



# Academic Senate of El Camino College 2010-2011

October 19, 2010

AC152, 16007 Crenshaw Boulevard  
Torrance, CA 90506-0001 (310) 532-3670 x3254  
www.elcamino.edu/academics/academicssenate/

## Officers & Executive Committee

President	<b>Christina Gold</b>	Co-VPs Faculty Development	<b>Briita Halonen &amp; Cristina Pajo</b>
VP Compton Educ'l Center	<b>Saul Panski</b>	VP Finance and Special Projects	<b>Lance Widman</b>
Curriculum Chair	<b>Lars Kjeseth</b>	VP Legislative Action	<b>Chris Wells</b>
VP Educational Policies	<b>Chris Jeffries</b>	Secretary	<b>Claudia Striepe</b>

## Senate Mailing List

<u>Adjunct</u>	(1 yr term)	<u>Health Sci &amp; Athletics/Nursing</u>	<u>Natural Sciences</u>
_____ (vacant)		<b>Tom Hazell*</b> 10	<b>Chuck Herzig</b> 11/12
_____ (vacant)		<b>Tom Hicks</b> 10	<b>Miguel Jimenez</b> 11/12
		<b>Mina Colunga</b> 12/13	<b>Teresa Palos*</b> 10/11
<u>Behavior &amp; Social Sciences</u>		<b>Pat McGinley</b> 12/13	<b>Pete Doucette</b> 12/13
<b>Randy Firestone</b> 11/12		<b>Kathleen Rosales</b> 11/12	_____ (vacant)
<b>Christina Gold</b> 10/11			
<b>Michelle Moen</b> 11/12		<u>Humanities</u>	<u>Academic Affairs &amp; SCA</u>
<b>Lance Widman*</b> 10/11		<b>Brent Isaacs</b> 11/12	<b>Dr. Francisco Arce</b>
<b>Michael Wynne</b> 11/12		<b>Peter Marcoux</b> 11/12	<b>Dr. Jeanie Nishime</b>
		<b>Kate McLaughlin</b> 11/12	<b>Claudia Lee</b>
<u>Business</u>		<b>Briita Halonen</b> 11/12	
<b>Phillip Lau</b> 11/12		<b>Jenny Simon</b> 11/12	<u>Associated Students Org.</u>
<b>Jay Siddiqui*</b> 11/12			<b>Jessica Lopez</b>
<b>Kurt Hull</b> 12/13		<u>Industry &amp; Technology</u>	<b>Dalal Budri</b>
		<b>Patty Gebert</b> 12/13	
<u>Compton Educational Center</u>	(1 yr term)	<b>Harold Hofmann</b> 12/13	<u>President/Superintendent</u>
<b>Jerome Evans</b> 10/11		<b>Lee Macpherson</b> 12/13	<b>Dr. Thomas Fallo</b>
<b>Chris Halligan</b> 10/11		<b>Douglas Marston*</b> 12/13	
<b>Tom Norton</b> 10/11		<b>Merriel Winfree</b> 12/13	<u>The Union</u> <b>Editor</b>
<b>Saul Panski</b> 10/11			
<b>Estina Pratt</b> 10/11		<u>Learning Resource Unit</u>	<u>Division Personnel</u>
		<b>Moon Ichinaga</b> 10/11	<b>Jean Shankweiler</b>
<u>Counseling</u>		<b>Claudia Striepe*</b> 10/11	<b>Don Goldberg</b>
<b>Cristina Pajo</b> 11/12			<b>Tom Lew</b>
<b>Brenda Jackson*</b> 10/11		<u>Mathematical Sciences</u>	
<b>Chris Jeffries</b> 10/11		<b>Michael Bateman</b> 12/13	<u>Counseling</u> <b>Ken Key</b>
		<b>John Boerger</b> 10/11	<u>Ex-officio positions</u>
<u>Fine Arts</u>		<b>Greg Fry</b> 10/11	ECCFT President
<b>Ali Ahmadpour</b> 11/12		<b>Susan Taylor</b> 11/12	<b>Elizabeth Shadish</b>
<b>Randall Bloomberg</b> 11/12		<b>Paul Yun*</b> 10/11	<b>Nina Velasquez</b>
<b>Mark Crossman</b> 11/12			Curriculum Chair
<b>Patrick Schulz</b> 11/12			<b>Lars Kjeseth</b>
<b>Chris Wells*</b> 11/12			<u>Institutional Research</u>
			<b>Irene Graff</b>
			<b>Carolyn Pineda</b>

Dates after names indicate the last academic year of the senator's three year term, except for Compton senators who serve one-year terms. For example 11/12 = 2011-2012.

\*denotes senator from the division who has served on Senate the longest (i.e. the "senior senator")



# Academic Senate of El Camino College 2010-2011

October 19, 2010

AC152, 16007 Crenshaw Boulevard  
Torrance, CA 90506-0001 (310) 532-3670 x3254  
www.elcamino.edu/academics/academicssenate/

## **SENATE'S PURPOSE (from the Senate Constitution)**

- A. To provide an organization through which the faculty will have the means for full participation in the formulation of policy on academic and professional matters relating to the college including those in Title 5, Subchapter 2, Sections 53200-53206. *California Code of Regulations*. Specifically, as provided for in Board Policy 2510, and listed below, the "Board of Trustees will normally accept the recommendations of the Academic Senate on academic and professional matters of:
1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines
  2. Degree and certificate requirements
  3. Grading policies
  4. Educational program development
  5. Standards and policies regarding student preparation and success
  6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles
  7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation process, including self-study and annual reports
  8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
  9. Processes for program review
  10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development, and
  11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate."
- B. To facilitate communication among faculty, administration, employee organizations, bargaining agents and the El Camino College Board of Trustees.

## **ECC ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS** (1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesdays, usually)

<b><u>FALL 2010</u></b>		<b><u>SPRING 2011</u></b>	
September 7	DE Conference Room	March 1	Alondra Room
September 21	DE Conference Room	March 15	Alondra Room
October 5	Alondra Room	April 5	Alondra Room
October 19	Alondra Room	April 19	Compton Board Room
November 2	DE Conference Room	May 3	Alondra Room
November 16	Alondra Room	May 17	Alondra Room
December 7	Alondra Room	June 7	Alondra Room

## **CEC ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS** (Thursday after ECC Senate, usually)

<b><u>FALL 2010</u></b>		<b><u>SPRING 2011</u></b>	
September 9	Board Room	March 3	Board Room
September 23	Board Room	March 17	Board Room
October 7	Board Room	April 7	Board Room
October 21	Board Room	April 21	Board Room
November 4	Board Room	May 5	Board Room
November 18	Board Room	May 19	Board Room
December 9	Board Room	June 2	Board Room



**AGENDA & TABLE OF CONTENTS**

		Pages
<b>A. CALL TO ORDER (12:30)</b>		
<b>B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>		<b>6-14</b>
<b>C. OFFICER REPORTS</b>	<b>A. President</b> <b>B. VP – Compton Center</b> <b>C. Chair – Curriculum</b> <b>D. VP – Educational Policies</b> <b>E. Co-VPs – Faculty Development</b> <b>F. VP – Finance</b> <b>G. VP – Legislative Action</b>	<b>15-22</b>      <b>23-24</b>  <b>25</b>
<b>G. SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS</b>		
<b>H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (1:00pm)</b>	<b>A. Curriculum Committee – Ex-Officio Membership By-Laws (action item - second reading)</b>  <b>B. BP 5055 and AP 5055 (Priority Registration) (action item – second reading)</b>	<b>26-32</b>  <b>33-40</b>
<b>I. NEW BUSINESS</b>	<b>A. BP/AP 4055 – Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities (action item – first reading)</b>	<b>41-46</b>
<b>J. INFORMATION ITEMS - DISCUSSION</b>	<b>A. ECC Federation of Teachers Report</b>  <b>B. Winter Session / Proposed Calendar Changes</b>	<b>47-75</b>



# Academic Senate of El Camino College 2010-2011

October 19, 2010

AC152, 16007 Crenshaw Boulevard  
Torrance, CA 90506-0001 (310) 532-3670 x3254  
[www.elcamino.edu/academics/academicsenate/](http://www.elcamino.edu/academics/academicsenate/)

	<b>C. Title V Grant - Get Ready; Get Set; Go For the Associate's Degree</b>	<b>76-77</b>
<b>K. AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS</b>		
<b>L. PUBLIC COMMENT</b>		
<b>M. ADJOURN</b>		



