

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES
6th April 2010

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

Adjunct Faculty
Mangan, Michael(Hum)

Behavioral & Social Sciences
Firestone, Randy X
Gold, Christina
Moen, Michelle EXC
Widman, Lance X
Wynne, Michael X

Business
Siddiqui, Junaid X
Lau, Philip S

Counseling
Jackson, Brenda X
Jeffries, Chris X
Key, Ken
Pajo, Cristina X

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

Health Sciences & Athletics
Hazell, Tom
McGinley, Pat X
Rosales, Kathleen X

Humanities
Isaacs, Brent X
Marcoux, Pete X
McLaughlin, Kate X
Peppard, Bruce X
Simon, Jenny X

Industry & Technology
Gebert, Pat X
Hofmann, Ed
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
Pratt, Estina
Smith, Darwin

Assoc. Students Org.
Casper, Joshua
Safazada, Ana
Stokes, Philip
Begona Guereca X

Ex- Officio Positions
Arce, Francisco X
Nishime, Jeanie X
Shadish, Elizabeth
Kjeseth, Lars X

Guests and/Other Officers: Barbara Jaffe, Caroline Pinedo

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

The third Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2010 semester was called to order at 12:35pm

Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes [pp. 5 -10 of packet] were approved following a motion from Mr. Wells, seconded by Mr. Marcoux.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

President's report – Dave Vakil (henceforth DV)

DV reported a successful Area C Academic Senate meeting hosted by ECC on March 27th, 2010. Approximately 30 colleges were represented, and much was accomplished. DV mentioned the proposal of a “no confidence” resolution for the ACCJC, and that a topic of concern was how to encourage more diversity in the Academic Senate at the state- wide level.

DV asked for practical ideas and suggestions on this to be forwarded to him. DV particularly thanked Ms. Suekawa for her help and support in preparing for the meeting.

DV also expressed thanks to all the senators who participated in the special meeting on April 1st, which led to a vote of “no confidence” in the ACCJC leadership, with support for an amendment to the current “no confidence” resolution with the intent of looking at alternative accrediting bodies. DV also asked for volunteers to read through and offer guidance on the myriad resolutions that will be considered at the State Plenary session, April 15-17th.

DV reminded the senators again about the “disciplines” list of minimum hiring qualifications. He has received one revision proposal from the Physics/Earth Sciences Dept. to date.

An ECC Planning Summit was held recently, and a summary of the discussions and ideas can be found in the packet [pp 14-17]

DV reminded the senate that the next Academic Senate meeting would be held on the Compton campus in the Board Room on April 20th. Unfortunately the Compton bus is NOT available for use. Alternative transport was discussed. ECC vans can be borrowed if one has undergone the driver training, but hardly any senators had done so. The other alternative would be to carpool, and DV asked all those willing to drive to let him know so that he could arrange some “teams”. Ms. Jeffries also mentioned that the police have two vans which hold 7 people; she will investigate this option further. Compton is very happy to hear that we are coming to their campus. A teleconference Senate meeting has been planned for May 4th; Mr. Marcoux is awaiting more details from Mr. Story on this.

DV remarked that there seemed to be more “personal” problems, and that services are available to help people. DV mentioned the EASE program which offers counseling to employees, and that we should advertise this service to our peers. DV included a brochure in the packet [pp 22-25]

The Climate Survey will be distributed next week, with a submission date of the end of April. It is hoped that we will get a high participation rate.

DV encouraged the senators to also read his detailed report [pp 11-13 of packet]

VP – Compton Center - Saul Panski (SP)

No report.

Curriculum Committee – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

LK noted that according to the CCC bylaws the Curriculum Chair's successor must be elected from the current faculty voting membership. However the CCC election committee's “exhaustive process” had elicited no candidates. LK felt that the reason that no candidates has stepped forward were that people were wary of the time and energy the commitment required. LK felt this was the biggest obstacle. Also

they were apprehensive about the technical and training issues related to the transfer to CurricUNET, and about attaining a workable 6 year (or 4 year) Course Review cycle. Lastly, people did not feel they had enough curriculum knowledge, or enough training opportunities to gain said knowledge.

LK felt that the key to resolving the problem would be to “right- size” the job to make it more attractive to current CCC members. LK noted that at the next meeting he might ask the Senate to suspend the by-laws to allow a bigger pool of candidates.

