



Officers & Executive Committee

President	Christina Gold	Co-VPs Faculty Development	Briita Halonen & Moon Ichinaga
VP Compton Educ'l Center	Saul Panski	VP Finance and Special Projects	Lance Widman
Curriculum Chair	Jenny Simon	VP Academic Technology	Pete Marcoux
VP Educational Policies	Merriel Winfree	Secretary	Claudia Striepe
		VP Instructional Effectiveness	Kelly Holt

Senate Mailing List

<u>Adjunct</u>		<u>Health Sci & Athletics/Nursing</u>	<u>Natural Sciences</u>
	(1 yr term)		
	vacant	Tom Hazell*	Chuck Herzig
	12	13/14	11/12
	vacant	Kelly Holt	Miguel Jimenez
	12	13/14	11/12
		Mina Colunga	Teresa Palos*
		12/13	13/14
<u>Behavior & Social Sciences</u>		Kim Baily	Pete Doucette
Randy Firestone	11/12	13/14	12/13
Christina Gold	13/14	Tom Hicks (spring only)	_____(vacant)
Michelle Moen	11/12	13/14	
Lance Widman*	13/14		<u>Academic Affairs & SCA</u>
Michael Wynne	11/12		Francisco Arce
		<u>Humanities</u>	Karen Lam
		Brent Isaacs	Jeanie Nishime
		11/12	Claudia Lee
<u>Business</u>		Peter Marcoux*	
Phillip Lau	11/12	11/12	<u>Associated Students Org.</u>
Jay Siddiqui*	11/12	Kate McLaughlin	Rebekka Asher
_____(vacant)		11/12	Cindy Valdez
		Briita Halonen	
		11/12	
		Jenny Simon	
		11/12	
		<u>Industry & Technology</u>	
<u>Compton Educational Center</u>		Patty Gebert	
Darwin Smith	12/13	12/13	<u>President/Superintendent</u>
Chris Halligan	12/13	Harold Hofmann	Thomas Fallo
Tom Norton	12/13	12/13	
Saul Panski	11/12	Lee Macpherson	
Estina Pratt	12/13	12/13	<u>The Union</u>
		Douglas Marston*	Editor
		12/13	
		Merriel Winfree	
		12/13	
<u>Counseling</u>		<u>Learning Resource Unit</u>	<u>Division Personnel</u>
Cristina Pajo*	11/12	Moon Ichinaga	Jean Shankweiler
Sabra Sabio	13/14	13/14	Don Goldberg
Dexter Vaughn	13/14	Claudia Striepe*	Tom Lew
		13/14	Ken Key
		<u>Mathematical Sciences</u>	<u>Counseling</u>
<u>Fine Arts</u>		Michael Bateman	<u>Ex-officio positions</u>
Ali Ahmadpour	11/12	12/13	ECCFT President
Randall Bloomberg	11/12	Hamza Hamza	Elizabeth Shadish
Mark Crossman	11/12	13/14	Nina Velasquez
Patrick Schulz	11/12	Arkadiy Sheynshteyn	Curriculum Chair
Chris Wells*	11/12	11/12	Jenny Simon
		Susan Taylor*	CEC VP Elect
		11/12	Michael Odanaka
		Eduardo Barajas	<u>Institutional Research</u>
		13/14	Irene Graff
			Carolyn Pineda

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	Compton Board Room
April 17	Alondra Room
May 1	Alondra Room
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		5-11
C. OFFICER REPORTS	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	A. Resolution of No Confidence Task Force The Task Force will report on and seek feedback from the entire faculty body on the <i>Resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of Collegial Consultation at El Camino College</i> . This resolution had a first reading at the Feb. 21, 2012 Senate meeting when it was determined that the next meeting would be a plenary session of all faculty to discuss the resolution. After further revision based on discussions at the plenary session, the resolution will go back to the Senate for a second reading.	12-23
E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS		
F. NEW BUSINESS		
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
21st February 2012

Adjunct Faculty

Sue Ellen Warren
Leah Pate

Behavioral & Social Sciences

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

Business

Siddiqui, Junaid X
Lau, Philip S X
VACANT

Counseling

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

Fine Arts

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

Health Sciences & Athletics

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

Humanities

Isaacs, Brent X
Marcoux, Pete X
McLaughlin, Kate X
Halonen, 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
Taylor, Susan X
VACANT
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 X
Lee, Claudia
Lam, Karen

ECC CEC Members

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

Assoc. Students Org.

