

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES
1 June 2010

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

Adjunct Faculty

Mangan, Michael(Hum) X

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 X

Counseling

Jackson, Brenda X

Jeffries, Chris X

Key, Ken

Pajo, Christina X

Fine Arts

Ahmadpour, Ali X

Bloomberg, Randall X

Crossman, Mark

Schultz, Patrick EXC

Wells, Chris X

Health Sciences & Athletics

Hazell, Tom

McGinley, Pat X

Rosales, Kathleen X

Humanities

Isaacs, Brent X

Marcoux, Pete X

McLaughlin, Kate X

Peppard, Bruce X

Simon, Jenny

Industry & Technology

Gebert, Pat X

Hofmann, Ed X

MacPherson, Lee X

Marston, Doug X

Learning Resources Unit

Striepe, Claudia X

Ichinaga, Moon X

Mathematical Sciences

Boerger, John

Fry, Greg X

Glucksman, Marc X

Taylor, Susan X

Yun, Paul X

Natural Sciences

Cowell, Chas

Herzig, Chuck X

Jimenez, Miguel X

Palos Teresa X

Vakil, David X

Academic Affairs

Chapman, Quajuana

ECC CEC Members

Evans, Jerome

Norton, Tom

Panski, Saul X

Pratt, Estina

Smith, Darwin

Assoc. Students Org.

Casper, Joshua

Safazada, Ana

Stokes, Philip

Begonia Guereca

Ex- Officio Positions

Arce, Francisco X

Nishime, Jeanie X

Shadish, Elizabeth

Kjeseth, Lars X

Guests and/Other Officers: Marci Myers, Carolyn Pinedo,

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

The 8th, and last, Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2010 semester was called to order at 12:34pm

Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes [pp. 10 -16 of packet] from the May 18th Academic Senate meeting were reviewed. Ms. Striepe noted that Dr. Glucksman had requested that the statement re: Minimum Qualifications – Mathematics be changed to read “DV received input from Dr. Glucksman just before the Academic Senate meeting that the Mathematics Department had not considered the proposal and did not have a chance to support or oppose it. Dr. Glucksman suggested to DV that the proposal be pulled and discussed at a Math Department meeting prior to review by the Academic Senate.”

Ms. Jeffries noted Mr. Key’s name in some instances was incorrectly stated as Keys not Key.

It was suggested the phrase “cotton on to” be changed to “catch on to”.

The minutes were approved as amended following a motion from Mr. Marcoux, seconded by Mr. Kjeseth.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

Postponed except for brief President’s report and Curriculum Chair announcement.

President’s report – Dave Vakil (henceforth DV)

[see pp. 5-7 of packet]

DV conducted a straw poll on whether the senators would **consider starting and finishing the AS meetings 10 minutes earlier?** The results of the hand count showed 11 in favor and 5 against the idea.

DV noted that the **Senate Survey** had been conducted and that he had summarized the results on page 7. DV noted that the survey had shown interest in hearing more Program Review highlights. DV asked for volunteers for next year’s Program Review highlights? Mr. Wells volunteered. It was suggested we ask Ms. Uyemura of the ESL department for the future. DV said to read the President’s report for more details of the survey results, and if anyone saw something in the survey results that deserved mention, to please let DV know.

Regarding a **Senate meeting @ Compton**, DV asked the senators whether we should have the meeting after Spring break at Compton every year? There were no objections from the Senate. DV mentioned as justifications the fact that there is usually little senate business to conduct at this time, and lots to report from Plenary, with two Plenary representatives (ECC & CEC)

DV mentioned that due to the full agenda, officer reports had been moved to the end.

DV noted that, following the example of past Senate Presidents Dever and Marcoux, he had included a list of Senate accomplishments for the past year [see pp8-9 of packet]

DV asked the Senators to rise according to the length of time they had served on the Senate. It was found that most senators had been serving less than 3 years. Mssrs. Marcoux and Vakil had served for nine years, Mr. Widman twenty years, and Mr. Marston twenty five years. DV said this should serve as encouragement for all senators to participate in the discussions and not feel that they had nothing to contribute.

Curriculum Committee – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

LK noted that all ECC course are now in compliance. “We did it!” LK said that the final curriculum meeting of the semester would be held later in the afternoon, and the minutes approved that would make it official. LK thanked all in the various Division committees for their hard work.

Ms. Ichinaga asked about the matter of suspending the by-laws to elect a successor to LK for position of Chair of the Curriculum Committee. LK said that he would address this issue again in the Fall semester.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Award – Dr. Chris Gold (CG)

Further discussion will be postponed until Fall.