## **Committees**

<u>NAME</u>	<u>CHAIR</u>	<u>DAY</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>ROOM</u>
<b><u>Senate</u></b>				
<b>ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING (SLOs)</b>	Jenny Simon	2 <sup>nd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> Mon.	2:30-4:00	Library 202
<b>COMPTON ACADEMIC SENATE</b>	Saul Panski	Thursdays	1:00-2:00	CEC Board
<b>COMPTON FACULTY COUNCIL</b>	Saul Panski	Thursdays	2:00-3:00	CEC Board
<b>CURRICULUM</b>	Lars Kjeseth		2:30-4:30	Board Room
<b>EDUCATION POLICIES</b>	Chris Jeffries	2 <sup>nd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> Tues.	12:30-2:00	SSC 106
<b>PLANNING &amp; BUDGETING</b>	Arvid Spor	1 <sup>st</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> Thurs.	1:00 – 2:30	Library 202
<b>FACULTY DEVELOPMENT</b>	Briita Halonen	2 <sup>nd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> Tues	1:00 – 1:50	West Lib. Basement
<b>CALENDAR</b>	Jeanie Nishime	Sep 30	3pm	Board Room
<b>ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY</b>	Jim Noyes, Virginia Rapp	Sep 24 Nov 12	12:30 – 2:00 pm	Library 202
<b><u>Campus</u></b>				
<b>ACCREDITATION</b>	Francisco Arce , Arvid Spor, Evelyn Uyemura			
<b>BOARD OF TRUSTEES</b>	Ray Gen	3 <sup>rd</sup> Mon	4:00	Board Room
<b>COLLEGE COUNCIL</b>	Tom Fallo	Mondays	1:00-2:00	Adm. 127
<b>DEAN’S COUNCIL</b>	Francisco Arce	Thursdays	9:00-10:30	Library 202
<b>CAMPUS TECHNOLOGY</b>	.			
<b>ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT</b>	Arvid Spor	1 <sup>st</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> Thurs	9-10:00 am	Library 202

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES  
5<sup>th</sup> October 2010

**Adjunct Faculty**

vacant

**Behavioral & Social Sciences**

<u>Firestone, Randy</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Gold, Christina</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Moen, Michelle</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Widman, Lance</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Wynne, Michael</u>	<u>X</u>

**Business**

<u>Siddiqui, Junaid</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Lau, Philip S</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Hull, Kurt</u>	<u>X</u>

**Counseling**

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

**Fine Arts**

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

**Health Sciences & Athletics**

<u>Hazell, Tom</u>	
<u>McGinley, Pat</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Rosales, Kathleen</u>	
<u>Colunga, Mina</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Hicks, Tom</u>	<u>X</u>

**Humanities**

<u>Isaacs, Brent</u>	
<u>Marcoux, Pete</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>McLaughlin, Kate</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Halonen, Briita</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Simon, Jenny</u>	<u>EXC</u>

**Industry & Technology**

<u>Gebert, Pat</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Hofmann, Ed</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>MacPherson, Lee</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Winfree, Merriel</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Marston, Doug</u>	<u>X</u>

**Learning Resources Unit**

<u>Striepe, Claudia</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Ichinaga, Moon</u>	<u>X</u>

**Mathematical Sciences**

<u>Bateman, Michael</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Boerger, John</u>	
<u>Fry, Greg</u>	
<u>Taylor, Susan</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Yun, Paul</u>	<u>X</u>

**Natural Sciences**

<u>Doucette, Pete</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Herzig, Chuck</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Jimenez, Miguel</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Palos Teresa</u>	<u>X</u>

vacant

**Academic Affairs & SCA**

<u>Chapman, Quajuana</u>	
<u>Arce, Francisco</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Nishime, Jeanie</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Lee, Claudia</u>	<u>X</u>

**ECC CEC Members**

<u>Evans, Jerome</u>	
<u>Norton, Tom</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Panski, Saul</u>	<u>EXC</u>
<u>Pratt, Estina</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Halligan, Chris</u>	

**Assoc. Students Org.**

<u>Budri, Lala</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Lopez, Jessica</u>	<u>X</u>

**Ex- Officio Positions**

<u>Shadish, Elizabeth</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Kjeseth, Lars</u>	<u>X</u>

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

Carolyn Pineda,

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 Fall 2010 semester was called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:35pm.

#### Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes [pp.5 -10 of packet] from the September 21<sup>st</sup> Academic Senate meeting were reviewed. Several items for correction or clarification were noted. The minutes were approved as amended.

### **REPORTS OF OFFICERS**

#### President's report – Christina Gold (henceforth CG)

CG noted that the Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Award was being advertised and nominations were currently being sought. Nominations are due by the 15<sup>th</sup> October.

CG said that the Basic Skills Advisory Group needs Academic Senate representation. The group meets the 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday of each month, and the next meeting is October 14<sup>th</sup> at 1:00pm in Admin 127. Please contact CG if you are interested at [cgold@elcamino.edu](mailto:cgold@elcamino.edu) or call x3254 .

CG thanked everyone for the comments made during the last meeting's discussion on Morale. CG is following up on these with the College Council, and has discussed some ideas with Drs. Arce and Nishime. CG shared a slide showing the College Council goals for 2010-11

#### **College Council Goals, 2010-2011**

1. Continue to improve internal college communication.
2. Increase the amount of recognition for work well done.
3. Continue to incorporate evidence-based decision making, when evidence is available.
4. Communicate accreditation eligibility issues facing the College throughout the year.
5. Support, review, and discuss results of the Student Campus Climate survey.

#### **6. Define and discuss the issues of employee morale and student satisfaction at both locations. Support initiatives to improve employee morale and student satisfaction as defined by campus discussions.**

7. Complete 10+1 policies and accompanying procedures.
8. Continue to build a sense of community.

#### VP Compton Center - Saul Panski (SP)

No report. Excused.

#### Curriculum Committee – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

LK noted that the first course reviews have gone through the new CurricuNET system. The Notification system is ready to go, and LK will be sending emails on this soon. Bugs/glitches in the system are being ironed out as things progress. The Committee is still working on getting the SLO module up.

LK spoke on the relationship between Curriculum and Calendar, saying that people often ask him what the Curriculum Committee can contribute to the discussion.

LK shared a slide depicting the hours of study per unit students would ideally have to put in to be successful and asked faculty to keep these figures in mind when crafting a new course and especially when deciding to run a course in the Winter session, noting that the figures could add up to a large load for students. Ms. McGinley asked LK to send the slide to her for sharing with the Nursing faculty when developing new courses, and that these figures could also usefully be shared with students when

discussing time management with them. LK said he would be putting the slide in the Curriculum Handbook and would share it with others.

	Credit Units	2	3	4	5	6
Total Student Work Hours		108	162	216	270	324
Weeks		Hours/Week				
18	6	9	12	15	18	
17	6	10	13	16	19	
16	7	10	14	17	20	
15	7	11	14	18	22	
14	8	12	15	19	23	
13	8	12	17	21	25	
12	9	14	18	23	27	
11	10	15	20	25	29	
10	11	16	22	27	32	
9	12	18	24	30	36	
8	14	20	27	34	41	
7	15	23	31	39	46	
6	18	27	36	45	54	
5	22	32	43	54	65	
4	27	41	54	68	81	
3	36	54	72	90	108	
2	54	81	108	135	162	

≥ 12 hours/day - 7 days/wk

≥ 9 hours/day - 6 days/wk

≥ 8 hours/day - 5 days/wk

≥ 4 hours/day - 5 days/wk



VP Educational Policies Committee – Chris Jeffries (CJ)

CJ noted that she had no report, but that the Committee would be meeting next week and the focus would be on the Repeat Policy.

VP Faculty Development – Cristina Pajo (CP) (Co- VP) and Briita Halonen (BH) (Co-VP)



No report. CG introduced Cristina Pajo as Co VP of the Faculty Development Committee with Briita Halonen.

#### VP Finance and Special Projects – Lance Widman (LW)

LW reported no minutes in the packet as yet but urged senators to keep watching the news as there may be a budget this week.

#### VP Legal – Chris Wells (CW)

CW reported that 4 Bills had been recently signed:

- ▶ AB 2302 (Fong): Transfer Pathways
- ▶ AB 2385 (Perez): Accelerated Nursing and Allied Health Pilot Program – aimed only at a few colleges, ECC may not be affected.
- ▶ SB 1143 (Liu): Student Success Task Force
- ▶ SB 1440 (Padillo): CSU Transfer Associate's Degree

AB= Assembly Bill, SB= Senate Bill

CG noted that pp 13-14 of packet contained a letter from the Chancellor's Office re: SB1440.

Ms. Jeffries suggested that since 1440 deals with local campus priorities, we be proactive in getting recognition by local campuses like CSULB as a priority local campus. Dr. Nishime said that President Fallo was working on this. Ms. Jeffries said it was imperative to get our students in.

### **REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

#### Assessment of Learning Committee – Jenny Simon (JS)

No Report. Excused.

#### Technology Committee – Pete Marcoux (PM)

[See pp.15-33 of packet]

PM reported that the College Technology Committee had met, and that he had brought the concerns re: portal use by faculty to the attention of Messrs. Wagstaff and Warrior. They had noted that some changes were hard to make, but that the system was constantly being updated. Mr. Wagstaff had shared the El Camino Technology Plan 2009 - 2014 [see pp. 17-33 of packet] PM encouraged the senators to look at the plan and send suggestions to PM and Mr. Wagstaff.