Asher, Rebekka
Valdez, Cindy

Ex- Officio Positions

Guests, Dean's Rep, Visitors:

Carolyn Pineda,

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

The first 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.6-12 of packet]The minutes of the December 6th meeting were approved as written.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

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

- [See pg 14 of packet] CG reported on discussion at the **College Council meeting of December 12th**. CG noted that the minutes did not adequately reflect the content of the meeting, and that there had been some heated discussion pertaining to collegial consultation and the requested ASCCC/CCLC visit. President Fallo favors an informational visit, while CG favors a problem solving visit. Dr. Arce has since pit in for an informational visit via online channels. Please give Cg feedback via email as to who the intended audience for the visit should be – academic senate officers and administrators, college-wide audience, etc.
- [See pp 15-19 of packet] CG reported on the Council of Deans meeting of December 8th, 2011 and January 12th, 2012, noting that a lot of information had been conveyed at the meetings.

BP 4225 Course Repetition needs review and will be moving through the Ed. Policies Committee. Dr. Simon noted that Course Repetition should not be confused with Repeatability. Course Repetition allows for a course to be taken again (limit 3 times) due to a poor grade.etc.

The Field Trip Policy is also undergoing review. This is a complex issue due to the array of types of trips, and legal issues. CG noted that there was talk of trying to simplify things, but for now CG advised faculty thinking of arranging a field trip to talk to their Deans first. She noted it may be easiest to state that the class period will be held at an “alternative class site.”

VP Compton Education Center - Saul Panski (SP)

No report - requested to speak later in the agenda.

Curriculum Committee – Jenny Simon (JS)

No report, but a future report can be expected on BP 4260 Prerequisites. JS noted that the rules on setting prerequisites have loosened, but the Curriculum Committee feels there still needs to be some data driven guidelines.

VP Educational Policies Committee – Merriel Winfree (MW)

MW reported that the Committee is seeking new members. She noted that the Committee meets the 2nd and 4th Tuesday of every month from 12:30 - 2:0pm in Student Services 106. Currently there are only 5 members. Please email MW if interested in serving.

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

BH reported that the **Getting the Job Workshop Part 2** “The Interview Process” will be held February 24th 12:30 – 2:00pm. This is aimed primarily at adjunct faculty.

BH further reported that the Faculty Book Club would be running again, but the role of facilitator was still in flux.

MI noted that an email regarding the “California Reads” program would be forthcoming. Additional activities for this program have been planned, and it is not too late for faculty to participate. Excerpts from the titles for student readings can be organized via ERes..

Spring Flex day had featured a demonstration of the online reporting of Flex hours. If anyone has trouble with the system, please let BH or MI know, and they can pass the concerns along to Donna Manno.

VP Finance – Lance Widman (LW)

No report.

VP Academic Technology Committee – Pete Marcoux (PM)

PM noted that many faculty webpages are out of date and asked the Senators to remind their Divisions to update the pages or remove them. This is important for accreditation.

PM reported that the Campus Technology Committee would be meeting today at 2pm, and the Academic Technology Committee has still to set dates for meetings.

VP Instructional Effectiveness – Kelly Holt (KH)

KH noted that the Accreditation report will highlight the import of SLO work. SLO work can all be done via CurricUNET now, and while CurricUNET is not as user friendly as one could hope, one does get used to the quirks. CurricUNET/SLO training will be held this week in the Staff Development Lab on Friday and Program Review on CurricUNET on Thursday.

KH noted that one can sign up for these sessions online via FlexReporter. Mr. Norton asked if the training sessions could be repeated and KH said she would arrange this, but noted that Compton is not using CurricUNET for Program Review, only for SLO work, as programs at Compton do not mirror ECC programs.

CG made a request to reorder the agenda to present a **Resolution of Appreciation to Professor Jason Suarez** who had to leave shortly to teach a class.

