

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES
6th October, 2009

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

Behavioral & Social Sciences	
<u>Gold, Christina</u>	X
<u>Widman, Lance</u>	X
<u>Wynne, Michael</u>	X
<u>Mannen, Angela</u>	X

Business	
<u>Saddiqui, Junaid</u>	X
<u>Lau, Philip S</u>	X

Counseling	
<u>Jackson, Brenda</u>	X
<u>Jeffries, Chris</u>	X
<u>Key, Ken</u>	
<u>Pajo, Christina</u>	X

Fine Arts	
<u>Ahmadpour, Ali</u>	X
<u>Bloomberg, Randall</u>	X
<u>Crossman, Mark</u>	
<u>Schultz, Patrick</u>	X
<u>Wells, Chris</u>	X

Health Sciences & Athletics	
<u>Hazell, Tom</u>	
<u>McGinley, Pat</u>	X
<u>Rosales, Kathleen</u>	

Humanities	
<u>Isaacs, Brent</u>	X
<u>Marcoux, Pete</u>	X
<u>McLaughlin, Kate</u>	X
<u>Peppard, Bruce</u>	X
<u>Adrienne Sharp</u>	X
<u>Simon, Jenny</u>	X

Industry & Technology	
<u>Gebert, Pat</u>	
<u>Hofmann, Ed</u>	X
<u>MacPherson, Lee</u>	X
<u>Marston, Doug</u>	

Learning Resources Unit	
<u>Striepe, Claudia</u>	X
<u>Ichinaga, Moon</u>	X

Mathematical Sciences	
<u>Boerger, John</u>	
<u>Fry, Greg</u>	X
<u>Glucksman, Marc</u>	exc
<u>Taylor, Susan</u>	
<u>Yun, Paul</u>	X

Natural Sciences	
<u>Cowell, Chas</u>	
<u>Herzig, Chuck</u>	X
<u>Jimenez, Miguel</u>	X
<u>Palos Teresa</u>	X
<u>Vakil, David</u>	X

Academic Affairs	
<u>Chapman, Quajuana</u>	

ECC CEC Members	
<u>Evans, Jerome</u>	
<u>Norton, Tom</u>	
<u>Panski, Saul</u>	X
<u>Pratt, Estina</u>	X
<u>Smith, Darwin</u>	

Assoc. Students Org.	
<u>Caspar, Joshua</u>	X
<u>Safazada, Ana</u>	

Ex- Officio Positions	
<u>Arce, Francisco</u>	X
<u>Nishime, Jeanie</u>	X
<u>Shadish, Elizabeth</u>	
<u>Kjeseth, Lars</u>	X

Guests and/Other Officers: Jean Shankweiler (Dean's Rep), Barbara Perez, Emily Rader, Philip Stokes (ASO)

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

The second Academic Senate meeting of the Fall 2009 semester was called to order at 12:37pm

Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes [pp. 5-8 of packet] from the last Academic Senate meeting were approved with the following corrections:

M. Ichinaga noted an incorrect spelling of her name. C. Jeffries noted that she had said "lower enrollment" classes, not "smaller" classes in the section on Cancellation of Winter classes. The corrections will be made.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

President's report – Dave Vakil (henceforth DV)

DV reported that the last Council meeting focused on this year's goals. Items discussed were:

- A. Including increasing faculty /staff recognition. Some possibilities discussed involved creating a part- time faculty award, and increasing the use of Applause cards, while decreasing the processing time of the cards.
- B. Increasing the dissemination of information re: fiscal matters/issues on campus. For instance, the latest information concerns the possibility of ECC losing approximately \$1.4 million from ARRA (stimulus), mostly intended for categorical programs.
- C. Improving internal communication on campus and between ECC and the CEC.
- D. Campus Climate survey is coming in Spring 2010. DV encouraged faculty to take it and spread the word. Ms. Graf will be giving a presentation on this soon.
- E. Facilities Master Plan – campus forum coming soon. One will be held during the next senate meeting, but another meeting has been scheduled for Oct 2nd from 1-2pm. DV encouraged all faculty to attend. Mr. Wells asked why the Academic Senate meeting time was not avoided and Dr. Nishime replied that it was an unavoidable matter concerning Dr. Fallo's schedule and the necessity of getting input before the Facilities meeting on Oct 26th. The plan will lay the groundwork for going out for an extension on our Bond in 2012.
- F. The College Council self- evaluation results [see packet pp 18-19] Mr. Marcoux represented the Academic Senate.
- G. No show report rates – we need to do better. [see p 20 of packet] DV exhorted Senate members to spread the word, noting that only 60% of ECC and 20% of CEC reports were completed. Questions were raised re: comparison to the paper reporting process and DV will look into this.
- H. FTES and Section counts for 08-09 and 09-10 (see packet :Compton on p 21, ECC on p 22]. DV noted that the numbers are out of date.

