

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES

1st May 2012

Adjunct Faculty

Hall, Kathy
Bonness, Nicholas Sean

Behavioral & Social Sciences

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

Business

Siddiqui, Junaid X
Lau, Philip S
VACANT

Counseling

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

Fine Arts

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

Health Sciences & Athletics

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

Humanities

Isaacs, Brent
Marcoux, Pete
McLaughlin, Kate
Halonen, Briita EXC
Simon, Jenny

Industry & Technology

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

Learning Resources Unit

Striepe, Claudia X
Ichinaga, Moon X

Mathematical Sciences

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

Natural Sciences

Doucette, Pete
Herzig, Chuck EXC
Jimenez, Miguel
Palos Teresa
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 X
Odanaka, Michael X

Assoc. Students Org.

Asher, Rebekka
Valdez, Cindy

Ex- Officio Positions

Elizabeth Shadish

Guests, Dean's Rep, Visitors:

B. Perez, S.Dever

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

The sixth Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2012 semester was held at the Compton Education Center and called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:40pm.

Approval of last Minutes:

[See pp.6-11 of packet]The minutes of the 17 April meeting were approved as written.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

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

CG reported on items discussed in College Council.

El Camino will be designated a Restricted Smoking Campus. There was talk of the need for enforcement, and the ECC police will tickets those not keeping to the smoking areas. Per the Cal. Code of Regulations, offenders will get prior warning citations before actual tickets. In response to a question from Ms. Winfree CG noted that signs would be posted on campus.

The Grade Change Procedure was reviewed during College Council and will now move on to the Board. The Academic Senate had passed BP 4225, the Course Repetition Procedure and Policy. At College Council the Procedure was deemed good and will move on to the Board and be hyperlinked into the catalog, however [see separate handout] the Policy raised some concerns. The handout has on one side the current 92006) Policy, and on the other side the proposed revised Policy (2012) CG noted that the Comment boxes reflected the areas of concern/discussion during College Council. CG noted that President Fallo is uncomfortable with having the statement “*in mutual agreement with the Academic Senate..*” inserted into all policies as he feels the college has established mutual agreement as the overarching method of communication and procedure on the campus and therefore it is redundant to add this statement in. Additionally, the inclusion of this statement might lead to other groups insisting upon also being named. These were the arguments in favor of removing the statement. Please send feedback on this to CG.

Dr. Arce mentioned the traditional statement “...the Superintendent President or designee will develop procedures for these policies with consultation with appropriate constituents...” and recommended using this statement and eliminating the first paragraph. Ms. Winfree asked who would decide who the “appropriate constituents” would be? Dr. Arce said it would depend on the policy. Ms. Taylor felt the statement was too vague and was in favor of spelling out Academic Senate in areas where the Academic Senate was the appropriate constituent. Dr. Nishime cited the example of the Course Repetition Policy noting that this affected students heavily so the Student body should also be named, not just the Academic Senate. Ms. Taylor agreed, but noted that the level of involvement of the various groups is different. Dr. Nishime noted that most items move through the Senate Ad. Policies Committee anyway, so Senate involvement is a given. Dr. Arce asked whether the Senate wanted to pigeonhole the body into only being consulted where named. Dr. Arce mentioned the campus Internet policy as an example, saying that the Senate was not necessarily an “appropriate constituent” here, but had been consulted anyway. Senate consultation would always be sought if it made sense. CG noted that she would bring these arguments back to the Ed Policies Committee and will request it be an action item for the May 15th meeting, especially if it sets a precedent.

CG mentioned that the Consultation presentation had also been discussed during Council. College Council has not decided how to proceed. CG has requested the next presentation on Issue Resolution, but had received a negative response to that request. She noted she does not see these as accreditation visits, but visits to offer suggestions. Please send ideas on the matter to CG.

Mr. Wells mentioned that Senate had passed the Resolution before the visit, and perhaps Senate should revisit the issue to see whether they wanted to reaffirm the Resolution or whether the visit has caused the members to feel differently about the issue.

CG said she has held off on presenting the Resolution to the Board while she investigated how to get the matter on the official Board agenda. It seems one has to submit a Public Agenda Request.