Dean Miranda spoke briefly about Prof. Suarez’s work at ECC beginning in 2001. He has been a dedicated historian, teaching world history to students in such a way as to engage many learning styles, and spends much time and energy helping students learn. Prof. Suarez has been a State-wide Basic Skills Committee member, and works with other committees on and off-campus.

CG read the Resolution of Appreciation and presented it to Prof. Suarez, and noted that the Academic Senate would nominate Prof. Suarez for the State-wide Straub Diversity Award.

Prof. Suarez offered his thanks.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Calendar Committee Report:

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 has convened three subcommittees to gather information in the areas of Efficiency, Economy, and Academics. Information compiled by the committees will be presented at the March Board meeting. Mr. Wells requested that the compiled information also be brought to the Senate. Dr. Nishime agreed there would be an opportunity to do so as the Senate March meeting was the Tuesday before the Board meeting.

ECCFT Report:

Dr. Shadish was not present to provide a report.

Accreditation Report – Dr. J. Nishime:

[See extra handout provided – letter dated February 1, 2012]

ECC presented a mid-term report in October of 2011. The Commission met in January and later sent the letter as their response to the mid-term report. ECC is being asked to respond to 5 recommendations:

1. Planning and Budgeting
2. SLOs
3. Online Courses and appropriate rigor of same.
4. SLO assessments present in faculty evaluations – currently the campus provides this information in the self-assessment portion of the evaluation packet.
5. Fiscal management planning. This portion states that conditions at Compton could negatively affect ECC. Dr. Nishime has requested more clarification on this statement.

Dr. Nishime noted that once recommendations have been made, a campus has 2 years to correct the “problem”. ECC has been removed from warning, but this letter states that ECC and the CEC must meet the standards mentioned above. While it is recognized that we do have some issues, Dr. Nishime felt it not certain that we could meet the October deadline.

Dr. Nishime noted that re: Planning, she is not sure that we are at a sustainable level, noting that activity in this area needs to be ratcheted up. Thus more training sessions will be held at ECc and the CEC. These sessions will mainly be intended for managers.

Dr. Arce noted re: SLO’s, that with the transition to CurricUNET we have seen a drop in activity. He noted that much SLO work is incomplete and more of an effort must be made to update the work, and show how we are using SLO assessment to make changes. The campus should make the SLOs a more authentic activity, rather than just a compliance process.

Re: SLO Assessment and faculty evaluations, Dr. Arce noted that on the last site visit the Accreditation team had sampled faculty self-evaluations. There were some outstanding examples, but others are not, and faculty must work to make them more meaningful. Dr. Arce emphasized that Accreditation teams do read the SLO portions of the self-evaluations, as they are felt to be very important in making a better teaching/learning institution.

Dr. Nishime acknowledged that the Fiscal management issue will be difficult, noting that there has been a lot of turnover at the CEC, and that there had been a period with a Special Trustee that had not been beneficial to the college. However, she noted that it was fortunate that Mr. Henry had returned and he had good relationships with many parties.

Dr. Nishime reported that we must respond to this letter, and she has a timeline that she will take to the Board, and she is currently looking for a Compton co-chair to prepare a response that she hopes will be ready by June.

Mr. Panski reported that the CEC is in active discussion on the issues, he noted that the CEC had gotten an unqualified audit, which is good news, but will need to hire a Special Financial Officer., and the CEC CEO is developing a plan to revamp the financial area. Mr. Panski noted that the Special Trustee has been very active, and the CEC believes they can meet the recommendations. As regards SLO assessment and Program Review at the CEC, Mr. Panski feels that progress has been made in this area, but one problem is that there are many disciplines where programs are taught only be adjuncts. Incentives are being offered in these areas to get the SLO work done. Mr. Panski reported that, realizing there is a lot of work to do, meetings are being called for the faculty re: SLO work.

Mr. Marcoux asked Dr. Arce to provide examples for the faculty of the outstanding self-evaluations re: SLO work, and Dr. Arce agreed, saying it is important to have models. Ms. Halonen agreed with the request, noting that there has been little guidance in this area.

