

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES  
SPECIAL MEETING 29<sup>th</sup> March 2011

**Adjunct Faculty**

Sue Ellen Warren

Leah Pate

**Behavioral & Social Sciences**

Firestone, Randy

Gold, Christina X

Moen, Michelle X

Widman, Lance X

Wynne, Michael X

**Business**

Siddiqui, Junaid

Lau, Philip S

Hull, Kurt

**Counseling**

Jackson, Brenda EXC

Jeffries, Chris EXC

Pajo, Christina X

**Fine Arts**

Ahmadpour, Ali X

Bloomberg, Randall X

Crossman, Mark X

Schultz, Patrick X

Wells, Chris X

**Health Sciences & Athletics**

Hazell, Tom

McGinley, Pat X

Rosales, Kathleen

Colunga, Mina X

Hicks, Tom

**Humanities**

Isaacs, Brent X

Marcoux, Pete

McLaughlin, Kate

Halonen, Briita

Simon, Jenny X

**Industry & Technology**

Gebert, Pat X

Hofmann, Ed

MacPherson, Lee X

Winfree, Merriel

Marston, Doug X

**Learning Resources Unit**

Striepe, Claudia X

Ichinaga, Moon X

**Mathematical Sciences**

Bateman, Michael X

Fry, Greg

Hamza Hamza X

Taylor, Susan X

Yun, Paul X

**Natural Sciences**

Doucette, Pete X

Herzig, Chuck X

Jimenez, Miguel

Palos Teresa X

vacant

**Academic Affairs & SCA**

Chapman, Quajuana

Arce, Francisco X

Nishime, Jeanie X

Lee, Claudia

**ECC CEC Members**

Evans, Jerome

Norton, Tom

Panski, Saul X

Pratt, Estina X

Halligan, Chris

**Assoc. Students Org.**

Budri, Lala

Lopez, Jessica

**Ex- Officio Positions**

Shadish, Elizabeth X

Kjeseth, Lars X

**Guests, Dean's Rep, Visitors:**

T. Lew, B. Jaffe, V. Robles, D. Goldberg,  
A. Spor, G. Miranda, M. Rahnavard,  
N. Velasquez, A. Zazveta, J. Mendoza,  
D. Brown, C. Pineda

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

The special session of the Academic Senate was called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:36pm.

#### Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes from the March 15<sup>th</sup> Academic Senate meeting and this special session meeting will be approved at the April 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **AGENDA**

Dr. Gold welcomed senate members and guests to the special meeting.

Ms. Pajo made a motion to reorder the agenda to attend to some new business first while the Senate had quorum numbers, and then go on to the emergency business. This was seconded by Ms. Ichinaga. All approved the motion.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Amendment of ECC Academic Senate Constitution, Article IV: Officers. First Reading.**

Ms. Pajo stated that in light of the discussion on having co-chairs with staggered terms for the running of the Faculty Development Committee, it would be logical to amend the Constitution on this point [see pg. 14 of packet] by the addition of the statement “*In addition, co-officers may be nominated and elected at the discretion of the Senate and may serve either jointly for 2 years or in staggered terms*” so that it could be open to other Committees to have the same arrangement.

The next meeting will see the second reading of this item.

### **EMERGENCY BUSINESS**

#### **Academic Senate Recommendations re: the impact of budget cuts on 10+1 items, particularly scheduling, curriculum and programs. Chris Gold (CG)**

CG noted the draft document [see packet pp 4-6] intended to provide guiding principles for budget cuts in the 10+1 area. The draft is a result of the ideas and input from Senators, the Senate Executives, campus documents/guiding principles, LAO, conversations with Dr. Arce, and other statistics [see packet pp 7 – 13]

CG stepped through the packet [pg 7-13] inserts, noting the VPAA & Deans’ Selection Reduction Criteria document [pg.7], a Sections Reduction proposal [pg.9], 5 year trends in Sections and FTES [pp.10-11], the 3 possible budget scenarios [pg.12], and an attempt to break courses into categories [pg.13]

Dr. Nishime remarked that the VPAA & Deans’ Selection Reduction Criteria document included in the packet was no longer a valid draft.

