

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES
17TH NOVEMBER, 2009

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

Adjunct Faculty

Mangan, Michael(Hum) X

Behavioral & Social Sciences

Firestone, Randy

Gold, Christina X

Widman, Lance X

Wynne, Michael X

Mannen, Angela

Business

Siddiqui, Junaid X

Lau, Philip S X

Counseling

Jackson, Brenda X

Jeffries, Chris X

Key, Ken

Pajo, Christina X

Fine Arts

Ahmadpour, Ali X

Bloomberg, Randall X

Crossman, Mark

Schultz, Patrick

Wells, Chris X

Health Sciences & Athletics

Hazell, Tom

McGinley, Pat X

Rosales, Kathleen X

Humanities

Isaacs, Brent

Marcoux, Pete EXC

McLaughlin, Kate X

Peppard, Bruce X

Simon, Jenny

Industry & Technology

Gebert, Pat X

Hofmann, Ed X

MacPherson, Lee X

Marston, Doug X

Learning Resources Unit

Striepe, Claudia X

Ichinaga, Moon X

Mathematical Sciences

Boerger, John

Fry, Greg X

Glucksman, Marc X

Taylor, Susan X

Yun, Paul X

Natural Sciences

Cowell, Chas

Herzig, Chuck X

Jimenez, Miguel X

Palos Teresa X

Vakil, David X

Academic Affairs

Chapman, Quajuana

ECC CEC Members

Evans, Jerome

Norton, Tom

Panski, Saul X

Pratt, Estina

Smith, Darwin

Assoc. Students Org.

Casper, Joshua

Safazada, Ana X

Stokes, Philip

Ex- Officio Positions

Arce, Francisco

Nishime, Jeanie X

Shadish, Elizabeth X

Kjeseth, Lars X

Guests and/Other Officers: Kim Bailey (Dean's Rep), Barbara Jaffe, Lori Suekawa, Art Martinez

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

The fifth Academic Senate meeting of the Fall 2009 semester was called to order at 12:33pm

Approval of last Minutes:

Approval of the minutes [pp. 5 -11 of packet] from the 3rd November Academic Senate meeting was delayed as Ms. Taylor had a concern with the accuracy of a statement as written. The Senate voted to wait and see the amended minutes before approval.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

President's report – Dave Vakil (henceforth DV)

DV asked the Senate whether he should **create a campus-wide wiki to discuss the potential impact of faculty adding extra students above cap**. DV asked whether the senators were interested, and if they would participate? The likelihood of participation was discussed. DV said he would set up a link and people could edit the document. Ms. Taylor noted that she was not sure what information or results DV could hope to achieve, and DV said that he aimed for fostering an informed, campus-wide discussion and exchange of ideas. Ms. Ichinaga felt that the wiki might suffer the same fate as discussions via e-mail, which were not necessarily constructive as there was no true dialogue, just a statement of opinions. Ms. Ichinaga also noted, however, that sometimes actions resulted from these seemingly non-fruitful discussions, citing the Faculty Development Committee's "Hot Topics" program that was a result of faculty desire for a forum to share ideas. Mr. Ahmadpour stated he felt that ECC faculty did not pay enough attention to what was happening elsewhere. For instance, he noted that in Northern California some campuses were banding together to protest issues of concern. Mr. Peppard noted that the wiki seemed like a good idea, but suggested having someone act as a moderator. Please send ideas and views to DV.

DV would like to **seek faculty-wide ratification of two constitutional amendments to create two new VP positions: a VP-Tech**, to start as soon as ratified and election is held, and a VP-Effectiveness to start in Fall. The start dates were not specified in the amendments. DV noted that the Senate had ratified both positions, but these had not yet been taken to the faculty at large, and asked the Senate's permission to send out a notice with the desired start dates. There were no objections from the Senate. It was noted that the position of VP Effectiveness deserves reassigned time. Ms. Jeffries noted that the duties for each position should be noted., and DV agreed to include these in the next packet.

DV reported that **individual faculty success & retention rates will soon be published** on an ECC web page – and maybe grade distributions too. Ms. Rosales asked why this was being done. The reply was that this was information students should have access to. Also the publication of these rates might lead to interesting faculty peer discussions. Grades will be aggregated. It was noted that this is similar to information already available on a site "Pick-A-Professor."

DV announced that he would like to **hold regular senate officer meetings**, similar to those currently held with the officers and VPs Arce & Nishime.

It was noted that the **full-time Faculty hiring prioritized** list would be revealed at 2pm. DV will include the final list in the next packet.

With reference to Planning, DV asked the Senate to think about possibly having a **"Faculty Planning Summit"** before the ECC Planning Summit, in spring?

DV drew attention to **the summary of the senate officers' meeting** with VPs Arce & Nishime. [see pp 12- 14 of packet], noting in particular the good discussion on Distance

Education and thanking Ms. Gold for her email on the topic, and the registration deadlines for Spring with the expectation that faculty will have to print their own first- week rosters.