PM reported that the Academic Technology Committee would be meeting soon. A big concern is the number of computers and devices that are breaking down and requiring maintenance.. These issues will only increase as the number of computers is set to double when the new buildings are ready. Dr. Arce noted that a position for a floating computer technician to help in these areas may be in the works. It appears the college has the funds to buy, but not to service, computers and related equipment. PM urged senators with suggestions to attend the meetings. Ms. Ichinaga brought up a recent issue of students experiencing difficulty signing on via the ECC portal, and there being long hold times at the Help Desk to get assistance. Mr. Widman suggested there may only be one Help Desk staff member. Dr. Arce said that \$1 million has been allocated to the campus computer system and 1/3 goes to infrastructure, 1/3 goes to replacing faculty/staff/student use computers, and 1/3 goes to maintenance. In the next few weeks we may be hearing more re: the bond money expenditures and if any money is available from this fund.

#### Report on Deans' Council – Moon Ichinaga (MI)

[see pp. 34-35 of packet] for a summary of the minutes of the September 24<sup>th</sup> meeting.

MI reported that Mr. Mulrooney had spoken about the Academic Senate concerns re: the portal and the desirability of combining the No Show and Active Enrollment reports into a merged application. Mr. Mulrooney suggested the senators and interested faculty form a task force to deliver concrete suggestions on this to ITS.

MI noted that Dr. Dever had announced that the CEC would be holding a special commencement ceremony on October 16<sup>th</sup> for Japanese-Americans who had been unable to complete or get their degrees awarded due to war-time internment.

MI noted that Mr. Wagstaff had reported a phishing problem on campus.

Calendar Committee.

CG said that this report would be held until the later Winter Session information discussion..

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Action Items:**

**A. Curriculum Committee – Ex- Officio membership By-Laws – Lars Kjeseth (LK)**

[See pp. 44-50 of packet] First reading. LN noted that it is important to remember that the Curriculum Committee is part of the Academic Senate and so the Academic Senate sets the rules. LK asked the senators to look at the by-laws and proposed changes as set forth in the packet, and this item will be on the agenda for discussion at the next senate meeting.

LK noted that in 1.6 the Curriculum Committee is merely proposing to amend the list of ex-officio members, by adding one position (Associate Dean-Academic Affairs), and deleting one position (Matriculation Officer) More detailed changes may be made in the future.

Mr. Marcoux asked why these changes were being made piecemeal and LK said that the Curriculum Committee needed time to discuss the changes.

**Information Items:**

**A. BP 5055 & AP 5055 Priority Registration – Chris Jeffries (CJ)**

[See pp. 36- 43 of packet] BP= Board Policy, AP= Administrative Procedure. CJ reminded the senators that this issue had come before the Senate last Spring. We were told that a long lead time was needed on the issue and that there would be time for more discussion. However, it appears that the Policy is going through College Council now and will not come back before the Senate. CJ remembered that the Senate had had some concerns on the issues and wanted to bring it back for our attention. Senate concerns had included athletes, veterans, priority of international students of local students.

Mr. Marcoux asked what had been changed. CJ said that EOPS, DSPS, veterans, and others must now go through a priority Registration Committee, and then priority, if granted, lasts 5 years and then the group must apply again. If refused the group must wait 2 years before reapplying. CJ said it was a concern that the appeals procedure and veto procedure seemed to be in the hands of one person.

Ms. Taylor said that #vii was of concern to her as it seemed unfair to individual students with limited time. CJ said that individual students could be referred to a group, but that it was doubtful that we would be able to help every individual case. Ms. Taylor said that then it would seem fairest not to grant priority to any. CJ noted that she would continue to speak and fight for the student athlete group not to lose priority registration. Mr. Wells felt that with so many groups getting priority it seemed that students without would not be able to graduate in two years and thus it seemed that priority registration worked against the goal of transfer velocity for all.

Dr. Nishime said in reply to the comment re: veto, that the veto would only be used if it was found that a committee decision was in violation. As for priority registration, Dr. Nishime had checked to see how many groups followed through on priority registration and had found that many do not. She will continue to monitor the situation and it may be that priority registration could be dropped if groups do not participate. The data can be obtained through data markers.

Mr. Kjeseth asked whether the policy did not require senate approval before being moved on to the next body. Dr. Nishime said that 5000 policies do not require Senate approval, and the policy was going on to College Council, and then on to the Board. Mr. Marcoux said that President Gold could voice Senate concerns at the college Council meeting. Mr. Kjeseth felt that Senate had not had enough time to reflect and discuss the policy and that it perhaps should not be a 5000 policy. Dr. Arce asked how much time the Academic Senate needed. Mr. Kjeseth felt it should come back to senate one more time. Dr. Nishime noted that the policy was only going to College council on November 1<sup>st</sup>, so that left plenty of time for discussion.

Ms. McGinley asked, what, if anything, in the BP and AP could still be altered? Dr. Nishime said not much, numbers I & II could not be changed, but changes were still possible in terms of how the cohort groups are approved.

Mr. Wells and Ms. Jeffries both felt that some language was too fuzzy and that more definition and specific criteria were needed.

Ms. Taylor felt it was important to have more information on who the groups represented, how large the groups are, and what portion of the total student population they accounted for. It the numbers are such that it effects those without priority registration then more discussion is needed, CG asked CJ to discuss this with Mr. Mulrooney at an Ed Policies Committee meeting and bring comments back to the next Academic Senate meeting.

**B. Calendar Committee Report/ Winter Session Information & Discussion – Pat McGinley (PM)**

PM reported that the Calendar Committee had met last week. Administration wants to eliminate Winter and have two back-to-back Summer sessions as this was felt to be more favorable re: FTES.

PM noted that concerns had been expressed re: Honors Transfer students and high school students. Mr. Mulrooney had suggested holding some open-forum meetings on campus to gauge wider opinion.

The matter is going to Cabinet on Monday October 11 for discussion. The basic options are to keep the same calendar with a Winter and Summer session, or eliminate Winter and have two back-to-back Summer sessions. If the two Summer sessions option is approved the new calendar would come into effect come Winter 2012 to allow students to plan and also to give adequate notice to incoming students. There have been no votes taken yet, opinion is still sharply divided on the issue.

PROs for continuing Winter: critical for UC/CSU transfers, Ms. Oda Omori and Mr. Holliday had surveyed the Honors Transfer students and they were in favor of retaining Winter, Winter showed good success rates.

CONs against continuing Winter: causes major organizational dysfunction, disrupts Program Review, no hiring committee activity can be scheduled, causes problems for planning and budgeting, hard to conduct disciplinary hearings. Dr Nishime said that President Fallo wishes to give priority to high school students access and that Winter did not allow for this. The new budget may bring cuts and Winter may be a victim of the cuts anyway.

The proposed schedule would be:

Fall to end mid-December

Spring to begin mid- January

Spring to end May 11<sup>th</sup>

This would allow plenty of time for students to plan for summer jobs.

Summer Session 1 to begin May 22, and end July 5<sup>th</sup>

Summer Session 2 to begin July 9<sup>th</sup>, and end August 16<sup>th</sup>

Fall to begin August 27<sup>th</sup>

This would give faculty a choice to work both sessions or rest during one session. So this could result in a built-in rest for faculty and down time for classified staff to catch up on work and allow for facility maintenance, while giving students more options – for instance, foreign students

would have a long break during which to visit home. Dr. Nishime emphasized that although this is what the Administration favors, no action/decisions have been taken yet.

Mr. Wells shared a slide that detailed success and retention rates for Winter (data from the Chancellor's website)

	<u>Retention</u>	<u>Success</u>
<u>El Camino</u>		
Spring 2010	80.98	67.02
Winter 2010	92.13	84.40
Fall 2009	81.64	66.31
Summer 2009	85.33	73.13

	<u>Retention</u>	<u>Success</u>
<u>Statewide</u>		
Spring 2010	84.20	67.96
Winter 2010	89.55	79.43
Fall 2009	84.66	67.52
Summer 2009	88.51	77.15

And CG displayed slides originally provided by Ms. Graff (Institutional Research) via the Campus Climate survey, along with an executive summary handout explaining how Winter students differ from students at other times of the year and also compares ECC to other institutions.

SLIDE 1

Should we change the Schedule (Staff response)

Torrance campus

47% - keep calendar the same

46% - eliminate Winter

Compton campus

66% - keep calendar the same

33% - eliminate Winter

SLIDE 2

Did you enroll in Winter (Student response)

Torrance campus

79% - yes

11% - interested, but did not enroll

8% - no

Compton campus

80% - yes

14% - interested, but did not enroll

6% - no

SLIDE 3

Why enroll in Winter (student response)

In order of importance: to make faster progress, to "fill the gap", to take fewer units in Spring, to repeat a course

SLIDE 4

Should we change the schedule (student response)

- ▶ 56% - Keep it the same (range: 52%-60%\*)
- ▶ 41% - Eliminate Winter (range: 37%-45%\*)
- ▶ Responses weighted to represent original populations.

