Priority Registration Committee, Cabinet violated AP5055, ignored the collegial consultation process, and wasted a significant amount of faculty, student, staff and administrator's time. No written response explaining the decision was provided.

6. In fall 2011, the Insurance Benefits Committee was demoted from a decision-making committee (the last of its kind on the ECC Torrance campus) to an advisory committee due to the outcome of labor negotiations. No written explanation was provided to explain the necessity for this change in a campus-wide consultation committee.
7. The Recycling Task Force comprised of 30-40 faculty, staff and students was asked to develop a recycling program. They surveyed the waste stream, developed a recycling plan, distributed bins and began collecting recycling. The bins were removed and the program was disbanded by the ECC President without consultation or written explanation.
8. Study abroad offerings were eliminated by the VPAA, leading to the de-facto cancellation of the Study Abroad Program without consultation with the Senate and irrespective of its objection. The *ECC Academic Senate Guidelines for Budget Cuts and Reductions on the Torrance Campus* (Spring 2011) asserted the understanding that deep cuts were necessary but asked that they be made in a transparent and strategic way, guided by data and evidence. Furthermore, it asked for the preservation of "Study Abroad courses because of the unique and high impact experience they offer to students who may have few other chances to travel abroad." A written response to the request was not provided.
9. No written response was provided to the following recent Senate resolutions presented to and asking for action by the ECC President and the Board of Trustees:
 - November 2010. *Winter Session Resolution*.
 - June 2011. *Resolution of No Confidence in the 2011/12 Proposed Calendar Revision and Schedule*.
 - November 2011. *Student Success and Winter Session*.
 - November 2011. *Counseling for Student Preparation and Success*.

Problems Faced by the College Curriculum Committee

1. Insufficient Reassign Time for the Curriculum Chair and the Erosion of Faculty Control Over the Process

Over the last four years, the work of the College Curriculum Committee has drastically increased, but the reassignment for the Curriculum Chair has not been supplemented by the VPAA; the support staff for the Curriculum Advisor continues to be casual employees that roll over frequently; and some of the work that should be faculty-driven has been reassigned by the VPAA to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs without consultation.

In addition to helping the Curriculum Committee establish policy recommendations and working with faculty on developing and implementing new courses and updating programs of study, the Curriculum

Chair is also responsible for shepherding a certain number of course reviews per semester. Ten years ago, course review was on a ten-year cycle, with roughly 60 course reviews due each semester. Although stretched thin, the Curriculum Advisor was able to keep all of this work in line and roughly on track, even without a secretary, but the 30% reassignment for the Curriculum Chair was inadequate to allow the Chair to meet the policy and advising requirements of the position without volunteering a great deal of time. The effect of the resource allocation for curriculum at the time was to undermine curriculum as a faculty-driven endeavor. Repeated requests to the VPAA to increase reassign time have been denied with the justification that Senate reassign time should be taken from other Senate leaders and given to the Curriculum Chair. This would simply shift the problem of too little reassign time to other Senate leaders who have also assumed new responsibilities connected to the issuance the revised 2002 accreditation standards.

Matters have only become grimmer. With the accreditation demand that all courses be reviewed on a six-year cycle, the course review workload for the Curriculum Chair has roughly doubled. Many of the duties the Curriculum Advisor formerly performed for overload pay are now done as part of the regular workweek, shifting much of the technical advising duties from the Curriculum Advisor to the Curriculum Chair. Add to this mix the development of the CurricUNET system for curriculum, student learning outcomes and assessments, and program review. At nearly all other schools which have adopted CurricUNET for curriculum alone, roughly one FTEF was set aside for a team of faculty for at least a year, in addition to administrative and staff support for the project. At ECC, with the exception of the occasional intersession special assignment provided by the VPAA and an added 10% reassignment from the Academic Senate (taken away from another AS Vice President), the curriculum module was simply a project added on to the already stressed Curriculum Chair and Curriculum Advisor. The time required for the CurricUNET project further eroded the efficacy of the Curriculum Chair and the Curriculum Advisor.

In the last two years, the interim associate dean for academic affairs has done a fantastic job of coordinating curriculum work, SLO assessments and program review. She has been and will continue to be a strong advocate for more efficient and higher quality support for the Curriculum Advisor. She respects faculty and honors their responsibilities vis-à-vis curriculum, and listens thoughtfully to faculty concerns about SLO assessments and program review. The school is fortunate to have this individual in this position at this time, but a member of the faculty should be doing much of the work she does. Two years ago, the VPAA rejected our request that a faculty position be created to do similar work and since then, the VPAA has consistently failed to consult faculty about which roles are appropriate or inappropriate for the interim associate dean for academic affairs. The position itself erodes the faculty role in these important collegial consultation areas. The VPAA says repeatedly that the associate dean works for him, not for the faculty. He and he alone decides what her duties will be; he considers discussions of her duties outside the realm of consultation.