With reference to the **Plenary session**, [see pp 12- 14 of packet] DV is seeking input on “no equivalency to Assoc. degree”. It was noted that the next local meeting will be held at ECC on March 27, 2010, and Mr. Ahmadpour and Ms. Suekawa would be attending and helping out.

VP – Compton Center - Saul Panski (SP)

No report.

Curriculum Committee – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

LK noted that abridged minutes from Oct 27 meeting were available [see pp. 18-20 of packet], and a full version, including curriculum updates, available on MyECC.

VP - Educational Policies – Chris Jeffries (CJ)

No report. [See pp 31-32 of packet for BP & AP 4050 to be have first reading later this meeting]. CJ noted that the committee is considering revisions to Academic Probation policy, based in part on recommendations from the Enrollment Management Committee. CJ will be attending a Policies and Procedures workshop.

VP - Faculty Development – Chris Gold (CG)

CG noted that the minutes for the last three meetings were in the packet [see pp. 21- 24 of packet] and reminded the Senate of the On-Line Retention and Success workshops coming up. Faculty can learn about the approaches and innovative on-line teaching tools used by several colleagues with high retention and success rates. Creative ideas can be shared to help students succeed in on-line courses.

This “Hot Topics” workshop is a follow-up to the September workshop about success and retention statistics and the discussion of the mechanics of enrollment. A brief report and advice about enrollment procedures will be given.

Presenters: Eduardo Munoz, Jason Suarez, Christina Gold Thursday, November 19, 1-1:50 West Library Basement.

VP - Finance & Special Projects/Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC)– Lance Widman (LW)

[See pp. 25-29 of packet] and [see pp. 26-29 of packet] for Oct. 15 PBC Minutes, where the major item for discussion was the major funding cuts incurred by categorical programs this year (09-10) and likely to continue over the next few years, no relief in sight from the State. Several hundred thousand dollars would have to be taken from reserves to keep programs and services thus funded. Mr. Ahmadpour asked why ECC was not more active in responding to the issue of cuts? He noted that the LA Community Colleges had had a meeting to come up with responses and solutions, and believed that we should take action and join with other colleges, or risk sending the wrong message. Mr. Ahmadpour urged for taking action as moral leaders of our community, and as a responsibility to our students.

LW reported that there was an anticipated deficit of \$7 billion, with another \$7.5 billion anticipated for the next fiscal year 2010/2011.

Council of Dean’s Meeting Report –Moon Ichinaga (MI)

[See pg. 30 of packet] MI reported that she came away from the meeting with a sense of a change of direction, in that more data is being presented at the meetings. MI opined that whether the data supports the decisions and recommendations the Deans’ arrive at is open to opinion. For instance, Dr. Spor presented some data on retention, and said the aim was to use data to determine which classes to cut. Dr. Arce said the Deans were given a free hand in determining which classes to

cut, but Dr. Spor noted that data is a determining factor. Dr. Spor asked whether some of the low-level basic skills classes, which also have low retention rates, should be cut and the students redirected to Adult Education classes? No consensus on the issue was reached. Another area of discussion was the increasing academic probation rates. Data was presented showing a 5 year trend. It was recommended that instead of assessing and making decisions on academic probation once a year, this be done twice a year. Ms. Jeffries will also be discussing this issue at an Ed. Policies Meeting. Mr. Wells asked whether the courses ECC offers at high schools were discussed as he had heard there were also bad retention rates there. MI said that that had not been discussed.

Mr. Panski was of the opinion that it seemed like social engineering to cut classes for the most vulnerable populations. He had been shocked to read the statistics for Basic Skills reaching into the 40 and 60 percents. But if these classes were cut, they would also cut out entire communities from education. He asked why Administration and not Faculty were discussing this issue. Ms. Taylor noted that scheduling of classes was in the domain of Administration, not Faculty. Mr. Vakil noted that faculty can make recommendations to Administration. Mr. Kjeseth said that currently people read the College Mission as a prioritized list, but in reality the chief mission is to keep the doors of the college open to all, and that perhaps there was a need to re-examine the Ed. Code. Mr. Vakil agreed, noting that statewide Academic Senate President Jane Patton had suggested revisiting priorities, and that some schools had made "local" interpretations of documents. Dr. Jaffe noted that Chancellor Scott had said that the included in the mission of the California Community Colleges were the goals of transfer and providing basic skills.

VP – Legislative Action – Chris Wells (CW)

No report.

REPORTS OF SPECAIL COMMITTEES

Academic Technology

DV noted that it was likely that critical laptop replacements will be forthcoming. Ms. Taylor said that she had heard there was a plan and asked if the Senate could see it. DV will ask Mr. Wagstaff about that. Mr. Wells asked about non- laptop computers and DV said faculty would have to approach ITS re: those issues.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

Board Policy (BP) 4050 -Articulation

[See pp.31-32 of packet] It was noted that this constituted the first reading of the policy. This is a policy that needed updating. It was under Student Services, and is now moving back to Academic Affairs. Hearing no questions on the item, the next meeting will see the second reading of the policy.