- ▶ Count of non-Winter students too small at CEC for separate analysis.  
\*  $\pm 4\%$  error margin

Mr. Marcoux voiced a concern that academics are not being addressed – stated college goals include transfer and success, and Mr. Marcoux said it seemed contradictory to be putting the needs of classified staff ahead of these, that the Senate must keep academics in mind and reflect on how the proposed change would affect the mission of the college.

Ms. Jeffries agreed, noting that students do better in the Winter session, as some seem to like the quick pace and noted that Mr. Holliday had said the Winter sessions were imperative for transfer.

Mr. Wells noted that the schools with the highest success and retention rates all worked on the quarter system, with a Winter term, so we needed to look at all the data, not just administrative issues. We should look at the evidence and at what is best for the students.

Mr. Widman reported that the perception on campus was that the Winter change was already a “done deal”. Mr. Widman noted that this same issue has come up before and he suggested going back to the old records and revisiting the old arguments. He also agreed with Mr. Marcoux that the focus should be on academics. Mr. Widman also felt that President Fallo’s argument about giving the best access to high school students was flawed as the proposed 1<sup>st</sup> Summer session would begin too early for local high school students to participate.

Ms. Taylor asked whether the Calendar committee had considered expanding the Winter session from 5 to 6 weeks to address the study load concerns raised earlier by Mr. Kjeseth. The answer was negative.

Dr. Arce said there were only 150 sessions offered in Winter, and that ECC had cancelled Winter in the past. Adding more sections did not work and the college had had to scale back. Dr. Arce offered to get the exact numbers if desired by the Academic Senate. He noted that Winter has never been a huge program at ECC, and that ECC had seen a drop in Spring enrollment after Winter session. Dr. Arce remarked that enrollment can never be exactly predicated, so the college has to work with projections. The 150 Winter sections would be folded into the Summer offerings. Summer 2009 had 520 sections, and now we could offer more. Dr. Arce felt that the Summer was important both for students beginning their school careers and those looking to catch up.

Ms. Lopez (Associates Students) asked why Summer sessions could not be moved into Winter? Dr. Arce replied that the college had grown the Winter session in 2007, but had experienced a loss of enrollment the following Spring. Dr. Nishime said it had to be a balancing act.

Mr. Kjeseth was of the opinion that the Winter session is pedagogically too short at 5 weeks for students to benefit, and noted that if the faculty really wanted to save Winter we should think of lengthening it to 6 weeks and eliminate the Spring break. Mr. Wells said that a long Summer break contributed to “summer learning loss”. Mr. Kjeseth acknowledged this as a concern, but would personally like to see two 6 weekback-to-back Summer sessions as this would give students more chances to succeed, especially in Basic Skills areas.

## **AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

None

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Dr. Shadish reported on behalf of Mr. Ahmadpour that October 7<sup>th</sup> would be a National Strike and Day of Action (to defend public education and social services) with a rally to be held in Los Angeles. Contact Mr. Ahmadpour if you have interest in arranging an open-mic session on the issues here on campus.

Dr. Shadish noted that the Federation is interested in gathering information on members’ stand/opinions on two Propositions, and people willing to share their views could pick up and fill out a post card which could be returned to the Federation Office

**ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 1:59pm  
Cs/ecc2010

EL CAMINO COLLEGE  
Office of the President  
Minutes of the College Council Meeting September 27, 2010

Present: Francisco Arce, Thomas Fallo, Ann Garten, Christina Gold, Jo Ann Higdon, Jessica Lopez, David Mc Patchell, Jeanie Nishime, Dipte Patel, Susan Pickens, Gary Robertson, Elizabeth Shadish, Lynn Solomita, and Arvid Spor.

1. College Council Goals 2010-2011
  1. Continue to improve internal college communications.
  2. Increase the amount of recognition for work well done.
  3. Continue to incorporate evidence-based decision making when evidence is available.
  4. Communicate accreditation eligibility issues facing the College throughout the year.
  5. Support, review, and discuss results of a Student Campus Climate survey.
  6. Define and discuss the issue of employee morale and student satisfaction at both locations. Support initiatives to improve employee morale and student satisfaction as defined by campus discussions.
  7. Complete 10 + 1 policies and accompanying procedures.
  8. Continue to build a sense of community.
2. Morale is not the right issue for students. It was stated that morale is the commitment to the institution for which people work and the sense of being a valued member of an institution.

Morale was discussed at Academic Senate. When referring to morale faculty stated: "Do I feel good about going to work," "I do not feel good about the Administration," "my colleagues do not feel good about coming to work," and some reflected about "the broader changes on the economy and is my job stable."

3. It was noted that "community" in goal eight includes students. There was a question as to how we can get more students involved in activities. It was noted that the student welcome day and student clubs do this. The student representative feels that a lack of communication limits involvement between faculty and students. The student representative suggested having sports inclusive rallies that involve the athletic department, ASO, and student clubs. It was also noted that the Foundation sponsored a Word Theatre event on Saturday night. The proceeds from this event will help build scholarships for students. This event brought together students, faculty, Foundation and community members. There was a sense of community there. The students were the largest group in attendance.

4. College Council will work to develop objectives to reach our goals.
5. Board Policy and Administrative Procedures – 5055 Enrollment Priorities will be distributed among constituent groups and come back to College Council on November 1<sup>st</sup>.
6. The Board of Governors will have their meeting here at ECC on November 8-9<sup>th</sup>. They will take a field trip to the Compton Center on November 9<sup>th</sup>.

Agenda for the October 4, 2010 Meeting:

1. Minutes of September 27, 2010
2. Team Reports
3. Develop objectives for College Council Goals 2010-2011



**The Daily Breeze**

**"El Camino quarrels over grant"**

By Rob Kuznia Staff Writer

Posted: 10/09/2010 07:13:53 AM PDT

Updated: 10/09/2010 10:34:20 PM PDT

It isn't often that a school turns away money from the federal government. But it happened at El Camino College near Torrance. And now the faculty's union - as well as at least one elected school board member - are up in arms.

The dispute centers on a \$180,000, two-year grant offered by the U.S. Department of Education that would have sent a handful of students and some faculty to Europe for a student-exchange program focused on early childhood development.

Administrators chalk up the quarrel to a simple misunderstanding about a grant that amounts to a slim fraction of the millions of dollars the college receives from grants every year.

But the flare-up seems to highlight a fault line between faculty and the administration - and in particular college President Thomas Fallo - at a community college campus known for running a tight financial ship.

"It's autocratic, this kind of decision-making," said Elizabeth Shadish, a philosophy professor and the president of the El Camino faculty union. "Here we were, developing an educational program and Tom Fallo cuts it off at the knee. I'm just puzzled."

Back in April, faculty from the childhood-education department applied for the so-named "Atlantis" grant. At the time, it appeared they'd had Fallo's blessing. Attached to the application was a letter signed and apparently written by him.

"Building international capacity in the teaching field reflects a compelling national interest and need," Fallo wrote in the letter. "Future teachers at El Camino College and the professors who help prepare them are ready and willing to address it."

This summer, members of the childhood-education department were pleased to learn they were awarded the grant; they'd tried the year before but were turned down by the federal government.

But last month, administrators informed the department that it could not accept the money. The reason: The grant paid for faculty to travel internationally, and the college - owing to the state budget crisis - banned international travel last school year.

"We're baffled and perplexed and disappointed," said Janet Young, a professor of early childhood education, who was one of the grant's primary authors. "We see ourselves as professionals. The president signed off on it. I'm perplexed and very disappointed as a professional."

Young said the grant would have caused her to miss five days of school. It also would have paid her a stipend of \$2,000.

Administrators say they didn't realize the grant involved international travel when they signed off on it. They add that it isn't productive to send faculty abroad in the middle of the school year, when doing so benefits only a handful of students.

"It's a wonderful program in that a couple of students would get to go to Europe," said Francisco Arce, the college's vice president of academic affairs. "On the other hand, we have thousands of students."

He noted that some of the travel would have occurred in October 2011.

"That's right in the middle of the semester," he said.

Fallo declined to be interviewed for this article, deferring all questions to Arce.

Faculty union fights back

After the grant was turned down, grumblings through the grapevine brought word of the situation to Shadish of the faculty union. She in turn brought the informal complaint to college board member Maureen O'Donnell.

A former Torrance school board member and city councilwoman known for asking tough questions, O'Donnell's El Camino candidacy was supported by the faculty in 2005, when she ran unopposed.

On Sept. 7, O'Donnell brought up the issue with Fallo at the college's regular board meeting. Last week, she said his reaction left her peeved.