2. Purposeful Delays to the Curriculum Process by the VPAA

The VPAA has been an inconsistent and at times obstructionist liaison for the College Curriculum Committee to the Cabinet and the Board. Curriculum has been delayed at various stages by the VPAA to

avoid consultation and to attempt to enforce an administrative decision. Ten years ago, for example, after the increase in units, contact hours and faculty load for Math 70 were approved by the College Curriculum Committee, the administration withheld the proposal from the Board for many months, ignoring the existing appeal processes and the requirement to communicate the reasons for concern directly to faculty in writing. Eventually the changes were made, but we still have no reliable information about administration's specific concerns. In response to this and other instances, the CCC changed its procedures so that issues of cost and faculty load could be resolved before CCC approval. Rather than improved negotiations, the result of these changes is that now proposals languish in a limbo between Division Curriculum Committee approval and the College Curriculum Committee. For example, as a result of an exemplary program review, the instructors in the Math for Future Teachers program proposed decreasing the units and faculty load slightly in Math 115 and Math 116 and increasing the contact hours and faculty load slightly in Math 110. The evidence was clear that these changes together were fiscally neutral, but while the proposed changes for Math 115 and Math 116 sailed through; the small increase in faculty load (23.33% rather than 20.00%) for Math 110 languished for ten months, delaying the implementation of the changes for an additional year. Other courses were pulled from the Board agenda at the last minute without notifying the College Curriculum Committee or department faculty.

Whereas, the ECC President and the Vice President of Academic Affairs have demonstrated a disregard for faculty expertise, leading to a routine prioritization of administrative concerns over academic ones, thereby jeopardizing the advancement of the college academic mission.

Much of the evidence for the above whereas statement is provided in the previous section. The unique concern here is that the lack of appreciation for the expertise of the faculty and the lack of willingness by the ECC President and the VPAA to engage in the collegial consultation process leads to underutilizing of the valuable ideas and information gleaned from those who directly instruct and serve students. Consequently, decisions tend to prioritize administrative concerns over academic ones. Evidence of this is peppered throughout the previous section and three more examples are listed below.

Faculty who assume that their opinions are not appreciated and are unheeded by administration are less likely to participate in and may resist the SLO and program review processes that the ACCJC has asserted are essential to maintaining accreditation. This was seen in the fall 2011 union call for faculty to resign from collegial consultation committees. Conversely, faculty who feel respected and appreciated are more likely to fully participate in the processes required for accreditation that are designed to enhance student success.

Trust and respect between faculty and administrators are important components in an effective collegial consultation system. These are lacking on the El Camino College, Torrance Campus. The 2010 *Employee Campus Climate Survey* reveals that 44% of employees "often felt left out" and 50% believe

that the majority of employees cannot talk to management about their concerns. Only 42% of on those surveyed believe that morale is high on campus. When asked during a Senate meeting in September 2011 what accounted for low morale, faculty cited issues related to a lack of collegial consultation, including a “low sense of empowerment,” the need for “more faculty input needed in decision-making” and “a perception of no shared governance.” These problems have persisted since the 2002 Accreditation Self-Study, which reported that employees commonly indicated that the most important decisions impacting constituent groups on campus were unilaterally made by upper management of the college.

Decisions by the VPAA and College President that Unnecessarily Prioritized Administrative Needs Over Academic Ones

1. In fall 2010, the Atlantis Grant in Child Development was canceled in its final stages by the VPAA for negligible administrative procedural reasons, thereby denying ECC students the profound educational opportunity for fully funded internships in Italy and wasting the extensive time that faculty and staff spent in developing the program. The Senate expressed its objection during its report to the Board.
2. In spring 2011, the ECC President revoked a designated parking spot granted yearly to the Outstanding Adjunct Faculty award winner. Although it was approved by the Parking Committee and was provided to the first recipient of this Academic Senate award, the parking spot was revoked with the explanation that process had not been followed. Yet, no Board policy or procedure exists for this situation. This decision prioritized the ECC President’s desire to control minor campus decisions over a cost-free recognition of faculty excellence in instruction. Since then, the ECC President has requested the writing of an administrative procedure that would allow Cabinet to approve or disapprove the decisions of the Parking Committee regarding allocating spots for award recipients.
3. The second hand bookstore, an integral part of the state-approved library expansion project, was developed by library staff as a way to continually raise funds for needs unmet by the regular budget, such as the purchase of textbooks. It was shut down after operating briefly and was converted at considerable expense to a conference room, without consultation with LRC faculty and staff.