CG noted that the budget crisis meant a time of tough choices and the Academic Senate wanted to give input into the 10+1 areas. CG noted that the planning and decision process needed to be transparent and involve collegial consultation and adhere to existing principles and policies. CG noted the basic draft document on pg.4 with more recommendations and other potential reduction areas on pp 5-6 of packet. CG then opened the floor for comment/discussion.

Dr. Spor asked for clarification of the statement “*minimize the detrimental impact on students*” CG said that it was aimed at protecting GE courses, courses for transfer, and those required for degrees and certificates. Ms. Taylor wanted clarification that these areas would receive *fewer* cuts, not *no* cuts. CG answered yes.

CG then asked if all were in agreement with the stated sentiments in general and all answered yes.

**CG then moved the discussion to pg. 5** of the draft document, noting that the intent was to reinforce the importance of the mission of the State and local community college system. Ms. Taylor felt that # 1 was a

bit broad, asking how we would define “academic goals”. Mr. Crossman felt this was clarified in the second half of the statement. Ms. Taylor asked if that meant we were not supporting athletics goals and the like. Mr. Kjeseth noted that the intent is the achievement of degrees/certificates or transfer, not avocational goals, and the statement aimed to preserve the courses and programs that lead to those academic goals. Ms. Taylor noted that many of our courses are dual purpose.

Mr. Panski wanted to add a clause to #1 to include instructional support services like libraries. It was agreed that #1 would read “Focus on helping students complete their stated academic goals, by preserving *instructional support services* and courses that meet degree and transfer...”

Dr. Young noted that Child Development has some dual purpose courses, and the program has sometimes had to cut sections. The first allegiance is to saving the program and certificate. Mr. Wells noted that one would have to look at how many other courses would/could fulfill the GE requirements. If there are many one could look at the program. Mr. Kjeseth said that was one of the reasons for the prioritization of the points, that we thought the end result of a degree or certificate or transfer is important. Ms. Taylor said she was nervous of the word “*preserving*” and suggested using the phrase “*preserving as much as possible*”

Dr. Spor suggested moving #3 into the introductory paragraph on pg. 5 as there was some duplication of ideas. Dr. Nishime thought it would be a good idea to have a list of the numbers of degrees and certificates historically awarded to see student need of programs. CG noted, as Dr. Young had indicated, that some programs may be serving more student than just those in the program. Mr. Kjeseth said that the need for historical patterns re: degrees and certificates was understood, hence the inclusion of #3. Mr. Crossman thought it would be useful and interesting to have data on transfer patterns as well, and Mr. Kjeseth agreed. Dr. Shadish noted that it had only been recently a topic of interest so the data may be thin. Dr. Nishime said that actually data was good for the last 5 years. Ms. Taylor wondered about courses vs programs, noting that sections may be cut to reduce costs, but if small programs with some special courses were to be cut would that mean they were cut forever, or merely on hold? CG said there was a difference between discontinuance and suspension. Only the Curriculum Committee process could discontinue a program, the Senate was recommending suspension as the preferred term as seen on pg 6 Further Recommendations #3