"I requested information about the Atlantis grant, and asked Fallo why he wanted to rescind participation," she said. "All he would say is 'Because of information I have learned.'"

The Daily Breeze obtained a CD recording of the meeting, but the recording cuts out just as O'Donnell begins to ask about the grant, which happened toward the end of the meeting just before adjournment.

O'Donnell said when she pressed him further, Fallo suggested that she read it online.

"He began to deride me for not using a computer," she said.

O'Donnell said she found the exchange particularly irksome because she and the rest of the board function as Fallo's boss.

"Dr. Fallo is, after all, an employee of the board," she said. "In the corporate world, an employee who would refuse the reasonable request by an employer would be fired instantly."

Other board members didn't seem to share O'Donnell's level of pique.

School board President Ray Gen said he doesn't believe the issue should have risen to the level of the college board.

"This should have been worked out way before it got to this point," he said. "Otherwise we're micro-managing every decision - who goes on what field trip, which teams our football team is going to play. We're supposed to set policy."

But he added: "Somewhere the communications fell apart."

School board member Bill Beverly said he doesn't have enough information on the matter to pick sides.

"I'm hoping by the next board meeting (on Oct. 18) to have a full report," he said. "Until then I can't say it's a big issue or it's not."

El Camino administrators say the dust-up has caused them to revise the review process for grant applications.

They reject the criticism from the union that El Camino's refusal to accept the money could jeopardize the school's ability to land grants from the U.S. Department of Education in the future.

To buttress their point, administrators cited examples such as a \$3 million, five-year federal grant that will focus on improving the graduation rate, and a \$1.3 million, five-year federal grant to bolster math and science education, particularly for disadvantaged students.

Rejection is a first

As for the Atlantis grant, the federal administrator, Frank Frankfort of the U.S. Department of Education, said this is the first time a school has turned down the award.

"We funded 25 projects this year," he said in an e-mail. "Beyond that I have no comment."

The Atlantis grant clusters colleges in groups of four. El Camino was to partner with California State University, Dominguez Hills; University of Modena and Reggio Emilia in Italy; and the University of Valencia in Spain.

El Camino has since been replaced by the Kern Community College District in Bakersfield.

Each college selects four students to participate. Over the course of the program, the students spend time at other schools within the cluster.

Young, the childhood-education professor who helped write the grant, said the goal is to create a more global track of future teachers.

"We have a commitment to provide our students with tools to help in the increasingly global 21st century workplace," she said.

She added that the Italian school would have been especially enlightening, as it is recognized worldwide for its approach to early childhood education. The "Reggio Emilia" philosophy, for instance, calls for children to have some control over the direction of their learning, and to learn through experiences of "touching, moving, listening, seeing and hearing."

Oddly, of the 25 institutions in the United States to receive the grant, El Camino was the only two-year college until Kern accepted.

"This would have put us on the map a little bit here," Young said.

**Board Policy 7400****Travel**

El Camino Community College District encourages employees to attend conferences, meetings, and activities that will promote their professional growth. These professional growth activities should be related to the educational and professional changes and innovations of the employees' positions, their divisions/departments, and the mission and goals of the College.

In accordance with this philosophy, the Superintendent/President is authorized to attend conferences, meetings and other activities that are appropriate to the functions of the District.

In addition, the Superintendent/President shall establish procedures regarding the attendance of other employees at conferences, meetings, or activities. These shall include procedures regarding the authorization of expenses, advancement of funds, and reimbursement, in accordance with the relevant bargaining unit agreements.

The Board must approve all travel outside the United States in advance.

Replaces Board policy #4332

**A G R E E M E N T**  
**between**  
**EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
**and**  
**EL CAMINO COLLEGE**  
**FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,**  
**LOCAL 1388, AFT, AFL-CIO**  
**July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2010**

ARTICLE 16  
PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES

Section 1. General

The District encourages Faculty Members to attend professional meetings and conferences related to the District's educational program and the Faculty Member's professional growth.

Section 2. Budget Allocation

(a) Each fiscal year the District will budget a conference and travel fund for Faculty Members to be administered as provided herein. The fund will amount to a sum equivalent to One Hundred Dollars (\$100.00) times the number of Full-Time Faculty Member positions provided for that year. The fund will be utilized to pay the cost, or a portion of the cost, of the Faculty Member attending a professional meeting or conference and may include such expenses as registration fees, meals, and lodging expenses and travel expenses.

(b) Each fiscal year, the District will budget an additional conference and travel fund for Faculty Members to be administered by the College Conference Committee. The fund will amount to a sum equivalent to One Hundred Dollars (\$100.00) times the number of Full-Time Faculty Member positions provided for that year. These funds will be used to pay the cost, or a portion of the costs, of the Faculty Member attending a professional meeting or conference that focuses on (1) uses of technology in the instructional program, (2) strategies for improving student retention, or (3) issues of sensitivity to diversity. Such costs may include expenses as registration fees, meal, lodging expenses and travel expenses. The Committee shall set a goal of using twenty-five percent (25%) of these funds for Part-Time Faculty. Funds not used in one fiscal year, as described in this paragraph (b), shall be rolled over to the next fiscal year.

Section 3. Administration of the Fund

The District's conference and travel fund for Faculty Members will be divided into two parts to be administered as herein provided. Eighty percent (80%) of the fund will be allocated to the College's academic divisions or approved unit proportionate to the number of Full-Time Faculty Members in each respective division and shall be administered by the Deans of the divisions as provided in Section 4. Twenty percent (20%) of the fund will be allocated to the College Conference Committee, provision for which is set forth in Section 5 of this Article.

Section 4. Faculty Member Requests

(a) A Faculty Member who desires to attend a conference should submit a request for approval and/or funding in writing to the Dean of the Division at least one (1) month prior to the conference and two (2) months in advance of proposed international travel. International conferences require approval by the Board of Trustees. Therefore, conference requests must be submitted to the Division Conference Committee at least two months prior to the conference date in order to comply with the

board approval process. The District cannot be responsible for conference attendance commitments prior to Board approval.

(b) Travel outside the United States must be approved by the President prior to submission of the conference request to the Board of Trustees. The President will provide a written explanation to the faculty members whose request for conference attendance is not approved.

(c) Requests will be reviewed by a committee chaired by the Dean of the Division, a Faculty Member appointed by the Federation representative of the division, and a Faculty Member appointed by the Dean. If the request is deemed appropriate by the committee, the Dean will submit the request for necessary approval and action. The committee may refer the request to the Vice President - Academic Affairs, or the College Conference Committee, if appropriate. The Committee will provide a written explanation to the Faculty Member whose request for conference attendance and/or funding is not approved. Faculty Members utilizing conference and/or travel funding will agree to make a reasonable effort to minimize the cost of substitutes by arranging for their classes to be covered by other Faculty Members, arranging class assignments to utilize students' time appropriately, or by arranging departure times to minimize missed classes whenever possible. The Temporary Instructor Reassignment form (Article 11, Section 10) must be submitted to the Dean if classes will be covered by other Faculty Members.

#### Section 5. College Conference Committee

(a) A College Conference Committee shall be established composed of the Vice President -Academic Affairs (or the Vice President's designee), one Dean appointed by the Vice President, and two Faculty Members appointed by the President of the Federation. The two Faculty Members appointed by the Federation will be selected from divisions other than that represented by the Dean. The Committee members shall serve for the term of this Agreement. The Vice President (or his or her designee) shall chair the Committee.

(b) The fund administered by the College Conference Committee will be utilized for

(1) Conferences of a general import to the College, and (2) Conferences that the District requests a Faculty Member to attend as its representative, and (3) Conference expenses in any division which has utilized its fund and where allocation of additional funds is desirable.

#### Section 6. District Appointments

The District may appoint a Faculty Member, with the Faculty Member's consent, as its representative to a conference. If a Faculty Member is approved for attendance at a conference, the Faculty Member will be entitled to attend the conference without loss of pay or benefits. The District may approve attendance for a conference without providing any reimbursement for expenses.

#### Section 7. Reimbursements

If expenses are authorized, the following rules shall apply:

(a) Faculty Members will travel jet economy air coach or by authorized alternative means.

(b) Faculty Members authorized to use a private car with expenses paid shall be reimbursed at the rate established by the District for business travel, but in no case will such mileage expense exceed the cost of jet economy air transportation plus ancillary ground expenses.

(c) If two or more Faculty Members attend a conference and travel together by private automobile, only the individual furnishing the car will be compensated for transportation expenses.

(d) Requests for reimbursement of expenses shall be for actual authorized expenses and shall be made on the appropriate expense form.

#### Section 8. Reports

Written reports of conferences attended at District expense shall be submitted to the Division Dean.