Whereas, the Academic Senate seeks to repair the collegial consultation process by requesting the problem-solving “issue resolution” service from a neutral, joint Community College League of California and Academic Senate of California Community Colleges technical assistance program, and the ECC President has blocked this effort by agreeing only to an informational presentation designed for campuses that need an “orientation or refresher.”

The Senate efforts to repair the collegial consultation process include resolutions and accreditation reports that attempt to draw attention to the problem and suggestion solutions. These actions, unfortunately, have not lead to improvement. In addition, faculty members have made requests for votes by committees, requests for more detailed minutes and requests for written responses to rejected

recommendations. The requests in these three areas often are met with refusal, delay or inadequate implementation. For instance, the ECC President has rejected repeated requests by the past several Senate Presidents for accurate minutes of College Council meetings. Also, the Calendar Committee has historically not taken votes, and when a vote finally was held, the administrator chair refused to conduct the vote and a member of the committee consequently conducted the vote. Without an explanation otherwise, these practices are perceived as an attempt to avoid recording faculty opinions, especially when they disagree with administration. In addition, the lack of consistently provided written responses by administrators to Senate and collegial consultation committee recommendations violates Title 5 regulations and leaves the faculty to speculate about administrative decisions and motives. Prompt and full written responses to Senate and consultation committee recommendations could potentially resolve and avoid some misunderstandings and would show respect for faculty expertise and hard work.

The Academic Senate has proposed that we seek to repair our collegial consultation problems by requesting the issue resolution service of a neutral, joint Community College League of California and Academic Senate of California Community Colleges technical assistance program. In this service, representatives of administrators and faculty on the state level, who are experts in the collegial consultation process, provide a neutral reflection on the collegial consultation process on our campus. If warranted, they offer solutions to any identified problems and would return if necessary to conduct training to implement the recommendations. This is a fair, balanced way to resolve a long term problem on the campus.

Although the ECC President has agreed to invite a representative from the ASCCC/CCLC service to give a two-hour informational presentation, he refused to agree to problem-solving assistance. In extensive discussions in College Council, which are not recorded in the minutes, the ECC President has asserted that we do not have a problem with collegial consultation and that we should solve any issues on our own without outside intervention. However, he has repeatedly shown that he is unwilling to admit there is a problem and is unwilling to work to resolve it. In spring 2008, when the Senate requested this same service in order to resolve festering disagreements and to seek advisement on BP2510, the ECC President also refused to participate. Since then, no identified efforts were made to improve collegial consultation and there is nothing to suggest that the ECC President will seek to repair collegial consultation at this time without outside assistance. We have reached an impasse in which an outside, neutral party is necessary to provide objective opinions and recommendations to move us forward towards solutions that will build an effective collegial consultation system in which all parties contribute appropriately to the advancement of student success and our college mission.

**Resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of the Collegial Consultation Process
at El Camino College, Torrance Campus
El Camino College Academic Senate
Spring 2012**

Whereas, shared governance and collegial consultation are ~~is~~ deeply rooted in American higher education ~~and~~ because they provides for the most effective and efficient operation of a college by delegating “academic decisions to the faculty and administrative decisions to the administration, leaving the governing board to focus on public policy and accountability;”¹ and,

Comment [t1]: “Torrance Campus” was added after consultation with the CEC faculty who are pleased with the collegial consultation process at the Compton Center.

Comment [t2]: “collegial consultation” was added because it is the language used in Education Code and Title 5.

Comment [t3]: The footnote was moved into the evidence portion.

Whereas, California state laws and regulations contained within ~~the~~ Education Code and Title 5 require collegial consultation and grant primary responsibility over academic and professional matters to faculty through Academic Senates; and,

Whereas, ECC Board Policy 2510 states that “if the District Governing Board of Trustees disagrees with the recommendation of the Academic Senate, representatives of the two bodies shall have the obligation to meet and reach mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation, or policy of the Governing Board;” and,

Whereas, although the infrastructure of collegial consultation exists at ECC (including the necessary policies, procedures and committees), its operation does not effectively honor faculty primacy in academic and professional matters and is hindered by poor communication and a lack of transparency in decision-making by administrative leadership; and,

Whereas, the ECC President and the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the President of the Board of Trustees have demonstrated a disregard for faculty concerns and expertise, leading to a routine prioritization of administrative concerns over academic ones, ~~thereby~~ which jeopardizes ~~jeopardizing~~ the advancement of the college academic mission; and,

Comment [t4]: Evidence did not support the inclusion of the President of the Board of Trustees

Whereas, the Academic Senate seeks to repair the collegial consultation process by requesting the problem-solving ~~technical assistance~~ “issue resolution” service from a neutral joint Community College League of California and Academic Senate of California Community Colleges ~~task force~~ technical assistance program, and the ECC President has blocked this effort by agreeing only to an informational presentation designed for campuses that need an “orientation or refresher.”²

Comment [t5]: The footnote and edits to this whereas statement clarify the Senate’s request for CCLC/ASCCC technical assistance services.