Program Review – 4 Year Cycle Proposal

[See pp.30-31 of packet for schedule]

DV noted that the details of annual update have not changed since our review on May 4, 2010, and asked that we move to vote to adopt the 4-year schedule. Mr. Marcoux and Mr. Wells moved to approve. Mr. Marcoux asked if the Deans had seen and approved the details. DV said yes.

Ms. McGinley said that Nursing has an annual review and who should they send it to? Dr. Arce said that the Program Reviews are tracked by his office (Academic Affairs) and there is a committee that will be reviewing first drafts. The committee will give advice. The finished reviews will be posted on the Academic Affairs web site. DV noted that the committee would not generally look at annual reviews that are responsible to outside accrediting agencies – as with Nursing and the paralegal program for instance. These departments usually have their own processes in place.

Mr. Kjeseth mentioned the mock-up demonstrated at an earlier academic senate meeting by himself and Dr. Jaffe, noting that this mock-up would inform the program review and could be reviewed in the specific Division. Mr. Panski asked What is a Program? What is a Division? Are we not de facto accepting certain definitions if we accept this proposal? Mr. Marcoux said he thought we were only voting on the cycle issue. Dr. Arce said that we could get the definitions from Dr. Jaffe, and he thought they were linked by discipline. Mr. Marcoux asked whether student services would be on a four- year cycle too. Dr. Nishime said yes. DV noted the reason behind the proposal was that the ACCJC had noted in the last accreditation report that six years was a long time between Program Reviews, and that he had found out that El Camino was one of only a handful of community colleges who adhered to this long schedule. Mr. Kjeseth noted that CurricuNET would help the Program Review process.

It was voted in favor of approving the basic notion of moving to the four year cycle, but the schedule of programs and dates would need further review and discussion.

Academic Senate broke from the agenda for a 1:00pm presentation from the Counseling Department.

NEW BUSINESS

Basic Skills Intervention Presentation – Counseling

Dr. Margaret Quinones introduced the team and gave a historical overview. In 2008 Counseling went to Humanities and saw many students that were at a basic skills level, yet were self selecting courses. The Counselors wondered how they could help these students become successful, and came up with the intervention proposal. The intent was to prepare an atmosphere conducive to retention and student success at ECC. The intervention process has been pared down a little, from working initially with Humanities and Maths., the counselors now work mainly with

the Maths. Division. Dr. Quinones said that a part-time counselor had been added to help with this initiative, and she thanked Mr. Key and Dean Dr. Smith and the faculty in the classrooms for their contributions to the success of the program.

Dr. Lisa Raufman spoke next on College Resources and support programs important to Basic Skills Intervention. Dr. Raufman provided a handout of these resources. She noted that there were approximately 50 different support resources and programs, and that many students did not know about them. There is an online orientation, and Human Development classes. The counselors show the STARRS web site which lists all of the resources. They have found that students who use the services persist in school. Dr. Raufman quoted Dr. Tinto saying that students who use services then feel that they belong and feel that the college is a community.

Xiao Wang spoke on Financial Aid. She noted that one of the challenges the students face is a lack of financial support. The counselors come into the classrooms and encourage them to apply for financial aid and tell them of the variety of loans, scholarships and other funds available.

Valencia Rayford spoke on the College System Overview. This overview consists of a presentation on the important dates relating to drops, W, drop with Notation, the syllabus, etc. Students are surprised to hear it is their responsibility to drop, not that of the faculty.

Margaret Miranda spoke on the AA/AS/Certificate and Transfer Process. Many of the students are first-generation college students. Two informational sessions are provided. One is an introduction to the higher education system in California and how to transfer to a private college. The other provides information on what is required in order to get a Certificate, or an AA/AS degree and how to transfer to a 4 year school.

Rene Lozano spoke on the education planning process. He noted three goals – Educational goals entailing items like sequencing of classes, what “units” are and how they work, etc – Access goals, covering things like access to counseling appointments – and Success and Retention, to ensure that the students stay in school.

Sabra Sabio spoke on Registration and MyECC. This area tries to tie all the elements together. Students who go to the trouble of creating an educational plan tend to register. She tries to get them into a workshop and to login to a computer and see how to register. Students can register for two semesters at a time and this helps them with their planning and sequencing.

Arturo Martinez spoke on data. He showed a powerpoint chart detailing student success, persistence and improvement rates with and without counselor involvement. Involvement with counseling and support programs showed slight improvement in these areas and therefore the programs will continue to be funded.