---

**EL CAMINO COLLEGE**  
**Planning & Budgeting Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**Date: September 2, 2010**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Enomoto, Ryuichiro (Rio) – ASO        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shenefield, Cheryl – Administrative Svcs. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ott, Jonathan – Campus Police         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spor, Arvid – Chair (non-voting)          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patel, Dipte – Academic Affairs       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Turner, Gary – ECCE                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quinones-Perez, Margaret – ECCFT                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tyler, Harold – Management/Supervisors    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reid, Dawn – Student & Community Adv. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Widman, Lance – Academic Senate           |

**OTHERS ATTENDING:** Francisco Arce, Janice Ely, Connie Fitzsimons, Alice Grigsby, Jo Ann Higdon, Jeanie Nishime, Emily Rader, John Wagstaff

---

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

**Approval of August 19, 2010 Minutes**

1. Page 1, #2 – Clarification: The College borrowed \$8.85M in TRANS.
2. Page 2, #7a – Update: Twenty faculty positions have been filled.
3. Page 2, #12 – Statement was made that two counselors went with J. Wagstaff to 3CDUG last month and saw Datatel’s broader strategy for advising and student educational “ed” plans not in Colleague. Asked Datatel to schedule a webinar and invite counselors and others from this area who attended the 3CDUG meeting to view Napa Valley deployment of the advising piece. This will address concerns about Colleague expressed at the August 19<sup>th</sup> PBC meeting. \$100K will address need to add more licenses because of enormous student use; students are finding enormous functionality with the portal.
4. Page 2, #10 – Clarification added: F-1 Visa students do not affect the College’s FTES, since we do not receive State apportionment for this population. The concern that was raised may be related to international/out-of-state students taking seats away from California resident students and possibly restricting local students’ access to classes. But, international/out-of-state tuition could be used to generate additional classes.

**2010-11 Final Budget Review:**

Question and Concerns:

1. 2010-11 Final Budget Blue Book, pages 59-61: Clarification: Dates listed on headings are correct. These are carryover funds still to be expended. There are no new funds from this State block grant - Library Materials/Instructional Equipment/Technology Apportionment (3:1 Match). Try to expend funds within a three-year window. There is a total of \$11,595 left to spend from 2008-09 (\$8,068 for Mathematical Sciences, \$1,384 for Natural Sciences, and \$2,143 for Instructional Services); \$86,693 from 2007-08; and \$79,103 from 2006-07 (\$2,646 for academic software and \$76,457 from one time State Trailer Bill not yet allocated).
2. Any reaction from the Board to \$6M deficit spending? Budget goes to the Board next Tuesday – their concerns would be expressed at that time. There was a deficit of \$3M-\$4M in last couple of year’s budgets. The Board is aware of five-year projection and running deficit budgets.
3. Page 14, Workers’ Compensation Fund – the adjustment (-\$299,056) has nothing to do with the rates. May have been based on the beginning balance being too high. J. Ely will research the reason.

4. Comment was made that the College's Mission Statement does not appear until page 33. Since the Mission Statement and Strategic Initiatives are the driving force of the College, the suggestion was made to move them at the beginning, right after the President's letter to the Board of Trustees. The new Strategic Initiatives on page 33 do not go into effect until July 1, 2011.
5. Pages 71 and 72 – Assumptions: bottom of page 72, last paragraph, Fund 15 is not necessarily designed for student learning outcomes – source of considerable discussion and meaning. This issue was brought up in past meeting (see March 18, 2010 meeting minutes, page 2, #6). Historically, that was the intended use, however (as stated in the next sentence) a portion has different use given current economic conditions. But one-time programs were not specifically designed to improve student learning outcomes. Suggestion was made to add to future agenda for discussion.
6. Page 70, 2011-2012 Voice/Data Replacement – will the \$400,000 be used to populate underground piping system with fiber optics? Will double check with Bob Gann. Thought that project would occur earlier.
7. Staying with 6% increase for medical premiums for now, but received notice a few days ago that programs increasing at much higher percentage.
8. Page 49 – COLA for 2010-11 listed at zero percent, but negative COLA (approximately -.457%) still appears in the governor's budget.
9. PBC vote to endorse 2010-11 Budget: 8 – yes, 0 – no, 0 – abstain.

#### **Planning Update:**

1. Plan Builder goal and objective evaluations were to be completed by the end of July. By the beginning of August, only 26% of ECC plans and 6% Compton plans were evaluated. As of last Monday, 56% of ECC plans and 45% of CEC plans were evaluated. All plans must be evaluated.
2. A. Spor and Donna Manno will conduct planning presentation at the October 7<sup>th</sup> Management Forum and will focus on annual plans and evaluation components. New Strategic Initiatives go into effect on July 1<sup>st</sup>. Fall is the time to implement program plans for 2011-12 and finalize by the end of the fall semester.
3. The new Strategic Initiatives will become the Goals for all plans in Plan Builder. When plans are rolled over, goals statements will need to be deleted. Plans should have no more than 7 goals. Objectives should be written concisely and to-the-point and be something that can reasonably be accomplished in one year. Multiple-year plans can be broken down year-to-year.
4. Program review is separate from Plan Builder, but assessment and recommendations occur at the end of program review. Highest ranked priorities must go into program plans.
5. Two open forums will be held at each campus. Managers are encouraged to send faculty and staff involved in writing or editing plans to the open forums. Emails will be sent to notify campuses of dates, times and locations: ECC – October 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>; CEC – October 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>. PBC members who are not managers may attend any of the open forums.
6. ITS is represented in the Compton and ECC plans under Administrative Services. Global plans, such as Technology Plans, Educational Master Plans, Staffing Plans, Facilities Plans and Enrollment Management Plans are not captured in Plan Builder. Structure of Plan Builder is set up for programs, units and areas. If this is a gap in planning process, suggestion was made for PBC to discuss how to incorporate global plans. Accreditation teams focus on program level plans. Master Plan is document that guides the entire campus. Facilities and technology plans at Golden West became part of PBC agenda which received commendation from Accreditation team visit. Done differently at ECC using the Facilities Steering Committee.

The next meeting is scheduled on September 16, 2010. The meeting adjourned at 1:53 p.m.



# CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH



UNIVERSITY OUTREACH AND SCHOOL RELATIONS  
DIVISION OF STUDENT SERVICES

October 2011

Dear Community College Colleagues:

## Great News!

**As a result of restored state funding and federal economic stimulus funding, California State University Long Beach (CSULB) will admit upper division transfer students for Spring 2011. We are also excited to share that for Fall 2011 we have removed impaction status for five majors *and* we are now planning to welcome a larger class of new transfer students next Fall than Fall 2010.**

### Spring 2011

- Applicants are strongly encouraged to submit all requested documentation including official transcripts, if requested, by the October 15<sup>th</sup> deadline (Please do not send transcripts unless instructed to do so).
- Admitted students must submit their ***Intent to Enroll*** and the \$150 deposit within 30 days of receipt of their admissions notice.
- Participation in January 2011 SOAR (Student Orientation, Advising, and Registration) is required for all transfer students. For additional information on registration, dates and sessions for specific majors, students should visit the website at [www.csub.edu/divisions/students/soar/workshop/transfer.htm](http://www.csub.edu/divisions/students/soar/workshop/transfer.htm).
- Applications for Housing for the Spring 2011 term will be available starting November 15, 2010 at [www.csulb.housing.edu](http://www.csulb.housing.edu). Applications will be accepted on a first come, first served basis. For additional information, students should visit the website or call the Housing and Residential Life Office at (562) 985-4187.

### Fall 2011

- The following majors are no longer impacted for Fall 2011:
  - English (all Options)
  - History
  - Journalism
  - Sociology
  - Political Science
- Applicants to impacted programs should insure announced pre-requisites are completed by the end of Spring 2011.
- For a current list of all impacted programs and requirements for Fall 2011, please visit: [http://www.csulb.edu/depts/enrollment/admissions/impacted\\_major.html](http://www.csulb.edu/depts/enrollment/admissions/impacted_major.html).
- Applications from CSU eligible students to non-impacted programs are strongly encouraged.
- Applicants should have a back-up option, are strongly encouraged to **APPLY EARLY**, however no later than the November 30, 2010 deadline.

We hope you are encouraged by the good news that CSULB will serve more transfer students this Spring and in the coming Fall. If you have questions or need additional information, please contact Bruce Vancil, Assistant Director Transfer Services at (562) 985-5358 or email [vancil@csulb.edu](mailto:vancil@csulb.edu). Information is also available at [www.csulb.edu/depts/enrollment/admissions](http://www.csulb.edu/depts/enrollment/admissions).

Sincerely,

Valerie Bordeaux, Director  
University Outreach & School Relations

### **CSULB Counselor Conference Reminder:**

We hope to see you at the CSULB Counselor Conference on Friday, October 29, 2011 for the latest on CSULB admissions, academic programs, student support services and campus life. Please register by Tuesday, October 26th online at: <http://www.csulb.edu/uosr/conference>.