Mr. Crossman said that it was his recollection that when the ECC/Compton partnership had been proposed many had had concerns, but we had been told that ECC would be held harmless, and was this correct? Dr. Arce replied that in essence it is correct, it is in the Memorandum of Understanding that ECC could terminate the partnership, but things were not as simple as that.. Dr. Arce noted that ECC could still be put on sanction, and we would still have to undergo a process to extricate ECC from the partnership. Mr. Crossman asked why did ECC then agree to this. Dr. Arce noted that in the

interim guidelines have changed and become stricter. Earlier we were not held to the 2-year requirement, and this has changed. Mr. Crossman asked whether ECC has anything in writing to hold us harmless. Dr. Arce answered No, only the Memorandum of Understanding, and our only option would be to withdraw.

Mr. Wells asked if the ACCJC thus trumps the Memorandum of Understanding? Mr. Crossman asked if anyone had ever discussed this possibility.

Dr. Nishime noted that if we withdraw ECC is not obligated to find another partner for the CEC. Dr. Arce noted though that if ECC terminated the contract, ECC would have to make some arrangements, and be intermediaries while the termination process was worked through.

Mr. Panski noted that the CEC was working through its problems and that ECC should concentrate on its own shortcomings.

It was noted, in reply to a question from Mr. Ahmadapour, that colleges often get recommendations, and it is not an unusual situation. What is unusual is our unique relationship with the CEC..

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

CG asked to postpone the items

BP/AP 4025 Philosophy for Associate Degree & General Education (second reading) and Nominations for Adjunct Senators. Senate President, and Co-VP Faculty Development and move to a discussion of the Resolution of No Confidence.

Resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of the Collegial Consultation Process at El Camino College.

[See packet pp 43 = 45]

CG reported that a Taskforce had met twice during Winter session and had discussion large issues re: the resolution. The Taskforce had also spoken to the State-wide representative for our area from Santa Monica College. It had been decided to make the Implementation of the process of collegial consultation the focus of the Resolution as this cast a wider net and pinpointed more exactly the problem we felt we are faced with.

CG emphasized that the Resolution must be supported by evidence and that the taskforce is in the process of collecting said evidence.

CG noted that if we choose to take a faculty-wide vote, it would be prudent to make sure that the majority of the faculty support the Resolution., therefore a need was felt for a Plenary session to discuss the Resolution on a campus level and get feedback. CG noted she has already received feedback that generally seems to indicate support. The feedback, though, has varied, with some feedback has calling to name President Fallo directly, while other feedback has indicated that some think the Resolution is not a good idea at all. Some Divisions have taken polls to assess feelings on the matter.

The concerns are the long-term frustration with the collegial consultation process, and concerns re: the outcome of such a move – would it make the situation worse/would there be retribution/would names be named?

The taskforce has written a draft Resolution [see Packet] and a factsheet with supporting evidence will accompany the final document.

Mr. Wells asked if this was a first reading?

Mr. Ahmadapour suggested getting people' s comments on tape, so as to have a written and audio record.

Mr. Marcoux suggested we need a plan of action. CG agreed. Mr. Wells asked if the Senate needed a motion before moving to discussion and Ms. Taylor felt things should be kept more informal at this stage.

Mr. Crossman said that the body should schedule a vote, so as not to be in violation of the Brown Act.

CG noted that we could vote here, then move ahead with a campus- wide vote after a Plenary session. Ms.

Taylor agreed. Mr. Wells noted that document might be altered after hearing the discussion engendered

by the Plenary. CG said we could discuss the issue here, make amendments as necessary, then send it on

to faculty. Mr. Wells asked when the Plenary would be scheduled? CG said we should first ensure that we

were all comfortable with the Resolution. Mr. Wells suggested making the next Academic Senate meeting

session the Plenary Session. CG asked for the formal motion to be made and Mr. Marcoux made the motion that the next Academic Senate meeting would be a Plenary Session to discuss the Resolution with the faculty, seconded by Ms. Taylor. The vote was taken, all ayes, no nays, one abstention by Mr. Panski. The motion passed.