Dr. Arce stated that he is aware of and sympathetic to the issue, and has a proposal under consideration to increase staffing in the Academic affairs office. If there were an analyst to help, this would reduce the pressure significantly. Dr. Arce noted that we are under scrutiny as regards our Review cycle as the perception seems to be that we start initiatives but cannot sustain them. We have to prove to the Commission that we CAN sustain initiatives, for instance in the areas of Course Review and SLOs. Dr. Arce agreed that no one should have to work for free.

Mr. Marcoux asked LK if he had someone in mind for the position. LK said no, and that a better solution would be to make the job attractive to people who are currently on the Curriculum Committee so that they could step in now.

Mr. Marcoux asked whether LK felt 100% release time was needed. LK said yes, it was necessary at least during the transition period, and after that it could taper off to about 50%, in his opinion. LK also stated that he would be on board to help out as much as he could. The Chair elect needed a plan re: training, going to Curriculum Institute conferences, shadowing the current Chair, etc. as the job is very complex. DV noted that as Chair elect of the Academic Senate, he had found shadowing Ex President AS Pete Marcoux very helpful indeed, and Mr. Marston agreed re: his time with Joe Banano.

VP - Educational Policies – Chris Jeffries (CJ)

CJ reported that minutes from the last meeting, March 9th, are in the packet [pg 34] The next meeting has had to be changed, due to Spring Break, and will take place on April 27th at 1pm in the Student Counseling Conference room.

VP - Faculty Development – Chris Gold (CG)

CG was unable to attend, but DV noted that the Committee continues to work on the **Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Award** and on **revising the Faculty Handbook**.

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

[See pp. 26- 28 of packet] for the PBC 3/4/2010 Minutes. LW reported that President Fallo had attended this meeting for a discussion of PBC responsibilities, especially in the areas of planning, budgeting and communication. LW felt that improvement in the interaction between program Review and Planning and Budgeting is taking place and is on- going. LW felt that the critical element is how individual faculty communicate planning and budgeting processes at the grassroots level of our Divisions and departments, and campus communications in general.

[See pp 31-33 of packet] for the tentative budget assumptions for 2010-2011. This shows an initial draft of the assumptions that will be used in building the 2010-11 budget.

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

[See pp 35-37 of packet] MI reported that Copy Center Direct is set to replace email near the end of the semester. MI felt that the “Facts and Figures” for both ECC and CEC, which had earlier been reviewed by Ms. Graf and which are available from the Office of Institutional Research’s web site, provided much valuable information especially as regards information for planning and budgeting. MI mentioned particularly statistics on racial composition, first generation college goers, and textbook purchases. This information also was helpful in proving the college with a culture of evidence. DV also thanked Ms. Pineda for regularly attending the Senate meetings.

Mr. Widman wondered whether anyone had thought of the impact of not having textbooks on SLOs , and how it might affect the outcomes.

Discussion followed on the new methods of getting textbook information to students, including “half” textbooks, customized textbooks, buying chapters of a textbook of the internet, and renting textbooks to students. Ms. Nishime said that buying textbooks was at times a matter of priorities, but that Financial Aid was trying to find ways of alleviating the wait for money, including issuing debit cards. MI noted that with inflation costs had risen and that not many colleges had textbook collections now. MI thanked Mr. Yun for his continued contribution of textbooks to the ECC library, as sometimes teacher donations were our only source of textbooks. Begonia Guereca agreed that many students have problems in this area, with the expense and that she would discuss the issue at the Thursday meeting of the ASO.

VP – Legislative Action – Chris Wells (CW)

CW reported that there are many Bills being considered by the State legislature that may affect community colleges.

He mentioned the following:

SB 1440 & AB 440 California Community Colleges: Student transfer. Colleges would not be allowed to add requirements for a transfer degree.

AB 2302 would have transfer degreed students transfer as juniors/have third year status.

AB 2385 Pilot Program for Accelerated Nursing and Allied Health Care Profession Education at the California Community Colleges, which would allow a degree to be earned in 18 months or less.

AB 1909 would authorize Community Colleges to run K-12 Charter schools.

AB 2542 Accelerating Student Success: Improving Student Outcomes at Community Colleges, would change funding from being based on the third week census to students who successfully complete the degree/certificate. An extra \$1,000. in funding would be provided for each student who completes a degree/certificate, or who is eligible to transfer to a 4 year college.

Kaplan College has come up with a MOU. This may be problematic as it seems it was written without collegial consultation.