Responding to a question about parent involvement Dr. Smith noted that there is a perception that a call from the College means that the student is in trouble. She also noted the privacy issues. It was noted that parents are invited to New Student Welcome Day, and an evening program is organized especially for parents in the Puente and Project Success programs. Last year books were purchased for parents in certain programs on assisting their students. Dr. Smith said she would look into extending this (if funding allowed) to all basic skills student parents. Mr. Ahmadapour wondered if it would be possible to create a digital/online parent handbook. Dr. Quinones welcomed the suggestion as something worthy of future exploration, but said that the key is to change student behavior. Mr. Firestone asked whether students who work were encouraged to take a realistic, less-than-full time load? Dr. Quinones said yes.

The Academic Senate returned to the agenda item Unfinished Business at this point.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – contd.

BP 4100 and AP 4100 – Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates – Education Policies Committee - Chris Jeffries (CJ)

[See pp. 32-34 of packet]

This is the Second reading. CJ noted that Mr. Robles and various invited students had given valuable input, and she thanked all concerned. CJ noted that there had been a previous question concerning the 12 unit residency requirement, and at the committee meeting she had presented the various residency requirements for local schools. This issue does not occur very often, however it has been addressed in the policy and procedures. Ms. Palos suggested a 20% residency and CJ noted that 12 units was form Title V. Ms. Palos suggested that that figure was a qualification not a resolution of the issue. Ms. Palos asked if the other college courses are comparable to ECC courses. CJ said that we must take it on trust that they are. Ms. Palos protested this notion, and CJ said that we had to be realistic in our approach. Mr. Widman asked for an explanation of general education as used in 1a i. CJ said it would be any course falling within general education requirements. CJ noted that she would like a vote on the issue today. Mr. Key noted that 1a iii should read “in which” not “in with”. CJ noted the correction. Mr. Hofmann said that certificates earned at ECC require 50% of the courses to be taken at ECC. CJ said that that is correct, but these statements were intended to refer to degrees only. Mr. Kjeseth noted that the 12 unit residency was a minimum figure. Particular AA/AS degrees were at liberty to require more, and approval to do so could be sought. CJ confirmed that this is true, and added that the school would now be tracking this issue, and the Policy and Procedure could be revised if this was thought to be necessary.

Mr. Key suggested adding the words “general education” to 1 b.

Ms. Palos noted that the top of the page read Board Policies...and DV said that this had slipped from the previous page and was just a formatting error.

A vote was called to approve the Policy and Procedure as amended. The vote was in favor with 4 nays. Dr. Arce thanked CJ for her patience and work in getting this through.

Mr. Marston called the vote out of order.

DV asked who was in favor of calling the question. The ayes were in the majority. There was another call to approve the Policy and Procedure. A vocal vote was taken, and DV also called for a show of hands. A hand vote count showed 20 ayes and 5 nays.

Curriculum Recommendation – Curriculum Committee – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

[see pg. 35 of packet] This constitutes the second reading of this issue.

LK said he would like to move forward on this for the sake of clarity and ease of articulation. LK reminded the senate that courses are much easier to articulate if the listed “required textbook” in the Course Outline of Record (COR) is no more than 5 years old.

LK had outlined a proposal whereby instructors would be asked to list a current text and use their classic texts as supplemental or required texts. LK drew Senate’s attention to a proposal beginning on line 24.

Ms. Jeffries asked if this statement would be included in the curriculum handbook. LK said that this was for articulation purposed and would be explained in the handbook. Ms. Jeffries said the handbook used to state “current edition”. LK noted that that statement used to be sufficient, but now the publication year was required. Ms. Taylor noted that this could mean changing the handbook language. LK said he had thought of this and was proposing to change the language to read “texts, supplementary readings and other materials”. Many courses do not have a textbook, but if they are general education courses they MUST have a textbook noted. Ms. Taylor noted that this might entail having to go into the Course Outline of Record. Dr. Arce noted that Ms. Suekawa has to resubmit classes for articulation from time to time and could notify the appropriate faculty. LK agreed saying that we should not jump in too hastily, but rely on Ms. Suekawa to alert us as needed. Mr. Yun stated that some Maths classes use a text by Ravenstein, even though the text is out-of-print, as it is so good. He feels it is important to point out to faculty that if a text is still good, they are at liberty to stick with it. LK said he would take these suggestions and work more on the language of the proposal.

Resolution of Appreciation for Dr. Jaffe

DV invited the senators to go the Dr. Arce's office and sign the resolution as soon as possible.

NEW BUSINESS contd.

SLOs and Adjunct Faculty Resolution

[See pg. 36 of packet] This is a single-reading resolution.