Ms. Taylor noted all the talk seemed to be on budget cuts to courses and programs, and asked whether there would be further administrative cuts. Dr. Arce said he wanted to allay fears, and said he was not aware of any program in so much trouble it would necessitate being cut. He noted there are a few problems with degree and certificate completion, but these problems were being worked on. Ms. Taylor then recommended striking mentions of program cuts. Mr. Kjeseth said he disagreed, noting that we are facing a bad situation that was likely going to get worse, but he did agree that we should say something more specific on program discontinuance vs suspension. Mr. Robles asked for the definition of a program. Is it FYE or a Paralegal program, and if it does not meet the definition is a target for elimination. Mr. Robles said he remembered the total removal of the Culinary Arts program. CG said the Academic Senate purview only extended to academic programs, not student services programs, but agreed that it would be good to clarify *academic* programs in the document. Dr. Arce agreed that it was important to distinguish between the programs, noting that cuts would only be made in the academic programs, which included Career Tech., and while none were in danger from lack of enrollment, section reduction was being considered. Mr. Widman confirmed that # 3 on pg.5 would be included in the opening paragraph and #1, and 2 would be amended to include the suggestions. CG confirmed this saying that this was a working document and encouraged comments and suggestions.

**CG then moved the discussion to pg. 6** of the document. Mr. Panski was concerned at the inclusion of non-credit courses here, noting that if something happened at ECC it would have repercussions for classes and courses at the Compton Center campus – citing the example of the ESL program. Mr. Panski suggested adding a note stating that reductions and cuts could differ from campus to campus. Mr. Panski asked about the genesis of Further Recommendation #1. CG said it had come from the second paragraph of the VPAA and Deans’ Selection Reduction Criteria. Mr. Panski said that most of the CEC students

tested in low, so why target Basic Skills. Mr. Kjeseth said the intent was not to eliminate but reduce offerings.. Mr. Kjeseth also spoke to the point re: the different campuses, saying that the document could be seen primarily as a Torrance document as the situations on the 2 campuses were so different, and that this should be made very clear. Torrance is the bigger campus, with more “wobble-room” and the intent re: Basic Skills was to narrow the funnel a little so as to guarantee that those in the funnel would make progress and get through the program in a timely manner. Mr. Panski was concerned that if Basic Skills were made non- credit on the Torrance campus, they would become non- credit on the CEC campus as well. He suggested having a note not to eliminate, but perhaps pursue a non-credit program later. It was finally agreed to eliminate #1 and to put a note in differentiating the Torrance and Compton campuses. Dr. Young was worried that other mentions of Basic Skills could still be misconstrued, and Dr. Lew agreed, noting that Basic Skills also impacted Financial Aid apportionment. Mr. Isaacs wanted to know the genesis of #1. Ms. Striepe explained that at the Senate executive meeting it was felt that very low Basic Skills classes should not be credit classes but prerequisites, and therefore perhaps should be part of a non-credit program.

Mr. Marston asked how one would go about un-suspending a program later, and how long a program could be suspended for. CG said she was not aware of a policy on the matter and was therefore in favor of leaving the programs in the catalog with a note regarding temporary suspension, as discussed earlier. Mr. Crossman said that the numbering on pg. 6 implied a prioritization and suggested a statement like “*in no particular order*”, or making a bulleted list. With respect to #8 Repeatable courses, Mr. Crossman noted that some repeatability was core to the college mission and suggested the point be modified to allow repeatability for 2 academic years. Mr. Kjeseth agreed, saying that this was a complex issue regardless of the budget, and might be an issue to raise at Curriculum. Mr. Kjeseth noted the cutting repeatable courses in itself would probably not result in many cuts. It was observed that ECC does not have much fluff as we have focused on the core mission, so in a way we will be penalized. Sacrifices will have to be made by all, and the sacrifices will not be limited to the recommendations on the lists. The senators were urged to go back and talk to their fellow faculty and Deans to get consensus on what cuts the Division ARE willing to make that will mean the least harm to the programs.

Mr. Crossman said it is important to have precision of language as we need direction in areas of specificity – as just shown in the discussion on repeatability. Dr. Spor noted that the LAO had come up with the recommendation on repeatable courses and we may have no say finally on the issue. Ms. Taylor remarked that more detail was desirable with all the recommendations as too much was being left to the discretion of others. Mr. Wells noted that it was stated that these were only for *Consideration*.