Dr. Baily asked what of those who could not attend the session due to teaching commitments. CG said she could schedule one alternative time, and Ms. Taylor suggested also emailing a summary of the plenary discussion minutes to those faculty.

CG called for discussion of the draft document and Ms. Taylor asked for a few minutes to be given for all to read the document. This was granted.

CG gave a brief overview, noting that the reasons for the Resolution were given in the first three Whereases from the National, State, through local levels. The second Resolve indicates a willingness and determination to move forward. Mr. Firestone suggested splitting the second resolve into two parts, and Mr. Crossman agreed, saying it would give the point re: the Board of Trustees more emphasis.

Ms. Halonen remarked that if the Senate alone voted we would need to remove mention of the faculty from the first Resolve, and CG agreed that this could be done if the Senate alone voted.

Dr. Baily asked whether this document is supported by evidence, as concrete proof was needed, and it was hard to support the serious step this Resolution meant without seeing evidence. CG noted that evidence is being collected and would be included in the aforementioned factsheet. Ms. Taylor agreed that no-one could be expected to vote without first seeing evidence.

CG noted that the type of evidence being collected involved examples of arbitrary decision making, decisions contrary to committee wishes, lack of written responses to explain decisions, lack of transparency in decision making, and other problems with communication.

Mr. Crossmann stated that we had seen an example today with the comments re: Compton. Ms. Halonen noted that a list of the evidence is being drafted. CG asked if the Senate should see the list of evidence the meeting before the Plenary. Dr. Baily noted that the campus should see the list before the Plenary. CG noted that the Taskforce had discussed putting the evidence in the whereases, but felt it would make the document too long, and that it was better to provide a separate factsheet. Mr. Ahmadapour suggested pushing the meeting back to get groups of faculty to outline documentary evidence. CG noted that Santa Monica College had gathered plenty of evidence at the Plenary session. When asked what solution we hoped to achieve, CG noted that these had not been formally listed, but would be outlined: written responses to follow decisions, votes for college consultation committees, cleared lines of communication with the Board.

Mr. Panski urged moving forward with caution at this time, as such issues raised red flags for Accreditation Commissions, and that ECC could find itself on sanction. He recommended making a strategic decision to wait until after accreditation. Mr. Ahmadapour disagreed with this suggestion. Mr. Crossman felt that any document that suggested that we HAVE shared governance at ECC is fraudulent, and we should deal with the elephant in the room. Shared governance is required by law and via the Ed. Code, and we have to sign off on these documents, and this issue has been a problem at ECC for years. Ms. Colunga asked whether we had 2 years to resolve this problem. CG noted that the Senat Does have to sign off on the Accreditation report, but can also submit a minority report. The Senate can also request to meet with the Accreditation team to discuss issues.

Ms. Colunga asked how we can get the Board of Trustees to see our problems. She noted it is the job of the Board to see that we get Accreditation. Ms. Halonen asked if there was a precedent at another campus who did something similar while under Accreditation recommendation status. Mr. Panski thought the college of Redwoods. Mr. Panski repeated the danger of being put on sanction. Mr. Crossman asked if a College could be put on sanction and not be given time to resolve the issues. Mr. Panski answered yes.

Mr. wells noted ECC had never had a totally clear Accreditation report.

CG summed up that the Taskforce would meet for an editing session based on this discussion, noting that the second Resolve would be changed, we would add the factsheet, and a special Plenary session would be held in 2 weeks.

INFORMATION ITEMS –DISCUSSION

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

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
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 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 expertise, leading to a routine prioritization of administrative concerns over academic ones, thereby jeopardizing 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 arguing that an informational presentation designed for campuses that need an “orientation or refresher” is sufficient.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 along-side 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 and pp. 7-8.

**EXAMPLES, EVIDENCE AND EXPLANATION:
Resolution of No Confidence
in the Implementation of the Collegial Consultation Process at ECC**

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 at ECC is the result of a continuous compilation of problems, both big and small, over the years. This fact sheet provides examples 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 best use 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 through Education Code and Title 5 require that California Community College Boards of Trustees consult collegially with Academic Senates on the following 11 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 asserts 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 seven Strategic Initiatives guide campus planning and budgeting.