¹ James Duderstadt, “Governing the Twenty-First-Century University,” in William G. Tierney, *Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance*, 2004, p. 140. This definition is rooted in the historic *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* (commonly called the “Joint Statement” of the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities (2006).

² The CCLC/ASCCC technical assistance services are not tiered. They do not begin with a first step and proceed from there. Instead, a campus selects what it needs from a choice of services. Issue resolution is recommended for campuses in which “the parties have reached a stalemate and are unable to resolve their differences.” See Appendix A.

RESOLVED, the ECC faculty and the ECC Academic Senate have no confidence in the implementation of the collegial consultation process and shared governance at El Camino College; and,

RESOLVED, the ECC Academic Senate requests that the ECC Board of Trustees direct its designees to work along-side the Senate to request ~~the~~ problem-solving **“issue resolution” service** ~~technical assistance~~ from ~~a~~ **the** Community College League of California and Academic Senate of California Community Colleges ~~task force~~ **technical assistance program**.

Comment [t6]: The changes in this resolved clarify the services that are being requested by the Senate.

Board Policy 4225

Course Repetition

The president or designee will have the authority to develop and implement policy and procedures with regards to repeatable and non-repeatable courses within the district. Such policies and procedures will be developed in mutual agreement with the Academic Senate and in accordance with state, federal and/or district regulations.

Comment [t1]: This statement was added in to reinforce and ensure the Senate role in consultation (as per Senate discussion in the March 20, 2012 meeting).

Students may repeat a *non-repeatable* course in which they have received a substandard grade (D, F, NP or NC) or *Withdrawal (W)* only once *before college intervention. After college intervention, if a student received another substandard grade or Withdrawal (W) the student may repeat the non-repeatable course for a second repeat or (third attempt).*

Repeatable courses, such as activity courses, may be repeated per the education code and the district policy. ~~*A student may repeat a repeatable course in which they have received a substandard grade (D, F, NP or NC) or Withdrawal (W) only twice before college intervention. After college intervention, if a student received another substandard grade or Withdrawal (W) the student may repeat the repeatable course for a third repeat or fourth attempt.*~~

~~*Repeatable courses, such as, activity courses may be repeated per the education code and the district policy.*~~

For repeatable and non-repeatable courses, the new grade and credit will be substituted for the prior grade and credit in computing the grade point average (GPA) for a maximum of two times alleviations. ~~and the~~ The permanent academic record will be annotated in such a manner that all work remains legible, insuring a true and complete academic history.

~~*In general, students and not permitted to repeat courses in which they have earned a grade of A, B, C, or CR.*~~

~~*Students who have received a W in a course are permitted to re-enroll in that course two or more times, for a total of three enrollments.*~~

Specific exceptions to the above policies are detailed in administrative procedures.

This policy supersedes the section of BP 4220 (Standards of Scholarships) dealing with Course Repetition.

Spring 2012, revised

Procedures for implementing the policy will be developed with collegial consultation ~~with the Academic Senate, as defined with the Academic Senate, as defined~~ in CCR § 53200.

Reference Title 5, Sections 55761-55765, 55040, 55041, 55042, 55253, **55024 (A)(11)** and 56029

El Camino College
Adopted: 7/17/06

First reading in the Senate – March 20, 2012

Comment [t2]: The phrase “with the Academic Senate” was removed from the Board Policy. The Educational Policy Committee put it back into the policy. Even if consultation with the Senate is implied, they preferred to see it included directly in the language.

Students may retake a non-repeatable course in which they have one unsuccessful attempt only once without college intervention. An unsuccessful attempt occurs when a student receives a Withdrawal (“W”) or a substandard grade (D, F, NP or NC). Students may retake a non-repeatable course in which they have two unsuccessful attempts only after completing college intervention. Repeatable courses may be repeated per the education code and the district policy.

In general, students are not permitted to repeat courses in which they have earned a grade of A, B, C, or CR except as described below in section VI for Special Circumstances.

I. Non-Repeatable Courses

Non-Repeatable courses are those listed in the College Catalog that do not have lowercase letters in the course number. (Examples of non-repeatable courses include History 101, English 1A, and Psychology 9B.)