Feedback: Four possible whereas statements were submitted since publication of the packet, the last three by Mr. Kjeseth and/or jointly authored by the ALC.

1. WHEREAS ECC's response to the ACCJC's recommendation on SLOs and assessments includes mention of assigning adjunct faculty to work on SLOs and assessments and compensating them fairly for their work

2. WHEREAS no institutional planning and budgeting related to the education mission of El Camino College is compliant with California Education Code, Title 5 Regulations, and Accreditation standards without considering ongoing curriculum development and review, student learning outcomes and assessments, and program review conducted by qualified instructors,

3. WHEREAS for fulltime instructors, professional obligation work is limited in time and is compensated in accordance with the AGREEMENT between EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT and EL CAMINO COLLEGE FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,

4. WHEREAS the up-to-four hours per semester of professional activities time, for which part-time faculty are contractually compensated, is demonstrably insufficient to conduct quality curriculum development and review, student learning outcomes and assessments, and program review, let alone other professional obligations,

ECC had also noted in its response to the ACCJC 2009 October visit, on pg. 6 of the 10-15-2009 draft, that

- Plans are being developed to create student learning outcomes for courses that are only taught by adjuncts.
- Adjunct faculty will continue to be integrated into the campus SLO process through the academic senate, college SLO committee, the administration, and the ECCFT.

Dr. Simon was not able to be present, but Dr. Gold gave a bit of background, noting that while good progress has been made, there are still gaps in areas where adjuncts do most of the teaching. The above resolutions are an attempt to recognize that the SLO process involves a lot of work, and our desire to see the adjuncts compensated for this work. As full time faculty we have obligations to the college to justify the extra work.

Mr. Ahmadapour noted that some schools have obligatory duties for fulltime and part time faculty and thinks it should be the same at ECC. Dr. Shadish said that other schools represented a mixed bag and noted that SLOs are extra work for ALL of us. She felt that adjunct faculty should be compensated and noted that the college had been through mediation but that nothing had happened and there was currently no movement on the issue. DV felt it was better to focus on the academic aspects, and not on the contractual aspects of the issue. Mr. Panksi felt that this was an accreditation matter, and that (leaving the issue of compensation aside) adjuncts SHOULD be involved. Ms. Jeffries said it was hard to separate contract and academics in this case, She wondered if the case could be stronger if it were supported by the Union. DV said that Union action would have to be separate from Academic Senate action. Mr. Ahmadapour felt Senate should show it's support in this matter. Mr. Wells felt it could perhaps be stated as a negotiable issue, perhaps worded like "appropriate form of compensation". Dr. Arce noted concern at mixing academic and contractual matters. He noted that it is a fact that part timers need to be involved with SLOs. He noted that there is a grievance in place on this issue, and it would slowly work itself out through negotiation. He said that all who teach are spending more time on SLOs,

syllabi have grown to incorporate the SLOs. Dr. Arce felt the Senate should not get caught up in the compensation issue, as it would become politicized, yet he agreed it was important to support adjunct faculty. Mr. Widman disagreed. He felt that there are many 10+1 items that are also in the contract. He said that the academic senate has a primary responsibility and the Federation has a primary responsibility and sometimes they blend. Dr. Gold noted that the adjunct's primary role is in the classroom, yet they are now being asked to take on additional administrative responsibilities. She, too, felt they should be compensated. Mr. Kjeseth felt that any professional obligations should be compensated, and was concerned that the resolution language may not be broad enough. He felt that adjunct faculty should be compensated, or be allowed to give up something in another area in lieu of compensation. He asked about the quality of the adjunct faculty work re: SLOs and curriculum review if they were forced to do this without compensation, or given compensation only for one to four hours. Ms. McGinley asked if this was one to four hours a semester or a week? Mr. Kjeseth said per semester. Mr. Marston agreed that you get what you pay for.

DV noted that at this stage the Senate did not have enough members present for a quorum and so we could not vote on the issue today. This will be brought back in the Fall.

Program Viability, Intervention and Discontinuance Policy and Procedure.

[See pp. 37-43 of packet]

It was noted that this would constitute a "Progress report", or information item, not a "first reading." The authors are seeking feedback. We will have two more future readings.

DV decided to cancel the officer's reports as indicated in the last minutes.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Survey results from deans regarding thoughts on department chairs
- MAYBE: ARCC report data/summary
- MAYBE: Math minimum qualifications - pending discussion in Math department

PUBLIC COMMENT.

None.

The Academic Senate meeting was adjourned at 2:00pm
Cs/ecc2010