**1. CCC STRUCTURE****1.1 Voting Representatives**

Voting Representatives shall be one full-time faculty member from each academic division, one full-time faculty counselor, one full-time faculty librarian, one full-time faculty member from the Compton Community Education Center, and one full-time faculty counselor from the Compton Community Educational Center. The Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) shall be a voting representative and the Council of Academic Deans and Directors shall also have a voting representative.

**1.2 Term of Faculty Representatives**

The term of a faculty CCC representative shall be three years. The elections will be staggered so that one third of the representatives are elected each year.

**1.3 Election of Faculty Representatives**

The election process shall be initiated in each Academic Division, the Counseling Division, the Library, and the Compton Community Education Center in compliance with the Academic Senate Constitution. CCC elections for full terms shall take place in the fall semester of the last year of a term. Only full-time faculty are eligible to vote for a faculty representative.

1.3.1 Should a CCC representative not complete his or her term, the replacement shall be elected for the remainder of the term.

1.3.2 Should a CCC representative be required to take a leave exceeding one month, an interim representative must be appointed by the division dean, or if appropriate, the area director, and the senior Academic Senate representative for the period of the leave.

**1.4 Vice President of Academic Affairs Representative**

If for any reason the VPAA is unable to meet the attendant responsibilities of a CCC representative, then he or she shall appoint a designee from the Council of Academic Deans and Directors to fulfill the responsibilities on an interim basis.

**1.5 Council of Academic Deans and Directors Representative**

The Council of Academic Deans and Directors CCC representative will be appointed for a three-year term by the VPAA or the designee.

1.5.1 Should a Council of Deans and Directors CCC representative not complete his or her term, the VPAA or the designee shall appoint a replacement for the remainder of the term.

1.5.2 Should the Council of Deans and Directors CCC representative be required to take a leave exceeding one month, an interim representative shall be appointed by the VPAA or the designee.

**1.6 Ex-Officio Representatives**

The Ex-Officio representatives of the CCC, who are non-voting members, shall include but are not limited to:

1. Articulation Officer
2. Associate Dean, Academic Affairs
3. Chair-Elect (when not serving as a division representative)
4. Curriculum Advisor
5. Dean, Compton Center – Academic Affairs
6. ~~Director of Workforce and Community Education~~
7. Immediate Past Chair (when not serving as a division representative) shall serve for one year following completion of his or her term as CCC Chair
8. ~~Matriculation Officer~~
9. Member of the Associated Students (selected by President of Associated Students Organization)
10. Member of the Associated Students, Compton Community Educational Center (selected by President of Associated Student Body)
11. Student Services Advisor, Evaluations Unit

**1.7 Responsibilities of All Representatives**

These shall include:

1. Regular and punctual attendance at all meetings
2. Attend at least one in-service training session each academic year
3. Knowledge of current curriculum procedures and policies
4. Careful study and review of all curriculum proposals in advance of meetings
5. Assistance to faculty with curriculum issues and proposal preparation

**2. CCC CHAIR****2.1 Term of Office for CCC Chair**

The term of office is two years.

**2.2 Qualifications of CCC Chair**

A candidate for Chair must have two years of CCC experience and either be a current CCC faculty representative or present Chair or immediate past Chair.

**2.3 Election of CCC Chair****2.3.1 Election Process**

The election will be coordinated by the Curriculum Advisor and an Election Committee appointed by the CCC Chair.

The Election Committee will consist of two voting CCC members.

**2.3.2 Election Timeline**

2.3.2.1 Regular Election: The election will occur no later than the 12<sup>th</sup> week of the spring semester during the seated Chair's first year of office.

2.3.2.2 Special Election: In the event that a vacancy will exceed a period of six months, a special election will be held to fill the position for the remainder of the term. The CCC will determine the special election timeline.

**2.3.3 Chair Elect**

2.3.3.1 If the seated Chair is not re-elected, the person elected will serve as Chair-Elect for one academic year before taking office. The Chair-Elect may attend the weekly meetings with the Chair, VPAA or designee, and Curriculum Advisor throughout the year prior to taking office. The Chair-Elect shall serve as Acting Chair at the CCC meetings when the Chair cannot be present or needs to relinquish the chair. The Chair-Elect will also serve as either the division representative or as an ex-officio representative.

2.3.3.2 If the seated Chair cannot serve, then the Chair-Elect assumes the office of Chair for an interim period not to exceed 6 months.

**2.3.4 Chair Pro Tempore**

A Chair Pro Tempore shall be designated by the CCC Chair at the beginning of an academic year when there is no Chair-Elect. The Chair Pro Tempore shall serve as Acting Chair at the CCC meetings when the Chair cannot be present or needs to relinquish the chair.

**2.4 Appointment of CCC Chair**

In the event that neither the Chair nor Chair-Elect can serve, then the Academic Senate President shall appoint, in mutual agreement with the CCC, a Chair who shall serve for an interim period not to exceed 6 months.

**2.5 Duties of CCC Chair**

The Chair shall:

1. Preside at CCC meetings
2. Report at the regular Academic Senate meetings on actions of the CCC and curriculum issues
3. Attend weekly meetings with the VPAA or designee and the Curriculum Advisor and others as appropriate
4. Function as a liaison with the Distance Education Advisory Committee and other committees as appropriate
5. Attend the State Academic Senate meetings and appropriate breakout sessions

6. Attend curriculum workshops at the local, regional, and state levels
7. Participate in developing the annual curriculum calendar
8. Serve as CCC liaison with the Academic Senate, Council of Academic Deans and Directors, Division Curriculum Committees, Faculty, Cabinet, and Board of Trustees as appropriate
9. Notify division deans, or if appropriate, the area director, and senior Academic Senate representatives of CCC vacancies and timeline for elections of division representatives
10. Consult with the CCC prior to seeking action from non-CCC bodies
11. Share with the CCC copies of all written communication in a timely manner
12. Perform additional duties as mutually agreed upon by the CCC and VPAA or designee

- 2.6 Reassigned Time for CCC Chair  
The reassigned time for the CCC Chair shall be no less than 30%.

### **3. OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES**

- 3.1 Quorum for Meetings  
The quorum for conducting business at CCC meetings shall be 50% of the faculty representatives.
- 3.2 Attendance Requirements  
Members unable to attend a meeting should notify the Curriculum Office for an excused absence. When a CCC faculty representative has more than two consecutive, unexcused absences, the Chair shall notify the division's dean, or if appropriate, the area director, Academic Senate representatives, and faculty that the division's and/or the College's interests and concerns are not being adequately represented. In order to ensure the participation of ex-officio members of the CCC, when any of those members have more than two consecutive unexcused absences, the Chair and VPAA or the designee shall notify the appropriate administrator that the College's curriculum may be compromised by the ex-officio member's lack of involvement and representation.
- 3.3 Meeting Times  
The regular meetings of the CCC shall take place during the Fall and Spring semesters on the second and fourth Tuesdays of the month from 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Adjustments to the regularly scheduled meeting dates may be made by a majority vote of the CCC. Adjustments to the meeting times may be requested by the CCC Chair. Meeting times may be extended as long as a quorum exists. Special meetings may be called by the CCC Chair as necessary.

**4. RESPONSIBILITIES OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES**

- 4.1 **CCC Division Representative**  
The Division's/Compton Community Education Center's CCC Representative serves as a liaison and resource person for the Division/Compton Community Education Center faculty in matters of curriculum review, curriculum development, and College and State curriculum practices and procedures. The representative is responsible for thorough study and review of all curriculum proposals.
- 4.2 **CCC Librarian Representative**  
The CCC Librarian Representative serves as a liaison between the CCC and the Library. The library representative also serves as a resource person for divisions and faculty in matters of curriculum review, curriculum development, and College and State curriculum practices and procedures. The representative is responsible for thorough study and review of all curriculum proposals. In addition, the librarian serves as a liaison between the CCC and Learning Resources regarding curriculum-related matters.

**5. DIVISION CURRICULUM/TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (DCC)  
COMPOSITION AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

- 5.1 **Division Dean**  
The Dean is responsible for coordinating the development of all division curriculum and informing the Council of Academic Deans and Directors of curriculum developments that may affect other divisions. The Dean is a resource person for regulatory guidelines, faculty load, WSCH, lecture/lab ratios, fiscal implications, and related matters regarding curriculum proposals.
- 5.2 **CCC Division Representative**  
The Division's CCC representative serves as a liaison and resource person for the division.
- 5.3 **Division Representatives**  
Division representation will include a minimum of four faculty members who provide appropriate discipline expertise. Division representatives are responsible for the thorough review and approval of all division curriculum proposals.
- 5.4 **Division Counselor**  
The Division Counselor(s) serves as a resource person(s) for the division in such matters as transfer, articulation, associate degrees, certificates, and student needs.

- 5.5 Clerical Support  
A member of the division's clerical staff, under the direction of the Division Dean and with the assistance of the CCC representative, is responsible for providing to the CCC, clean, error-free proposals prepared on proper forms.
- 5.6 The DCC conducts technical review for all proposals. Technical review ensures that Title 5 regulations have been met, that local procedures are adhered to, and that course specifications have been appropriately addressed. The DCC should refer to the guidelines for curriculum preparation/review found in the Curriculum Handbook for El Camino College.