A. Original Attempt (first)

1. If a substandard grade or a “W” is received, the student may retake that course.
2. If a student receives a passing grade, a retake is not allowed unless provided under special circumstances.

B. Second Attempt

1. If a student receives a substandard grade or a “W” on the first attempt, a second attempt or a retake is permissible.
2. A passing or substandard grade received in the retake (second attempt) shall replace the original grade in the calculation of the grade point average. This will be annotated on the student’s academic transcript.
3. The original grade, alleviated by the new grade, must remain on the student’s academic transcript.
4. If a “W” is received on the second attempt, no grade alleviation would apply.

C. Third Attempt

1. If a student attempts a non-repeatable course two times (the original attempt and the retake) and in both attempts the student receives either a substandard grade or a “W” or a combination, then the student may be permitted a second retake or third attempt **with the completion and approval of college intervention plan.**

2. A passing or substandard grade received in the third attempt or second retake shall replace the grade received in the first retake or second attempt in the calculation of the grade point average.
3. The new grade shall be annotated on the student's academic transcript.
4. The original grade, alleviated by the new grade, must remain on the student's academic transcript.
5. If a "W" is received on the second attempt, no grade alleviation would apply.

D. College Intervention

Students with two unsuccessful attempts must submit a Plan for Student Success signed by ~~an~~ district division designee or counselor along with the repeat petition.

II. Repeatable Courses

Repeatable courses are those listed in the College Catalog that have lowercase letters in the course number. Examples of repeatable courses include Art 10ab, Dance 87abcd, and Physical Education 5abc. In these examples, students may enroll in Art 10ab twice, Dance 87abcd four times, or PE 5abc three times.

A. Scope and Limitations of Repeatable Courses

1. A repeatable course is one in which either:
 - a) the course content differs each time or
 - b) the course is an activity course where the student meets course objectives by repeating a similar primary educational activity and the student gains an expanded educational experience each time the course is repeated for one of the following reasons:
 - (1) skills or proficiencies are enhanced by supervised repetition and practice within class periods or
 - (2) active participatory experience in individual study or group assignments is the basic means by which learning objectives are obtained.
2. An activity course, meeting the requirements as set forth above, may qualify as a repeatable course and may include:
 - a) physical education courses
 - b) visual or performing arts courses in music, arts, theater, or dance.
3. Foreign language courses, ESL courses and nondegree applicable basic skills course are not considered activity courses.
4. Students may repeat a course for a maximum of three semesters (four attempts total) or the maximum number of times the course has been approved for repetitions. Substandard grades and "W" earned each count as an attempt.

B. Substandard Grade Alleviation

1. If a substandard grade has been recorded in a repeatable course, the course may be retaken for grade alleviation, provided that the repeat does not exceed the maximum number of times the course may be attempted with a passing or substandard grade.
2. No more than two substandard grades may be alleviated for a repeatable course.
3. If a substandard grade is recorded on the last allowable attempt in a repeatable course, the following applies:
 - a) That last grade cannot be alleviated, and
 - b) lapse of time can never be used for that course

Note: Extenuating circumstances described in section VI.B below do not apply to repeatable courses. A student may not petition on the grounds of extenuating circumstances for a repeatable course.

III. Variable Unit Courses

Title 5 regulations shall guide El Camino College on variable unit courses.

IV. Withdrawals

A. Withdrawal From a Course

1. Students who are withdrawn from a course after the census date shall receive a “W” on their transcript.

B. Military Withdrawals

1. Military withdrawals shall not be counted towards the permitted number of withdrawals or attempts.
2. A student who is a member of an active or reserve United States military service may receive a military withdrawal when the student receives orders from the military.
3. The orders must be verified by the Veterans’ Services Office with appropriate documentation provided by the student.
4. The military withdrawal may be assigned at any time.
5. The symbol for military withdrawals shall be “MW.”
6. Military withdrawals shall not be counted in progress probation or dismissal calculations.

7. Neither an “F” nor an “FW” can be assigned in lieu of a military withdrawal.

C. Withdrawal Due to Extraordinary Conditions

1. A “W” will not be assigned to any student who withdrew from one or more classes where such withdrawal was necessary due to:
 - a) fire
 - b) flood
 - c) other extraordinary conditions such as:
 - (1) earthquake
 - (2) riot
 - (3) terrorism
 - (4) acts of war
 - (5) other consequential and significant acts

V. Special Circumstances

A. Significant Lapse of Time

1. Lapse of time is determined by the nature of the course—i.e. skill, knowledge, technology.
2. A student may petition *with the appropriate division* for significant lapse of time.
3. A student will forfeit significant lapse of time if:
 - a) Three substandard grades were received for non repeatable courses
 - b) The maximum number of attempts in repeatable course was reached and last attempt was substandard grade.
4. Lapse of time can only be used once *per course*.