DV also introduced Mr. Michael Mangan, part- time English instructor, as the part- time faculty Academic Senator. One part- time faculty vacancy still remains.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

DV stopped his report at this point and asked most of the Officers to hold their reports so that the Senate could hear from **student government on BP 5500 & AP 5520 – Academic Honesty & Standards of Conduct**. [See pp 46-56 (espec p 47) of packet]

DV said that the students were concerned about the Academic Senate vote. They want us to reconsider our stance. DV introduced Joshua Casper, ASO President, and Philip Stokes, Region 7 representative to address the Academic Senate.

Mr. Casper noted that the students concerns involved the language used in the section on Academic Dishonesty. They felt, for instance, that Section 1 a, points vi & ix (6 & 9) put the responsibility on the students to check with the teachers, and the students believed it was not their responsibility, but rather that of the instructor to inform students via syllabi, mail, and verbal instructions. They further argued that 1 a viii (8) should be changed from ...UNLESS specifically authorized...to other wording as students might otherwise believe that they were prohibited from using devices for assignments and class work. The students believed that the focus needed to be put back on the faculty. Additionally, 1 a ii (2) was felt to be too vague, and the students suggested the term “graded work”, as some students may consider their class notes work and saw those as their own property to exchange with other students.

Mr. Stokes agreed with Mr. Casper, noting that students “copying” fellow class mates notes after being ill and missing class are merely demonstrating that they care about catching up with class work. He argued that it is ultimately the instructor’s responsibility to set guidelines on what is appropriate and therefore the student government is not in favor of the current language and would like to see it amended. Students see the teacher as being the responsible figure, and pay fees to benefit from the credentials and expertise of the teacher. The current language places an unfair burden on the students and does not account for faculty inconsistencies. The language is felt not to be in the interests of the students.

Discussion followed. Ms. Jeffries said the counselors would be in favor of the changes proposed by the students as some students may be afraid to speak to faculty, thus it was better if the responsibility was left with the teachers.

A motion was made and seconded, to consider each point as a separate section. Referring to 1 a ii (2) [pg 46 of packet] Ms. McGinley argued against including the word “graded” as she had noted students in the nursing program copying other’s patient care plans, and, while these were not intended to be graded, this was a bad practice. Some senators argued that the intent of #ii (2), seemed to be covered in #i (1) and so could possibly be eliminated for the sake of clarity.

Mr. Kjeseth noted that one could find problems for all of the points and that it seemed we were wasting time trying to micromanage the issue. Mr. Kjeseth recommended bringing the Policy back to the Ed. Policies Committee. There was a motion to delete item ii (2) but more discussion broke out. Mr. Stokes said that the current language put the burden on the student to interpret the teacher’s intentions, and in some instances these intentions were difficult to interpret. The question arose as to who had the burden of informing the students? Mr. Ahmadapour noted that the students were obliged to read the Code of

Student Conduct in the Schedule of Classes. Dr. Arce agreed with Mr. Kjeseth that the discussion was getting overly specific. He said that if the faculty of the Senate was having such trouble interpreting the policy, imagine how difficult it would be for the students. Dr. Arce said the individual faculty members should be trusted to know what they are doing. Dr. Nishime and Mr. Marcoux were of the opinion that we should keep the general statement 1a and eliminate the specific examples. DV wants the Ed. Policies Committee to take another look at the policy.

Mr. Wells made a motion to table the policy discussion and refer the matter back to the Ed. Policies Committee. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Jeffries made a plea for volunteers for the Ed. Policies Committee. DV thanked the student government representatives Casper and Stokes, and asked the student government to put a student member on the Ed. Policies Committee.