Program Review Highlight – Business Division – Jay Siddiqui (JS)

JS noted that the Business Division is the second largest division on campus. The Division sees a lot of transfer students and working adults, and they focus on teaching sellable skills that can go onto a resume.

Why is the program beneficial? No matter what field or profession a person is in, nowadays everyone will need some type of computer skills. The Business Division offer, for instance CIS13, an introduction to computers.

What is interesting or important about the Business Program? There is a focus on books and texts, but also on real- life issues like business ethics, identity theft and so on. The Business faculty take the lead in exploring these issues. It is also a very hands-on program, with classes having a lab. component. They have “help- desk” classes, classes in accounting, and other skills that are in high demand.

Some things faculty should know about the program are that the classes meet the State of California requirements for computer literacy, and no matter what field people are in, they could use or will need their classes.

Basic Skills Presentation – Trudy Meyer (TM) and Sara Blake (SB)

Handout were provided during the presentation.

SB gave some background on the history of Basic Skills at ECC. The need for Basic Skills was established in the Ed. Code. The meaning of the term Basic Skills shift between two documents – the ARCC Report which notes Basic Skills as being 2 levels below transfer level, and the Poppy Copy, which has Basic Skills as 1 level below transfer level aka college-prep, or pre- collegiate. Generating data on Basic Skills has been embraced, but the data can be suspect, and care must be taken not to unintentionally harm a group. There has been a shift from statistics on retention to statistics on success, but these do not include the pre- collegiate level. There is also no “floor” to these scores. No-one is refused admission to the lowest classes. With the emphasis on Success, there has been much research done, and the Basic Skills Initiative has been given funds to study success factors. The funds will end soon, but the data from the studies can be used to see how we can institutionalize practices that work.

TM spoke to these practices, including having mandatory orientations to college, integrating counseling into the Basic Skills program, noting the Basic Skills students do not do optional work, instituting a “learning communities” component into Basic Skills, and providing trained tutors at learning centers. These should be highly qualified and trained, even if it meant having fewer tutors.

It was noted that many colleges had coded their college courses differently, and this might have been corrected, but the funding has ceased.

Mr. Vakil asked how ECC Basic Skills compares with others? TM said this was difficult to answer given the aforementioned coding issue. Mr. Kjeseth said that one area we are ahead in is intervention, but there is room for growth especially with non- credit classes. Mr. Panski noted that the bias for non- credit classes is strong. Mr. Panski noted that in dealing with some of the issues, we should bear in mind the mission of the college. Ms. Taylor asked whether SB and TM had given this presentation to the administration. TM said no, but they intended to do so.

Mr. Vakil asked what the Senate could do. SB said could draft a position statement in support of Basic Skills. DV asked for volunteers to work on this and Mr. Ahmadpour volunteered to help. SB offered to draft something and let the Academic Senate see and discuss it. Mr. Kjeseth pointed out a misspelling of Trudy Meyer’s name [Miller} on the handout.

Department Chairs – Faculty Opinion.

DV noted that this discussion had been started a month ago.

Mr. Wells mentioned a court case re: department chairs, noting that the information was interesting, but not necessarily relevant. Originally, it was implied that the case suggested the Academic Senate does not have standing on the issue, but upon further reflection by Mr. Wells, the case was not relevant to the issue at ECC. Ms. Taylor noted that the math department had had a discussion on the topic and that it was observed that different departments have different needs. Math, for instance, has many students, but not many courses, so a course coordinator would be more valuable to the department than a department chair. Ms. Taylor asked whether there was a structure in place that would allow for different positions according to department need?

Mr. Panski asked what the difference is between a department chair and a faculty coordinator, and what the duties of each would be? Mr. Wells said that the position/duties of a faculty coordinator are described in the faculty contract, and that faculty contract language should be included in a future Senate packet. Ms. Ichinaga said she assumed there would be salary repercussions for a faculty coordinator, and what about a salary for department chairs? The reply was that it might be a reassignment issue. It was noted that Santa Monica College has extra pay for faculty coordinators AND department chairs. DV said that compensation was a Union issue, so that issue might have to wait and get Union input.

Mr. Wells noted that this discussion always comes at the end of the meeting, allowing scant time, and that perhaps a specific meeting should be set up to devote to the topic. Mr. Vakil asked if Senate should devote the next meeting to the topic or hold a separate meeting. The next Senate meetings are scheduled for the 1st and 15th December. The meeting of the 1st December should contain a presentation on the Campus Climate survey, and the 2nd reading of BP 4050 (Articulation). It was decided to make the discussion re: department Chairs the first item on the agenda, rather than devote the entire meeting to the issue. It was requested that a list of the programs that requested department chairs be made available.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- December 1
 - Program Review highlight: Journalism
 - Presentation: Campus Climate Survey by I. Graff
- December 15
 - ECC Foundation presentation – Katie Gleason
 -

PUBLIC COMMENT.

None

The Academic Senate meeting was adjourned at 2:00pm
Cs/ecc2009