B. Extenuating Circumstances

1. A student may petition to repeat a course for extenuating circumstances.
2. Extenuating circumstances are verified cases of accidents, illness, or other circumstances beyond the control of the student.
3. The student has the burden of proof to support a claim.
4. Extenuating circumstances may be used once for a non-repeatable course.
5. Extenuating circumstances cannot be used if the student has already used the course to obtain a degree at El Camino College or if the course was used in academic renewal.
6. Any approved extenuating circumstance petition, subsequently found based on fraudulent documentation, may be reversed. Submission of falsified documentation for extenuating circumstances shall result in the denial and may also result in student disciplinary action.

7. Final decision on extenuating circumstances will be made by admissions and records.

C. Special Classes for Students with Disabilities

1. Special classes designed for students with disabilities may be subject to extensions of repeatability in certain circumstances. Repetition may be authorized based on a case by case determination related to the student's educational limitation pursuant to state and federal non-discrimination laws.
2. The determination must be based on one of the following circumstances as specified in Title 5, Section 56029.
 - a) when continuing success of the student in other general and/or special classes is dependent on additional repetitions of a special class
 - b) when additional repetitions of a specific class are essential to completing a student's preparation for enrollment into other regular or special classes
 - c) when the student has an educational contract which involves a goal other than completion of the special class in question and repetition of the course will further achievement of that goal.
3. Previous grades and credits will be disregarded in computing the student's grade point average each time the course is repeated, **however the original grade, alleviated by the new grade, must remain on the student's academic transcript.** Therefore, only the most recent grade will be computed in the student's grade point average.

D. Legally Mandated Training

1. Cooperative Work Experience Education
Students may earn up to a total of 16 units, subject to the following limitations
 - a) General Work Experience Education - A maximum of six units may be earned during any one term
 - b) Occupational Work Experience Education - A maximum of eight units may be earned during any one term
2. Contractual Legally Mandated Training
Course repetition shall be permitted, without petition, in instances when such repetition is necessary for a student to meet a legally mandated training requirement as a condition of continued paid or volunteer employment. Such courses must conform to all attendance accounting, course approval, and other requirements imposed by applicable provisions of law. Such courses may be repeated for credit

any number of times. The governing board of a district may establish policies and procedures requiring students to certify or document that course repetition is necessary to complete legally mandated training pursuant to the California Code of Regulations.

VI. Other Provisions

A. Post Degree Grade Alleviation

Grade repetition to alleviate a grade or academic renewal after a degree has been earned at El Camino College is not allowed. Once a degree or certificate has been issued no form of grade alleviation or grade change can take place.

B. Grade Alleviation with Courses from Other Colleges

Grade alleviation with courses from other colleges will be allowed provided the following conditions are met:

- 1) the course is from a regionally accredited college
- 2) the course is comparable
- 3) the course is of equal value in units

Grade alleviation with a course from other colleges cannot take place if:

- 1) Three substandard grades have been received in a non-repeatable El Camino College course. ***However, the*** course may be used for subject credit to meet prerequisites ***and*** the course will count toward graduation subject requirements.
- 2) The student had reached the maximum number of attempts in a repeatable course and the grade in the final attempt was substandard.

Administrative Procedure 4231

Grade Change

Grades are determined by the instructor of a course. Both state law and college policy state that the determination of a grade by the instructor is final, in the absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency.

Most instances of incorrect grades are due to a mistake of some kind, such as a recording error or an error calculating an average. State law and college policy allow these mistakes to be corrected. The state law also provides that the college must have a policy for dealing with the very rare instances when a grade should be changed because it was recorded because of fraud, bad faith or incompetency.

In most cases of an error, the instructor can correct the grade once it has been pointed out. A student who believes an error has been made may meet or correspond with the instructor directly and the instructor can initiate the administrative process of correcting the grade. This is described in Part I B of this Administrative Procedure.

Comment [t1]: Added by Ed Policies 3/27/12 for accuracy.

A student may also begin the process with the submission of a Grade Change Petition. It is important to know that a petition submitted more than 18 months after the original grade was recorded cannot be approved.

A Grade Change Petition submitted within the time specified will be considered by the instructor of the course. This process is described in Part I C of the Administrative Procedure.

Comment [t2]: Added by Ed Policies 3/27/12 for accuracy.

When the Grade Change Petition is denied, the student may seek a review by an Appeal Panel; the procedure for submitting an appeal is described in Part I D of this Administrative Procedure.

Comment [t3]: Added by Ed Policies 3/27/12 for accuracy.

The VPAA can initiate grade changes in the event of documented fraud. This process is described in Part II of this Administrative Procedure.

