**ECC Academic Senate Minutes**

**April 2, 2013**

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

Academic Senate President Gold called the fourth Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2013 semester to order on April 2, 2013 at 12:38pm. The meeting was held in the Alondra Room.

Approval of last Minutes:

[See pgs. 5-8 of packet] for minutes of the March 19, 2013 meeting. Michael Odanaka asked that under his report the credit for authoring the document titled “Programs at the Compton Center” go to David Vakil rather than himself since David was the primary author. This change was approved by the Senate.

**OFFICER REPORTS**

**Academic Senate President’s report – Christina Gold (CG)**

CG reported that the College Council had cancelled one meeting, but otherwise the group has been working on “Making Decisions at El Camino College” and they are close to finishing.

CG asked that we look over the minutes of the Enrollment Management Committee that could be found on pages 9-10. The Committee has been looking at the new enrollment priorities and the new procedures have been brought to different venues such as Dean’s Council and Ed Policies. The new Student Success Act has changed the registration priorities and now new in-district high school graduates who have completed assessment, orientation, and educational planning will be given a priority registration date even over continuing students. C. Jeffries noted that without counselors available in the summer this may be a problem, but J. Nishime stated that this process will be started in April when counselors are here. G. Castro remarked that she does orientations now throughout the summer especially for probation students.

CG asked for feedback on the new procedure being used for hiring committees in which letters of recommendation are no longer being asked for as part of the application process. There has been some concern regarding this new procedure especially among the Math faculty. The reasons Human Resources has given for this change are a) it is a workload issue and with over 20 positions being flown right now that could result in over 6000 letters being processed; b) these letters are usually only positive anyways; c) some good applicants might get disqualified if we required the letters of recommendation, but for some reason which could be no fault of their own, the letter was never received. CG added that reasons she can see why it would be important to keep them is a) they provide a personal sense of the candidate; and b) the committee can sometimes read between the lines of a letter to decide if it really is a stellar recommendation or not. Much discussion followed. M. Ichinaga said she was surprised that last fall when Staff Development was conducting the “Getting the Job” workshop they were told of this change in policy. MI felt that the letters should still be allowed and thought that they were only optional anyways. MI doesn’t buy the workload issue and asked if references are still not required and the answer was yes. J. Simon suggested that maybe they ask for letters only from the applicants that they know they are going to interview. K. Hall stated that if it is listed as optional then most candidates are still going to get them and now that the applications are on the on-line system, that is a lot of work for the reviewers to read through all those letters. P. Doucette felt the letters were helpful on the last panel he was on and felt they were noticeably absent this year. Previously sometimes the letters were used to decide whether to interview someone or not.

CG brought up the fact that there really wasn’t an Administrative Hiring Committee procedure or process currently in place. There is a question as to who appoints members to this committee. The Union currently has one appointee, but there are two other faculty on the committees and currently it isn’t clarified as to who appoints those two. The contract states there is a policy, but in fact, there is only a draft policy available. This draft policy states that one member is appointed by the Union, one by the Senate and the third jointly by the Senate and the chair of the hiring committee. She asked if this policy should be prioritized. The selection of the Math dean’s committee was done by Dr. Arce, but all the appointees were good, so it really wasn’t an issue. A. Ahmadpour suggested that the chair get feedback from the divisions and the departments and each department select one and then reduce it down to one with a vote by the entire division. E. Barajas stated that the Math Department has diabolic forces within the division that no matter what is decided there will still be grumblings, so there should be a process in place. P. Doucette feels there should be a policy in place before the president hiring committee, but it was noted that there is a Board policy for the president, just not for the vice presidents or the deans. C. Jeffries recommended if there is already a draft then it should just be completed and brought to a vote.

**VP – Compton Educational Center report – Michael Odanaka (MO)**

MO provided us with a handout which outlined the Division Reorganization at the Center and was written by Barbara Perez and Keith Curry. As most everyone knows, Dr. Curry was appointed as the permanent CEO of the Center which everyone is happy there is now finally a permanent person on board. The faculty leadership is pleased with the appointment and MO thanked Dr. Arce and Chris Wells for their service on the hiring committee. With this finalization of the division reorganization nothing has changed much from the original proposal even though there was some vocal disagreement and it was decided it was best to just move forward. B. Perez felt the changes addressed the needs of underprepared students.

MO talked about the timeline for the SLO assessment and wasn’t concerned about the assessments actually getting done, but rather if there will be meaningful dialogue needed to actually improve the courses being assessed.

MO announced that David Vakil has accepted the position of Dean of Instruction at the Moreno Valley campus starting May 1st. Dave addressed the Senate and said that it was a difficult decision to leave El Camino, but really gave credit to the Senate for his growth and how everyone should take advantage of the opportunities this body has to benefit students. CG expressed her appreciation towards David for being very innovative and creative in dealing with change. MO personally thanked David and expressed his concerns of what they will do without him and thanked him for his support in his position as Senate President.

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

No report.

**VP – Educational Policies – Merriel Winfree (MW)**

No report.

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

MI referenced the minutes of the committee in the packet on pages 11-12. The committee is looking for new members and also a new co-vice president to start serving in Fall 13. It would be great to have new people and new ideas on the committee.

CG used this time to announce that there are a few VP positions open in the spring which includes Ed Policies, Finance, Secretary, Instructional Effectiveness and a president-elect since CG only has one more year left in her position as president.