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 contains 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 the Infrastructure of Collegial Consultation

1. BP2510 *Participation in Local Decision Making* was enacted over the objection of the Academic Senate. The Senate asserted that the language in the ECC policy differs from Title 5 language in a way that disempowers the Senate. In addition, the 2005 *Focused Midterm Report* 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.” In addition, the 2005 report found that “process proposals and policy changes affecting various areas and departments still occasionally by pass the full consultation process.” Senate opposition to BP2510 persisted through 2008 and no action has been taken by administration to address the concerns of the Senate.
2. Problems with collegial consultation have been persistent and enduring. 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” and that the Senate’s request for state-level technical assistance with collegial consultation was denied.
3. 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. Some policies and procedures, such as BP3750 *Use of Copyrighted Materials* and AP6160 *District Computer and Network Use Policy*, undergo years of revision and consultation before being brought to the Board. This 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. The 2011 report notes that a transmittal form was developed to alleviate this problem, but it is not in use.
4. The Academic Senate lacks the ability to fully inform the Board about academic and professional matters, because the ECC President closely controls the Board agenda and there is no mechanism 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.” During the ECC Board meetings, the Senate report comes after the Board has deliberated and voted on action items.
5. 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.

6. Over the past 6 years, Curriculum Chairs have received insufficient reassign time to adequately complete the greatly increased workload that resulted from accreditation demands. All curriculum needed to be brought into compliance and must now stay compliant on a six year cycle. In addition, Curriculum Chairs have helped develop CurricUNET modules and continue to conduct trainings for faculty across the campus. Although inconsistent and sparing amounts of support were periodically provided, Curriculum Chairs have been generously volunteering large amounts of their personal time to meet their duties and to ensure continued compliance. Repeated requests to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (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 just shift the problem of too little reassign time to other Senate leaders.
7. 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. For instance, the curriculum for Math 70 and Math 110 were each delayed by many months because they slightly increased faculty load. These courses were designed to facilitate student movement through the math sequence and their delay ran contrary to careful faculty plans to increase student success. Other courses were pulled from the Board agenda at the last minute without notifying the College Curriculum Committee or department faculty.
8. 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 the 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 are not given oversight and control over the budget for faculty development activities.
9. 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. 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.
10. There is a reluctance to objectively record faculty and other constituent group opinions expressed in some consultative committees, 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 at least since the 2005 *Focused Midterm Accreditation Report*. The ECC President's insistence on action minutes diminishes trust and leads to the suspicion that he does not want a record of the input of consultative groups in case they run contrary to administrative leadership decisions.

11. The 2010 *Employee Campus Climate Survey* revealed 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.

Sample arbitrary and/or unexplained decisions by the VPAA and College President with insufficient or no consultation with the Senate in professional and academic matters.

The following list includes examples of decisions made with no or insufficient consultation with the Senate and/or contrary to the express wishes of the Senate. In addition, data or objective information was generally not provided to justify these decisions, and they often prioritize administrative concerns over student success.

1. 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) asserts 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."
2. In fall 2010, the Atlantis Grant in Child Development was canceled at the last minute by the VPAA for negligible administrative procedural reasons, thereby denying ECC students the profound educational opportunity for fully funded internships in Italy.
3. The VPAA made a unilateral and arbitrary decision not to offer on-line classes during the winter session despite the fact that winter on-line classes enjoyed the highest success and retention rates of any term. No explanation, data or evidence were provided to support the decision. This is particularly troubling given that the February 1, 2012 ACCJC letter expresses concern about the quality of ECC on-line classes, and the winter sections were the strongest offerings.

4. 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 by the ECC President 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.
5. 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. [year?]

Decisions contrary to the wishes of campus-wide collegial consultation committees without written responses or with delayed written responses

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 only occurred when the Senate or other consultative bodies strongly insist on an explanation. Even then, the responses are typically delayed and/or excessively brief.