CG has a choice also whether to present to the Board as an informational item, or to present and ask for a vote on the Resolved to direct/persuade Dr. Fallo to request the issue resolution service. CG asked the Senate for opinion. Mr. Wells felt it should be presented as an informational item, and then later push for a vote, in the interests of being transparent and letting the Board be aware of faculty feeling on the issue. Mr. Panski agreed, noting he thought the Board would not vote on the issue. Mr. Wells noted that this issue would not be speedily resolved.

Dr. Arce pointed out that BP 2510 requires the Academic Senate to work with the VPAA as a liaison to the Board. He felt this was a protocol that should be used. CG noted that she had followed his directions in this matter. Dr. Arce felt that there should be more conversations with him on the Resolution.

CG went on to talk about parking, noting that it was gratifying to see the CEC lot so full. CG pointed to minutes of the Facilities Steering Committee [see pg. 12 of packet] noting that the Committee will be meeting more frequently while it develops the Facilities Master Plan. CG drew attention to Item #3 Parking Structure Lot F. An engineer called to investigate the problem of the crumbling cement has noted that the problem is extensive and will cost around \$13 million to repair. Ms. Higdon said the campus will attempt to use Bond monies for the repairs, or perhaps use monies from the General Fund.

CG said that the topic of Adjunct issues would be discussed at the next meeting. CG noted that Ms. Graff of Institutional Research can disaggregate adjunct answers from the last Campus Climate Survey, and these responses might give us more feedback on issues.

CG reported that Michelle Pilate???? Will attend our next Senate meeting on May 15th to give a report and listen to the presentation on myedu.

VP Compton Education Center – Saul Panski (SP)

SP noted that the CEC Academic Senate is meeting to honor 7 faculty who are retiring (SP among them) and Lesley Kawaguchi will be in attendance as she has long taken a great interest in the Compton campus.

SP reported that Jack Scott would be the CEC commencement speaker.

The CEC has hired a new CEO. An Academic Awards tea is upcoming. Holly Schumacher will be the CEC faculty Co-Chair to the next ECC Accreditation Self Study report. SP thanked ECC for the example of the Distinguished Faculty Award, which has now been adopted by the CEC, and which will help boost CEC faculty morale.

Curriculum Committee – Jenny Simon (JS)

No report.

VP Educational Policies Committee – Merriel Winfree (MW)

MW reported that the first reading of BP/AP 4250 and AP 4105 will come up later in the meeting.

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

[See pp14-16 of packet] for minutes of last Faculty Development Committee meeting. MI noted the screening of “Farewell to Manzanar” the 1976 Universal film to coincide with the Asian Pacific Heritage Month, confirmed for Thursday May 17th.

Regarding the discussion at the last Senate meeting on adjunct concerns, Faculty Development is coordinating with Institutional Research to prepare a survey of adjunct faculty only.

MI mentioned 2 development opportunities for faculty, both on May 4th -a “Strengthening Student Success” conference at Mt. SAC, and “Conversations about Acceleration” at ECC 8:30 am to 3:00pm.

VP Finance – Lance Widman (LW)

LW was not able to make the meeting. CG read LW's report.

[See pp. 17-20 of packet] PBC 3/5 Minutes: The primary point of discussion was the DRAFT Potential 2012-2013 Budget Reductions. Please remember that all of the numbers are tentative, subject to change, especially when considering the following:

1. The May Revision of estimated State revenues and projected expenses is due to be released within the next two weeks. That's when discussions in the Legislature get really serious when the numbers are much more firm than those used in the January Budget proposal.
2. The Legislative Analyst Office, the key advisory agency to the State Legislature, is already projecting a \$2 billion revenue shortfall for 2011-2012. If accurate, more cuts in State support are very likely.
3. Ballot measures to be voted on in November, including a proposed tax increase cosponsored by Gov. Brown and CFT, as well as a competing tax increase proposal. Recent poll results indicate that voter support for any tax increase is tepid at best.
4. P. 19, item 4.t, projected \$2+ million in savings based on negotiated items are a complete unknown, but will come out of the employees' hide one way or the other.