**VP- Finance – Lance Widman (LW)**

LW expressed that he felt David Vakil was the best chairperson the PBC has ever had and credited him for being very creative.

LW asked people to read over the minutes of the PBC on pages 13-14 of the packet.

The following is a written report that LW provided to the secretary for the minutes: “As the dust has been settling in Sacramento regarding the Governor’s proposed 2013-14 State Budget and exactly what the passage of Prop 30 will mean for K-12 and community colleges in the budget, PBC has been spending much of its time and energies on the planning and accreditation issues, as can be seen from these minutes. For example, the on-going discussions about the linkage of program review with annual plans and the budget expenditures provided to carry out those plans based on program review. PBC is struggling with this topic to make sure that the message of our efforts is clear to accreditation.

The planning summit will be held on Friday, May 10th, invitations will be forthcoming. Please attend if your schedule allows.

pp. 15-16: The PBC Planning and Budgeting Calendar: March and April are extremely busy months for the VPs and PBC, as you can see. Prioritizing area plans, development of the tentative Budget for PBC review, presenting prioritized area plans to PBC and Cabinet, finalizing planning and budget assumptions, and reviewing the Tentative Budget prior to being submitted to the Board in June. Definitely a very full plate for all of us.”

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

The first technology conference was held on March 22nd and it was very successful. There were 96 people in attendance including the vendors. There were some technical problems such as the internet crashing when everyone logged into the Ipads, but all in all it was a very worthwhile event.

The Faculty Technology Survey will be available soon and there will be a final viewing of the survey at the next meeting on Tuesday, May 28th at 12:30pm in the Stadium Room. If anyone wants something specific included on the survey, please send those suggestions to either PM or Irene Graff.

**VP – Instructional Effectiveness – Janet Young (JY)**

JY directed us to pages 17-18 in the packet which is a letter from Chris Gold to Dr. Arce regarding revisions to the Academic Program Review template. As agreed upon, the CurricUNET program review module will no longer be used due to technical difficulties, but the old paper template used in 2011 will be utilized since it is felt it yielded higher quality program reviews with more detail and reflection. This will be facilitated by more detailed styles of questions and requiring programs to set standards and goals in student achievement. The template also enhances the Assessment and SLO section which allows for more detailed alignment between course, program and institutional learning outcomes which accreditation is looking for. The strategic initiatives will be incorporated in the prioritized list of recommendations for more seamless use of the program review recommendations in Plan Builder. The draft of the “Academic Program Review Materials” was compiled by C. Gold with advice from JY and Joshua Rosales of Institutional Research. The Academic Review committee will make final comments and approve it and it will then be sent on to the Senate for their approval. Program review orientations were held for faculty authors and deans on Thursday, March 14 and Friday, March 15.

JY gave us an update on SLO’s and was pleased to announce that there has been progress. We will complete up to 97% of our assessments this spring and will get to 100% by the end of fall. Currently 100% of the divisions have SLO websites and alignment grids. The ACCJC recommends that assessments be accessible to the public which should include all SLO statements and reports for every course and programs. JY walked us through the website to find out where this information can be found. The program-level assessments are on the website and courses are highlighted that may have been linked to CurriCUNET to see the course SLO’s. JY also recommended that a link to the site page be included in the college catalog and D. Vakil stated that he believes it can be found on page 2 of the catalog. JY said ILO’s or Institutional Learning Outcomes are also available.

CG asked if the agenda could be reordered at this time to move BP/AP 4260 Prerequisites and Co-requisites above Special Committee Reports and being there was no objection this was done.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**BP/AP 4260 Prerequisites and Co-requisites**

Pgs. 26-35. This is the third reading with a correction to the collegial consultation language that puts it in alignment with an earlier Senate approved policy. C. Jeffries wondered if the reference to CurricUNET found on page 31 (6 of the procedure) should be included in the procedure since it is not known if this will be product that will always be used on our campus. D. Marston agreed and it was decided to remove it from the procedure. P. Marcoux moved that both the policy and procedure with the slight change be approved, it was seconded by M. Winfree and the motion passed unanimously.

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Academic Senate Distance Education Task Force**

The Academic Senate Distance Education Task Force Plan is outlined on pages 19-20 of the packet. The Task Force met on Friday, March 15th and identified problems to be resolved and clarified the role of the Task Force in regards to the Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC). It was decided that the Task Force will be advising the Senate. The main issue at hand is student contact and DEAC was asked for their recommendation for student contact based on the new requirements and this will be coming back to the Task Force in the near future. A “To Do List and Timeline” is outlined in the document through the end of the spring semester into the summer and where we should be by the fall. The Task Force is confident they are meeting authentication and contact requirements while maintaining instructional flexibility and optimal on-line learning. This will all be done through a process of cross-campus collegial consultation that creates more buy-in with the decision and further embeds accreditation into our campus conversations and processes.

**Senate Work Group: Institutional Student Achievement Standards**

Work group members and discussion can be found in the packet on pages 21-25. This group was formed out of concern that the standards were made without faculty input. The committee had to meet fast due to the quick turnaround for this report and there were some changes made which included modest lowering of retention and transfer standards. The work group expressed their appreciation for the openness to consult. M. Odanaka had some questions about the transfers as regards to students from the Center. I. Graff explained that the UC/CSU count all of the students the same, but internally there is quite a bit of overlap since pretty much all the students from the Center had to come to the Torrance campus at one time or other to take a class not offered at the Center.

**ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 1:36pm.
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