1. Administration has made repeated attempts to alter the academic calendar against the strongly stated wishes of the faculty and students that were expressed in four Academic Senate and Associated Student Organization resolutions and in a student petition. No written explanations or responses were provided to any of these resolutions. Also, in fall 2011 after the Calendar Committee voted unanimously 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. No written data or objective evidence to support the elimination of winter was collected until the Board directed administration to provide it with data and evidence regarding winter session. In addition, administration has not explained its decision to eliminate winter session to the student body, which has strongly asserted that it wants to preserve winter.
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 strong pressure, 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 were made only after strong requests, and the explanations that are now provided are excessively brief and insufficient. For instance, the explanation of changes to the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee recommendations in spring 2011 were provided in a short e-mail with brief explanations of one or two sentences for each change. Some changes were not explained at all. [Need dates]
4. 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.
[Years?]

5. In fall 2011, the Insurance Benefits Committee was demoted from a decision-making committee (the last of its kind on ECC campus) to an advisory committee due to the outcome of labor negotiations. No written explanation was provided to explain the necessity for this change.
6. 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. [Years? The 1990s?]

Lack of transparency by the ECC President

1. Over the past two years, no formal attempt was made by the ECC President to explain to the campus community the lawsuits against ECC that named campus administrators and cost the campus millions of dollars. Although administrators were under legal obligation not to discuss aspects of the cases while they were being tried, after the cases concluded, there was still no transparent, public explanation (within legal limits) by the ECC President. Many members of the campus community learned about these law suits through the local newspaper and many others remain unaware of them. This lack of transparency reflects a tendency to avoid honest admission of and reflection on problems that face the campus and contradicts the ECC vision statement, which asserts that “our college will be a leader in demonstrating accountability to our community.” During a time of major budget crisis and deep cuts to classes and student services, the cost of these lawsuits is alarming and unnecessary and should be explained to the faculty.
2. No attempt has been made by the ECC President to reassure the campus community that steps are being taken to protect the campus from potential future litigation against administrators. Without reassurance, it is unclear that any preventative measures are being taken and the question remains whether the campus continues to be exposed to further future litigation against administrators. This explanation is especially necessary given that over \$2.3 million were allocated in the 2011 budget to a miscellaneous fund for the event of losses in future litigation [confirm the factual accuracy of this].
3. There was no public acknowledgement or explanation to the campus community that the President of the ECC Board of Trustees was found guilty by a state court of fraud, breach of fiduciary duties and legal malpractice. Many in the campus community learned of this from the local newspaper. The ECC President has not attempted to allay concerns that the behavior of its Board President will tarnish the reputation of the college amongst the community and that it contradicts Board Policy 2751 which states that “the Board maintains high standards of ethical conduct for its members.”
4. The ECC President routinely meets with Board Trustees in a closed “meeting before the meeting” prior to open, public Board meetings. This practice continues, despite concerns that it violates the legal requirements of the Brown Act and further reveals a tendency by the ECC President to avoid open and transparent communication.

Poor Communication

1. Communication is repeatedly identified as a major problem area across campus. The 2002 *Accreditation Self-Study* indicates that the campus needed to improve its channels for communication and the 2005 *Focused Midterm 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.”
2. 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.
3. Despite cross-campus calls for improved communication, the ECC President shows few efforts to communicate more fully, transparently and directly with the faculty.
4. In the 2009-2010 College Council self-evaluation survey all members 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 communications. 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.”

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 this section 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 mean that valuable ideas and information gleaned from those who directly instruct and serve students are underutilized. Consequently, decisions tend to prioritize administrative concerns over academic ones. Evidence of this is peppered throughout the previous section.

Faculty who assume that their opinions are not appreciated and are unheeded by administration are more likely not to participate in and may resist the SLO and program review processes that the ACCJC has asserted are essential to maintaining accreditation. Most recently, this was seen in the 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.

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 arguing that an informational presentation designed for campuses that need an “orientation or refresher” is sufficient.

The Senate and faculty efforts “on the ground” to repair the collegial consultation process include 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 it had to be conducted by the body of the committee. 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 written responses by administrators to Senate and collegial consultation committee recommendations leave the faculty to speculate about administrative decisions and motives. Prompt and full written responses to Senate recommendations could potentially resolve and avoid some misunderstandings and would show respect for faculty expertise and hardwork. 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.”

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 would offer solutions to any identified problems. 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 technical 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 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.

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>)