Ms. Taylor asked if the Senate could get a copy of the 5year Budget Assumption report. CG said she would include it in the next packet. Dr. Arce noted that Dr. Spor has posted it online. Ms. Taylor noted that if we are to discuss it in Senate we would need to have a paper copy to refer to.

VP Academic Technology Committee – Pete Marcoux (PM)

No Report.

VP Instructional Effectiveness – Kelly Holt (KH)

KH noted that a focus group meeting had been held on April 23rd in Admin. 131 This had been a brainstorming session to decide on an assessment methods for the next core competency "community and Collaboration". Good ideas had come out of the meeting and Institutional Research also have some ideas to share. KH also noted that Program Review is going well. There have been concerns about needing a more authentic assessment, as thus far it has been mainly student self-interpretation. KH noted that CG had mentioned looking at data already collected by Programs, and these are the sorts of ideas needed. Email other ideas to KH or attend the meeting.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Evaluation Procedures Committee

MI reported that the librarians were trying to revise their evaluation tool, and had noted that contractually such changes are required to be passed via an Evaluation Procedures Committee. It appears that this Committee is a 3 member body comprised of one Administrator, one Federation member and one faculty member (or their designees) All faculty Divisions should be passing any evaluation revision plans through this committee. It was requested that the Committee be convened soon. Last Senate meeting had resulted in faculty volunteers (Ms. Taylor and Mr. Ahmadapour) Dr. Perez noted that the Committee was Federation business and thus should be convened by the Federation, and Ms. Taylor said she could also represent the Federation if needed. MI noted it was not clear who coordinated the Committee. Dr. Perez said it was a working condition, therefore a contract issue, therefore under the Federation. Dr. Perez went on to say that the Committee does not need a specialist, as they would bring in the subject specialist to talk to the Committee, the Committee merely "blesses the forms" that the Division or Department brings to them.

MI asked why there was not a Committee if this was supposed to be a standing Committee? Dr. Perez said that change to evaluation tools was requested so rarely that the Committee was just called as needed. Dr. Arce noted that this has been a non-formalized process that has worked well, noting that there has been no outpouring of concern on the matter before. Ms. Taylor noted that a student has approached her with concerns, and CG noted that the DE evaluation forms are also bad. Mr. Wells noted that in general the process could be made more meaningful.

Dr. Perez said that different Divisions have different forms based on subject content. One could find the common thread and then add specialties onto that.

MI noted that the librarians had a revised form ready, but had been holding onto it for several years because of being told different things. The need for action was felt to be urgent. CS noted that the Federation member for this area Don Brown was currently on Sabbatical.

CG noted she would bring this up again at the next Senate meeting.

The relevant portion of the contract is Evaluations Procedures Committee in Article 20, Section 5.

ASCCC Spring Plenary Session Report – Chris Wells (CW).

CW reported that the session was held in conjunction with the Chief Instructional Officers Conference .ECC was represented by Mr. Natividad at the CIO Conference and CW and Mr. Odanaka and Mr. Darwin represented ECC and the CEC at the ASCCC conference.) CW noted there had been a lot of interesting discussion and that the ppts from the session are on the website. Regarding the Student Success Taskforce recommendation, the ASCCC recommends waiting until the legislation comes through before acting, and that there was a lot of talk regarding the purview of the Academic Senates in this area. Also, some colleges are doing “bottleneck” analysis – looking at classes/processes that hold students up from graduating. Some colleges are asking the question: Which students are we NOT willing to serve? There has been no real analysis of the COST of student success, so the degree of implementation of the legislation based on the recommendations will depend on funding. It is unlikely colleges would be able to implement all, so which constituents would they cut/drop.

CW noted that SP1440 degrees were an important discussion. He reported on a new website “A Degree with a Guarantee.” From Spring 2013, the only students admitted to a SCU will be students with an AA/Transfer degree. In Fall admission will be open to all, and the next Spring back to only students with a transfer/AA degree, and so on. Mr. Norton asked if no high school students would be accepted and CW said only in the Fall semesters and then it would be conditional on passing Math and English – otherwise they would be referred to a Community College.

There were also concerns expressed re: the piloting of the MYEDU – the feeling is that Academic Senates should have been consulted for input.