CW also distributed a handout showing section offerings. He urged us to look at this so that we avoid creating bottlenecks in the system. Mr. Kjeseth said he had also been at the Conference and had attended a presentation on assessment that had brought up the question of how we can know if Community Colleges are successful. It seems that everyone realizes that measuring success by the number of degrees awarded is not the fairest method, but no one knows quite how else to calculate success. CW said he feared that success measured by degrees awarded might lead to grade inflation.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

NONE

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

AS President- Elect – Dave Vakil (DV).

DV noted that the Senate will need to select a new President- Elect by the end of the Spring Semester. The President- Elect will shadow DV for the 2010-11 year, and will then become the new Academic Senate President and serve a two year term 2011-2012 through 2012-2013. DV said that after much thought he has decided not to run for President again. Mr. Marcoux has volunteered to chair the election committee. DV said that he wanted to put the information out there so that interested parties could start campaigning.

Area C/ASCCC Resolutions – Dave Vakil (DV)

DV is still inviting input and feedback on ALL the resolutions so that he can cast informed votes. Please contact DV with your thoughts.

Program Review Timeline – Dave Vakil (DV)

The question is whether to adopt a 4 year review cycle instead of the current 6 year review cycle. Also how to meet the ACCJC requirements while making our process meaningful and reasonable. DV noted that some background information was available in his President's Report [see pp 11-13 of packet]

Mr. Kjeseth suggested having a mini annual cycle – perhaps targeted at a different aspect each year - and using these annual reports to construct the larger 4 year reviews. Ms. McGinley said that the Nursing Department does just that as they have State and National reviews to do, so she agrees with the idea of an annual model. Dr. Jaffe said the CurricUNET module would work with such a plan. She added that review should be annual to fit into Plan Builder. Dr. Arce said it would make the review process more relevant if it were on-going. We would be constantly current.

Ms. Striepe asked whether we should not be having this discussion in tandem with a discussion on Department Chairs, as this might alleviate some of the concerns about who would be doing/directing all the work involved. Dr. Simon said there was also the question of the SLO cycles – the Assessment of Learning Committee is currently compiling a timetable re: SLOs.

Mr. Marcoux asked where the idea of the 4 year cycle had come from, what was wrong with the 6 year cycle, and what were other colleges doing?

Dr. Arce noted that the 6 year cycle is a Matriculation regulation and is still common around the state. He noted that if we adopted an annual “mini” review that 4 year review would not be onerous. Ms. Taylor said that while she liked the idea of being flexible and spreading the work out, but was concerned that it was not being made clear what exactly was being talked about. If we were expected to vote on the issue, she wanted annual review and Program Review to be clearly defined.

Dr. Arce said that what we currently have is good, but a bit long. In his opinion, the time did not really matter so much as the credibility of our Program Review efforts. Whatever we decide we have to make it sustainable, and show we are serious about Program Review. Dr. Arce is exploring the possibility of having the Office of Institutional Research create and analyze data for each Division, which the Divisions could use in their review and planning processes.

Mr. Wells said he sees Program Review as a document one updates and revises as one goes along. It does not have to be a NEW document each time. Mr. Kjeseth said he felt Program Review should be important, not just a tired updating, but a showcase for new ideas and initiatives that show what we are doing. The value lies in talking to each other about processes and practices, creating a record and stimulating each other. Dr. Jaffe said it is shortsighted to think of Program Review only as a way of getting money. Dr. Nishime said that the Foundation would be offering the “mini- grants” again next year, but that she has asked the Foundation and Grants Office to consider for grants only those items that are in Plan Builder. Dr. Jaffe and Mr. Kjeseth were asked to bring an overview of the Program Review process and a mock- up of the Program Review module in CurricUNET to the May 4th Academic Senate meeting.

Amendment to “No Confidence” Resolution – Dave Vakil (DV)

DV noted that Mr. Firestone had proposed stronger language in the ‘no confidence’ resolution. DV was not quite sure how to make the amendment. DV decided to work with someone to meld the proposed language into a new resolution before and during the Plenary Session.

Senate Meeting with the Deans’.

Discussion postponed to next meeting.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

April 20th – Copyright policy and procedures, 2nd reading

May 4th – Basic Skills presentation – Margaret Quinones

Future

ARCC report results for ECC/Compton
DV's survey of Deans' regarding thoughts on Department Chairs
Evaluating the Academic Senate
Program Discontinuance/Support

PUBLIC COMMENT.

NONE

The Academic Senate meeting was adjourned at 1:56pm
Cs/ecc2010