Mr. Marston considered the recommendations a prescription for mediocrity, and agreed with Mr. Crossman that the list should not be numbered but include a statement like “*in no particular order*”, or making a bulleted list. Mr. Marston also felt it would be very hard to make some of the suggested cuts as things were very interrelated, for instance some advanced classes are needed for program completion.

Mr. Robles noted that we are still offering classes 7 days a week, and that some of these be put on the reduction consideration list. He noted that some students could only come on weekends and suggested a statement to protect some weekend classes.

Mr. Wells noted that weekend classes might present a scheduling issue, but might not be significant in terms of reducing sections. Mr. Marston felt that they should be considered as weekend classes did incur running costs like lights, custodial services, and so on.

Mr. Crossman said that high school classes may have made sense at one time, but what was the current justification for these classes. Dr. Arce said that we are scaling back in this area, and he would recommend cutting them altogether.

CG said that brought up the point of our not knowing the costs or cost savings of many of the items and that it would be good to have this data. This concern had come up with discussion on the Study Abroad program, the comments were purely speculative as there was no hard data re: costs to work with.

It was further noted that with reference to “lowest” Basic Skills courses, BS courses were not sequenced so it would be difficult to say which were the lowest. Dr. Lew said that the college had been deficient in defining Basic Skills clearly, and that there were several definitions about. Basic Skills was commonly

seen as course 2 levels below college level – this broad definition coming from the Poppy Copy, and Dr. Lew would recommend using this broadest sense definition.

Mr. Robles asked how many courses were taught in the prison system, and CG thought the number was around .4% Dr. Spor noted that these courses were run under a separate contract and separate funds.

Mr. Kjeseth felt that thought the list on pg.6 had generated good discussion, perhaps it got too complicated and he suggested just keeping pgs. 4 and 5 with a few clarifications and amendments. Mr. Isaacs agreed saying it would make for a stronger document. Mr. Widman disagreed, noting that the Deans' had made specific suggestions, and we should be on record as having made some specific recommendations too. CG agreed, noting that we had been requested to provide details. Dr. Arce said that the VPAs and Deans had compiled their document with the intent to share, and to be inclusive. CG asked how others felt. Mr. Wells was in favor of full inclusion, whereas Mr. Marston felt it was not our job. Mr. Taylor suggested leaving in the Course Reductions for Consideration, but removing the Further Recommendations section – and returning to these items at another meeting. Mr. Widman agreed that these were items that needed to be kept on the table and that the discussions needed to be transparent. Mr. Marston felt otherwise, remarking that we did not KNOW what was going to happen. Mr. Widman said we DID know that one of the 3 scenarios was going to happen, and we were running out of time to plan. Dr. Spor agreed, noting that the PDC needs the recommendations in April, so we did not have the luxury of time. CG agreed noting that Ms. Higdon had said that the State had moved beyond scenario 1, and was looking at scenario 2 or 3. Mr. Widman said this would be further discussed at the April 7<sup>th</sup> Town Hall meeting.

Dr. Nishime asked whether the Campus Theatre would be large enough for the meeting, or if the location should be moved to the Marsee? It was felt it might be better to move to the Marsee in terms of the numbers of people who would likely attend.

Dr. Arce noted the college had cut 170 sections last summer and might cut another 40 – 50 sections this summer, agreeing with Mr. Marston that the information was vague and no one could really tell what would happen. Dr. Arce said that in terms of sections, he was not planning any significant cuts for Fall. He emphasized the need to proceed slowly.

CG noted that scheduling is on the agenda for the next Senate meeting. Mr. Wells said we should also discuss short term classes and weekend scheduling.

#### **NEW BUSINESS. Contd.**

Dr. Shadish said she would table her report for another time.

#### **Resolution of Appreciation. Chris Gold (CG)**

CG announced she would like to present a Resolution of Appreciation to UNNAMED/SURPRISE. The resolution would be presented at the Academic Senate meeting following the Spring break which will take place at the Compton campus on April 19<sup>th</sup>.

#### **ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 1:50pm

Cs/ecc2011