CW mentioned another website “20 million Minds” from Rice University, the goal of the group is to lower textbook costs, and they have free or low cost books on an open source platform.

They also evaluate textbook costs and have student evaluations on textbooks.

<http://www.20mm.org/our-focus.html>

Dr. Arce said that he would like to suggest a linked matter for future Senate discussion. The college has been trying to get Divisions to get these transfer degrees mentioned earlier, completed. ECC has only 3 approved. Dr. Arce hoped the Senate considers this a serious matter and that the members will communicate this to their Divisions. This is fast becoming an important and urgent matter to transferring students. Mr. Wells agreed, noting that we are a ways

behind. Dr. Arce noted that we have an additional problem as we are not in a local selection area and therefore our students must have one of these degrees for admission.

Student Success Task Force Recommendations Committee.

[See pp21-22 of packet] for minutes of the Task Force meeting of April 6th. CG noted that this had been the first meeting of the task force. CG drew attention to the bolded are on pg 21 which set out the purpose of the task force “To evaluate the recommendations of the Student Success Task Force and develop a strategy for implementing the recommendations at El Camino College.” The task force had also talked of the meaning of “student success”.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

BP/AP4250 Probation, Dismissal and Readmission. First Reading. VP Ed. Policies Committee. Merriel Winfree (MW)

[See pp 23-27 of packet] MW reported that much of the language is from the CCCL template. CG noted that while 1.75 gpa is the minimal for dismissal/probation according the Title V, we are setting it higher at 2.0.

Ms. Taylor asked about the phrase “semester units”, asking what other unit types existed? CG said the document differentiated between intersession units and semester units, quoting the information on pg 30.”terms shorter than 16 weeks (ie winter , summer) will not be considered a semester”. Mr. Wells thought that veterans could bring in military units.

Dr. Nishime noted the explanation re Semester and intersession units was not clear. Dr. Arce felt it was cumulative and all gpa was considered. CG thought it might then have something to do with Admissions procedures...perhaps Summer session units could not be used when registering for Fall.

Ms. Taylor felt that the units were still essentially the same, and Dr. Arce agreed, saying a unit is a unit.

Ms. Taylor suggested eliminating the phrase “semester units” and rethinking point 9 on pg. 30.

CG said the Ed Policies Committee will try to get more clarification from Mr. Mulrooney

CG drew attention to a statement on pg. 25 “The Superintendent/President or designee, in mutual agreement with the Academic Senate...” suggesting that this phrase always be used instead of only mentioning the Superintendent/President or designee....

Dr. Nishime said that if this were to be changed, all such language in policies would have to be changed, and felt it was rather a given, and therefore not necessary to list all groups each time.

Dr. Arce requested that MW send him a copy of this document electronically.

AP 4105 Distance Education. First Reading. VP Ed. Policies Committee. Merriel Winfree (MW)

[see pp 38-39 of Packet]

MW drew attention to the second paragraph. Mr. Panski had a concern – he felt it was unclear whether all three procedures would be used, or just one, or a combination. He felt, depending on the intent, it might be better to say...”through utilization of one or more of the following...”

Mr. Panski asked whether we have proctored exams at this time? The answer is no, but Dr. Dever noted that some instructors have made such arrangements with other faculty or institutions. Dr. Dever said that much of the wording was also from the CCLC template, but agreed to make the wording more flexible, noting that the goal is to make the process secure.

Ms. Taylor suggested the Committee review the 2nd paragraph as the wording seemed awkward, and felt the statement “in consultation with the appropriate campus committee” was too vague. CG felt that DEAC should be consulted. Ms. Taylor asked why not say DEAC. CG said they were not named in case the Committee name changed. Suggestions were “...In consultation with DEAC or similar committee..”,

or “..Mutual agreement with the Academic Senate or committee designated by the Academic Senate...”
These suggestions will go back to the Committee.

Resolution for the Elimination of CSU Service Areas.

[See pg. 40 of Packet]

INFORMATION ITEMS –DISCUSSION

Adjunct Faculty Concerns.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ADJOURN

CG thanked all for coming out in the drizzle. The meeting adjourned at 2:00pm.

CS/ECC2012