Comment [t4]: Added by Ed Policies 3/27/12 to include Part II in this overview description.

Part I. Grade Change Petitions and Appeals.

A. Grounds for requesting or appealing for a grade change.

A student can request or appeal for a grade change only if the grade is incorrect due to mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency.

B. Informal Grade Change Request

If a student believes that a mistake was made in computing or recording a grade, he or she may contact the instructor directly to ask the instructor to review the grade records and make the correction. A mistake in a grade can be corrected by the instructor. Occasionally, the student may prefer to ask the instructor's Dean rather than asking the instructor. However, the Dean may not change the grade in response to an informal request; only the instructor can order the grade change in response to an informal request and only if the request is made within the time limits set by this procedure.

B.1. Making the Request

A student who believes that a grade is incorrect because of a mistake may inform the instructor of the course or the Dean who supervises the instructor. If the Dean is informed, he/she may discuss the request with the student and instructor, separately or together. The student may decline to meet with the instructor.

B.2. Response to Request

If the instructor agrees to change the grade, he/she may file a Grade Change Order with the Admissions and Records Office, explaining the change. The Grade Change Order requires the Dean to verify that the change is permitted by college policy. The Admissions and Records Office shall change the student's grade record and preserve a copy of the Grade Change Order. If the instructor decides not to change the grade, he/she should inform the student directly.

B.3. Time limit

The Grade Change Order, in response to an informal request for a grade change, must be submitted to the Division Office by the instructor no later than eighteen months after the last day of the term for which the grade was given.

C. Grade Change Petition

A student may file a Grade Change Petition whether or not he/she has pursued an informal grade change request.

C.1. Filing a Grade Change Petition

A student who alleges that a grade in a course was given as a result of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency may file a Grade Change Petition with the Admissions and Records Office, using the Grade Change Petition form. The student must state the grounds for the petition and include supporting documentation. The Grade Change Petition form is available at the Admissions and Records Office.

C.2. Time Limit for Submitting a Petition.

A Grade Change Petition must be received by the Admissions and Records Office no later than eighteen months after the last day of the term for which the grade was given.

C.3. Response to Filing

The Admissions and Records Office shall provide the Grade Change Petition to the instructional Dean for the division in which the course was offered. Upon receipt, the Dean may discuss the request with the student and instructor, separately or together. The student may decline to meet with the instructor and/or the Dean. The Dean shall forward the Grade Change Petition to the instructor and direct the instructor to act on the petition. The instructor shall then review the Petition within thirty days, decide whether or not to change the grade, and provide an explanation for the action. The Dean will verify that the action is permitted by college policy. The Admissions and Records Office shall notify the student of the action and preserve a copy of the Grade Change Petition.

C.4. Special Circumstances

The procedure described here shall be used in the following circumstances:

- (a) If the instructor is unavailable to respond to the Grade Change Petition within the time limit; or
- (b) If, at the time the Grade Change Petition is filed, the student has filed, in accordance with District procedures, a discrimination complaint against the instructor; or
- (c) If, at the time the Grade Change Petition is filed, the Dean determines that it is possible there has been gross misconduct by the instructor.

In such circumstances, the Dean, in consultation with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, shall appoint an alternate instructor to review and act upon the Petition. The alternate shall be in the discipline of the course or in a related discipline. In the event that no qualified instructor is on the faculty, the Dean, in consultation with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, shall arrange for a qualified consultant.

D. Grade Appeal*

If the instructor's response to the Grade Change Petition is not acceptable to the student, the student may file a Grade Appeal to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Before filing a grade appeal, the student must have submitted a formal Grade Change Petition to the appropriate Dean. The Grade Appeal shall consist of

- (a) The Grade Appeal Form stating the grounds for the appeal,
- (b) Allegation of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency,
- (c) A copy of the Grade Change Petition showing the instructor's decision, and
- (d) Supporting documentation.

The Grade Appeal Form is available at the office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

D.1. Time Limit for Submitting an Appeal

The Grade Appeal must be filed with the Vice President of Academic Affairs no later than thirty calendar days following the receipt of the instructor's response to the formal Grade Change Petition.

D.2. Pre-Hearing Communication

The Vice President of Academic Affairs or a designee may meet with the student, the instructor, or other persons, to facilitate communication between the student and the instructor and to determine the factual basis for the appeal.

D.3. Pre-Hearing Denial Review

The Vice President of Academic Affairs or designee may determine that the student's appeal submission does not state an allegation of mistake, fraud, bad faith or incompetency; or does not provide sufficient documentation or evidence to support an allegation. Upon this determination, the Vice President of Academic Affairs or designee may deny the appeal or request further documentation from the student.