OFFICERS' REPORTS

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

LW reported on the PBC Minutes [See pp 23-25 of packet], which featured extensive discussion of the District's response to the Accreditation Committee letter. All four Vice Presidents came to this meeting and the emphasis of the committee is slowly shifting from budgeting to planning, as desired. All are welcome to attend these meetings, held on the first and third Thursdays of the month in Library 202.

LW also referred to the minutes [See p 10 of packet] for mention of reports to the last few meetings which contain important information. LW noted that the PBC continues to brainstorm on issues that need to be considered as much is still undecided in Sacramento. LW remarked that President Fallo spends a lot of time with the PBC so the minutes have lots of insights.

As mentioned earlier, DV asked that some officer reports be held off. Ms. Ichinaga's Council of Deans meeting report was held off, as was Dr. Gold's Faculty Development Committee report, Mr. Panski's Compton Educational Center report, Mr. Wells' Legislative Action report, and Mr. Kjeseth's Curriculum Committee report.

VP Educational Policies Committee – Chris Jeffries (CJ)

BP 4020, AP 4020 Program, Curriculum and Course Development[see pp 26-27 of packet] It was decided to treat this as a first reading as it has been five months since the Senate looked at the issue. We will vote on the Policy and Procedure at the next meeting.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Calendar Committee.

For Summer 2010, all ECC classes will start 06/28/10 and there will be no first 6-week session. Compton will be the same with two overlapping six week sessions and an eight week session. Mr. Panski thanked Dr. Arce for his help. The reason for eliminating the first six week session is that many high schools are graduating at that time and a date favorable to the majority was chosen as the start date. Ms. Jeffries however, objected to this decision on the grounds that student athletes report for training in August and thus would be denied the opportunity to participate in the Summer session. Ms. Jeffries was

asked to get this input to the Calendar Committee. The calendar had to be changed officially to reflect the semester date and the Summer session dates as these dates determine residency. Mr. Wells asked whether the decision was made using collegial consultation. Dr. Arce noted that the Calendar Committee had been consulted, and Ms. Perez noted that the calendar Committee had approved the 06/28/10 start date. No change has as yet been made to plans for Winter 2011, though there may be some conversations about the possibility and effects of eliminating Winter ..Many arguments in favor of reconfiguring calendar to: Spring starting January, followed by 2 back-to-back 6-week summer sessions + an overlapping 8 week summer session. DV asked the senators to discuss with their dept/division and give feedback.

Student learning Outcomes – Jenny Simon (JS)

[See pp 42-44 of packet] for courses needing SLOs. This was also distributed during the last meeting. JS also reminded the senators of the upcoming SLO workshops, and said there had been a great response so far. JS thanked Industry and Technology for their work, in particular.

NEW BUSINESS

Program Review Highlights: Learning Resources Unit - Claudia Striepe (CS)

CS reported on the Learning Resources Unit's Program Review, based on the 2007-08 Program Review chaired by D. Brown (librarian)

Who does the Program serve and why is this program beneficial to the community?

The LRU program serves the students AND faculty, as well as the staff of El Camino College. The program is beneficial to students in providing resources/materials and study and research skills; information literacy is stressed as a way of optimizing college success and as a lifelong learning skill. Faculty and staff benefit by having research materials available for their use along with other services like Inter Library Loan and Book Selection committees, and having the LRU as a support resource to direct students for extra help.

List 2-3 things from your Program Review that are interesting or important.

One thing not clearly discernable from our written report is what a unique resource we have in the Music Library. We are one of the only Community Colleges to have 2 libraries – the Main Schauerman Library and a Music Library. The Music library has been gifted with many wonderful donations over the years and has built up a collection that is the envy of many 4 year schools, especially in the area of sheet music and scores. ECC often has inter- library loan requests from other libraries across the country for items from the collection. Our music students have some great resources to draw on and learn from.

Our book collection went through a stage of being quite shabby and outdated in some areas. A stated goal of the Program Review was to remedy this and with the formation of the library liaison program and hiring of a new acquisitions librarian, Alice Cornelio, efforts to reach out to the faculty in matters pertaining to weeding advice and purchasing suggestions are showing results. Our Program review states that most purchases are based on recommendations from faculty. So please stay involved in your Book Selection Committees, the newly created Faculty Library Advisory group and send personal recommendations to your Division library liaisons.

The LRU is comprised of several vital student /academic support areas without which the student success and retention rates would be much poorer.

A small staff of approx. 25 people handles the Library services, Distance Education and Media Services, the LRC, comprising the LMTC Commons computer labs, Basic Skills and Tutoring. All of these services are very heavily used.

List 2 things you would like other faculty to know about your program.

We would want faculty to know that the library is still a very relevant service on campus. We want faculty to know that library services are constantly modernizing and offering new resources to stay relevant to the new generation of researchers. We encourage faculty to bring their classes for a library visit, and for faculty themselves to familiarize themselves with our resources. The librarians attend workshops/conferences that focus on new technologies, resources, SLO's in an effort to improve library offerings and presentations.

The library Skills program is truly a program with the ability to affect all other academic programs and influence student success and retention. We also believe information competency is a fundamental skill for life- long learning and useful way beyond college life.

Ms. McGinley will give the next overview on the Nursing Program Review.

AA/AS Degree Task Force Reconstituted – Drs. Arce & Nishime

[See pp 57-59 of packet] The idea is to provide pathways for more students to earn AA/AS degrees by creating more streamlined majors. There are many majors but not many degrees in these areas. The college needs to consolidate and combine some areas to streamline, not prolong, the achievement of a degree. The task force will address the idea of trying to get students to take the appropriate units to get a degree and/or transfer.

Board Policy 3430 Prohibition of Sexual and Other Forms of Harassment – 1st Reading

[see pp 60-61 of packet] Dr. Nishime noted that the change in language had been recommended by legal counsel, both ours and those advising other Community College bodies. More changes to language may be forthcoming as these sorts of cases go on to the Supreme court. It was noted that the College Council had suggested adding the phrase “gender identity”. Mr. Panski pointed out that the Policy would apply to students and staff. He also noted that the CEC still had their own contract and disciplinary action processes, therefore the Policy would also need to be adopted by the CEC Board. Ms. Perez will liaise with Compton on this. The Senate will vote on this at the next meeting. Mr. Panski moved to include the phrase “gender identity”. Ms. Jeffries seconded this. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Technology Plan – Pete Marcoux (PM)

PM reported that the Technology Plan focused on building on technologies students already have and use and looked ahead to possible new technology infrastructures like the the virtual technologies of the thin client boxes which would help with IT servicing issues, and cloud computing. There would be a migration from the dedicated pcs. PM also reported on the 3rd generation portal, noting that there were still issues with the portal to be worked out. The Plan was looking ahead to remote management, student tracking, and online inventorying technologies. Also planned were a new telephone system and portal convergence. The Technology Plan would go to the Academic Technology Committee, on which every Division was represented. PM is the Senate representative on

the ATC and also on the Campus Technology Committee. There were also plans to make WiFi more accessible on the entire campus.

Ms. Ichinaga asked how IT priorities were established as there were many day-to-day technology problems/issues that needed to be addressed, for instance in the library WiFi was only available in a third of the building, the printer system gave trouble, there were no other printing options on campus, basic services like student fax access had still to be addressed, public access computers needed an automatic login installed, and so on. On being advised to contact ITS, Ms. Striepe noted that the library seemed to be a low priority as many requests had gone to ITS already. Ms. Ichinaga opined that the spotlight should be on solving the day- to- day problems. PM suggested emailing a list of issues to him to raise at a future meeting. DV suggested Dean Grigsby contact Dr. Arce directly. Dr. Arce said he was unaware that the library was experiencing so many problems.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

For Oct 20:

- Program Review Highlight: Nursing
- Irene Graff & Harold Tyler: Drug & Alcohol Survey coming soon, mandated by Federal government.
- “First” reading of AP exam unit limitations (holdover from Spring). Will discuss and vote during November 3 meeting.
- Department chair survey
- New procedure: dropping students for non-payment of fees, VP Nishime.

For Nov 17: Basic Skills proposal presentation.

The Academic Senate meeting was adjourned at 2:02pm
Cs/ecc2009