Comment [t5]: "Review" used by Ed Policies 3/27/12 because the pre-hearing does not necessarily result in denial. Students may be asked to provide further documentation.

Comment [t6]: Added by Ed Policies 3/27/12 to clarify the Pre-Hearing process.

D.4. Grade Appeal Panel: Composition

When a Grade Appeal is filed with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, a Grade Appeal Panel shall be appointed within thirty calendar days, unless the Vice President of Academic Affairs or designee has denied the appeal (section D.3.). The Panel shall consist of the following:

- (a) An instructional Dean chosen by the Vice President of Academic Affairs other than the Dean of the Division in which the disputed grade was given.
- (b) An instructor, chosen by the President of the Academic Senate, from the discipline of the course in which the disputed grade was given, or a related discipline; and

(c) A student chosen by the President of the Associated Students Organization.

The Panel shall be chaired by the Vice President of Academic Affairs or a designee; the chair shall be a non-voting member of the Panel. All matters considered by the Grade Appeal Panel shall be treated as confidential by members of the Panel.

D.5. Grade Appeal Panel: Hearing

Within 30 calendar days of empanelment, the Grades Appeal Panel shall review the Grade Appeal, including all documents submitted by the student and other documentation it considers relevant. The Grade Appeal Panel shall conduct a hearing prior to making a determination on the outcome of the grade appeal. Both the student and the instructor shall be notified of the day and time of the hearing and invited to attend. Both the student and the instructor will be provided an opportunity to make a statement and to be asked questions. The student may be accompanied by an advisor. The advisor may be a faculty member or a student. The advisor may be present to advise the student, but may not ask or answer questions. The instructor may be accompanied by an advisor. The advisor may be a faculty member or a representative of the faculty union. The advisor may be present to advise the instructor, but may not ask or answer questions. The Grade Appeal Panel may make a recording of the hearing, which may be consulted during the Panel's deliberation.

D.6. Grade Appeal Panel: Decision

Following its hearing, the Panel shall deliberate and make findings by majority vote. The burden of proof is on the student. The Panel may sustain or deny all, some, or none of the allegations in the Grade Appeal. The Panel may find that the disputed grade is incorrect because of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency; in such case, the Panel may determine the new grade to be assigned. The Appeal Panel shall issue its findings and recommendation to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, who shall inform the appealing student, the instructor, and the appropriate Dean. The decision of the Grade Appeal Panel is final. The Vice President of Academic Affairs will notify the instructor of the Grade Appeal Panel's recommendation. If the Panel recommends a grade change, the Vice President of Academic Affairs will direct the instructor to submit a grade change to the Admissions and Records Office. In the event that the instructor of record is unable or unwilling to process the grade change within a reasonable time, the Vice President of Academic Affairs shall form a group of faculty to issue a grade change.

E. Expunging of changed grade

When a grade is changed in accordance with this procedure, the original incorrect grade shall be expunged from the student's record.

Part II. Changing grades in cases of fraud

A. Instructor fraud

1. The Vice President of Academic Affairs may determine, based on credible evidence such as the faculty discipline process, legal findings, or other statements or documentation, that a grade was assigned by an instructor in a fraudulent manner. This determination may be made without any regard to time limit.
2. Upon such determination, the Vice President, in consultation with the Dean supervising the course in which the grade was assigned, shall appoint an alternate instructor to assign a replacement grade. The alternate shall be in the discipline of the course or in a related discipline. In the event that no qualified instructor is on the faculty, the Dean, in consultation with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, shall arrange for a qualified consultant.
3. In changing the grade, the alternate instructor shall consider all evidence of the student's actual performance in the course and all proper student discipline required.
4. If the alternate instructor is unable to determine the actual performance of the student in the course, then, in consultation with the Dean, may recommend to the Vice President that the grade for the course be removed. The Vice President has the authority to remove the grade from the student's record.
5. Following the determination that a grade was assigned in a fraudulent manner, the action to change or remove the grade shall be taken within a reasonable time.
6. In cases of fraud, both the instructor of record and the student shall be notified of the grade change.

Comment [t7]: This phrase was moved earlier in the sentence to emphasize that the VPAA's decision is expected to be evidence based. The intention of the section has not been altered.

B. Student fraud

1. In cases where fraud by a student is alleged, the allegation may be addressed in accordance with BP 5500 and AP 5520. No time limit on the initiation of such action shall apply.

* All time limits are measured within the primary term.

3/23/12 Final edits received from the Deans and passed on to the Educational Policies Committee for review.

3/27/12 Approved by the Educational Policies Committee to be presented to the Senate.

4/3/12 First reading of the Senate.