## **6. DIVISION CURRICULUM/TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE PROCEDURES**

- 6.1 DCC Meetings  
At least two regularly scheduled DCC meetings will be held in each division per semester. Meeting dates are to be forwarded to the CCC Chair no later than the first day of the Fall semester. All division faculty members and the Counseling Division are to be notified of DCC meeting dates. Minutes of the meetings are to be kept on file in the division office. Names of DCC members and meeting dates should be established at the end of the Spring term preceding the upcoming academic year and forwarded to the CCC Chair prior to the beginning of the academic year.
- 6.2 In-Service Training  
All DCC members will attend at least one in-service training session each academic year. These in-service training sessions will be presented by members of the CCC and, when appropriate, by DCC members.
- 6.3 Curriculum Review  
DCC members will review curriculum in accordance with the Curriculum Handbook for El Camino College, the California Community Colleges Program and Course Approval Handbook, Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, and District policies.

## **7. REVIEW OF CURRICULUM DECISIONS**

- 7.1 Refer to the current Curriculum Appeals Process Flow Charts which are located in the Curriculum Handbook for El Camino College.

## **8. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- 8.1 CCC Subcommittees  
The Chair shall form subcommittees to address curricular issues. All CCC representatives are expected to serve on subcommittee assignments, and faculty at large may be appointed to serve.

# COLLEGE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE BYLAWS

**DRAFT**

Adopted: 10-13-98

Revised/Approved by Academic Senate: 1-26-99

Revised/Approved by Academic Senate: 9-14-99

Revised/Approved by Academic Senate: 9-25-01

Revised/Approved by Academic Senate: 3-25-03

Revised/Approved by Academic Senate: 9-23-03

Revised/Approved by Academic Senate: 11-15-05

Revised/Approved by Academic Senate: 9-19-06

Revised/Approved by Academic Senate: 10-7-08



## Board Policy 5055

## Enrollment Priorities

All courses *of the District* shall be open to enrollment, subject to a priority system that may be established. Enrollment also may be limited to students meeting properly validated prerequisites and co-requisites, or ~~subject to other restrictions established by the District.~~ *due to other, practical considerations.*

~~The Superintendent/President or designee~~ ~~Procedures~~ shall *establish procedures* defining ~~be established defining~~ enrollment priorities, limitations, ~~restrictions~~, and processes for student challenge, which shall comply with Title 5 regulations.

Reference:

Title 5, Sections 58106; 51801

Replaces Board Policy 5120

El Camino College  
Adopted: 1/21/03  
Amended:

**I. Limitations**

Enrollment in courses and programs may be limited to students meeting properly established prerequisites and co-requisites. Enrollment may also be limited due to the following:

- 1) Health and safety considerations
- 2) Facility limitations
- 3) Faculty workload
- 4) Availability of qualified instructors
- 5) Funding limitations
- 6) Constraint of regional planning
- 7) Legal requirements imposed by statutes, regulations, or contracts

**II. Registration Priorities**

During registration periods, the following registration priority shall be followed:

- 1) Continuing students
- 2) New and returning students
- 3) K-12 concurrently enrolled students

Within each of the above cohorts, sub-cohorts may be established by law or through policy and procedure of the district.

**III. Continuing Students**

Continuing students shall be assigned a priority registration time based on the following criteria:

- 1) Students in legally mandated priority registration student cohorts shall register before other continuing students (continuing DSPS, EOP&S and qualified members or former members of the Armed Forces of the United States shall register before other continuing students).
- 2) Student cohorts established by a federal or state grant that mandates priority registration shall next receive priority registration if the granting of priority registration to the cohort does not contradict the provisions or intent of the laws and regulations governing registration priorities.
- 3) Qualified students who are members of cohorts that meet the criteria for priority registration as established and approved by a Priority Registration Committee shall next receive priority in registration.
- 4) Continuing students not receiving priority registration shall receive one registration point for each unit earned at El Camino College since 1983 for up to a maximum of 90 points.
- 5) The more registration points, the earlier the registration assignment time.
- 6) Ties in registration point shall be broken by random selection.

- 7) Students who have earned more than 90 units cannot earn additional registration points. Instead, for each unit earned over 90 two registration points shall be deducted from the accrued registration point count. Therefore, if a student has earned 95 units, the registration point count shall be 80 ( $90 - [2 \times 5]$ ).
- 8) Students who have earned more than 90 units shall continue to have two registration points deducted for each unit earned beyond 90 units until the registration point count equals 15. The student shall not be penalized beyond 15 registration points.

**IV. New and Returning Students**

New and returning students shall be assigned a registration appointment time based on the following criteria:

- 1) New or returning students who are in legally mandated priority registration student cohorts shall register before other new or returning students (new or returning DSPS, EOP&S and qualified members or former members of the Armed Forces of the United States shall register before other new or returning students
- 2) New international students with F-1, M-1, or J-1 visas shall register next.
- 3) Qualified new and returning students who are members of cohorts that meet the criteria for priority registration as established and approved by a Priority Registration Committee.
- 4) Assignment of the registration appointment time for new and returning students not in the groups described in IV 1, 2 and 3 is on a first come, first serve basis. All other new and returning students shall have their registration appointment time based on the submission date of the application for admissions.

**V. K-12 Concurrently Enrolled Students**

Assignment of the registration appointment time for K-12 concurrently enrolled students is on a first come, first serve basis. Each K-12 concurrently enrolled student shall be assigned a registration appointment time based on the submission date of all required documents for admissions (application for admissions, K-12 concurrent enrollment form, and other documents required by law, regulation, and district policy). Failure of a K-12 student to apply and submit all required documents by the deadline specified by the college shall result in that K-12 student being denied admissions and subsequent registration for that term.

**VI. Registration Time Allowance**

- 1) All students may register on or after their scheduled registration appointment time, but not before.
- 2) All students must register by the published deadlines and in accordance with the policies and procedures of the district. If a student fails to meet these deadlines or to follow the district's policies and/or procedures, the student will not be allowed to register for the course.

- 3) A student who attends and participates in a course without proper registration will neither receive credit nor a grade for that course and the backdating of registration will not be considered by the district unless the student can prove that he/she properly registered in a timely manner and it was a college error that caused the registration to fail. A hold against a student (dean, fee, dismissal, etc), a failure by the student to apply for admissions, a failure by the student to meet prerequisites or co-requisites, an unapproved course overload, a K-12 form or process not properly executed, an admissions hold (residency, AB540, missing data, etc) not resolved by the student in the manner and timeframe proscribed by the district shall not be considered to be college error. A student will not be allowed to enroll in a class if there is any time overlap with another class. A student may not be allowed to enroll in a class if the enrollment violates any of the repeat rules as set forth in Title 5 or in the El Camino College policy and procedure on repeats. Attending and participating in a course without registration, does not constitute college error.

**VII. District Designated Priority Groups**

Cohorts or student groups not otherwise receiving priority registration may qualify for priority registration by meeting the following criteria set forth by the district.

- 1) The group must demonstrate that extra-curricular or co-curricular activities require considerable dedicated hours outside of the classroom.
- 2) The group must demonstrate that participation in the extra-curricular or co-curricular activities would not be possible without priority registration consideration.
- 4) The group must demonstrate that there are no other alternatives or options at their disposal to receive priority registration.
- 5) Groups shall be provided the opportunity to request priority registration based on guidelines established by a Priority Registration Committee.
- 6) The burden of proof to demonstrate that the student group qualifies for priority registration is on the student group.
- 7) Groups that are granted district designated priority status will maintain that status for no more than five years.

**VIII. Priority Registration Committee**

**A. Composition of the Committee**

The committee shall be composed of the following:

1. El Camino College Director of Admissions & Records or, in the director's absence, Assistant Director of Admissions & Records.
2. An at large representative appointed by the El Camino College Cabinet.
3. Student Representative appointed by the Associated Student Organization of El Camino College. The student representative may be from the ASB or any student in good standing attending El Camino College.
4. An instructor appointed by the Academic Senate.
5. A representative from the Council of Deans.

**B. Chair of the Committee**

The El Camino College Director of Admissions & Records shall be the chair of the committee. The Director of Admissions & Records shall have the right to veto a decision of the committee if it is found that granting or failing to grant priority registration would violate provisions of the California Education Code, Title 5, or a contract or grant entered into by the El Camino Community College District.

**IX. Priority Registration Application Process**

**A. Application Period**

- 1) The application period for eligible student groups to apply for priority registration shall be established and publicized by the Priority Registration Committee to the campus community in advance. The application period shall be for no less than 30 calendar days.
- 2) This application period will take place once in a calendar year. A student group that fails to meet the deadline will need to wait until the following year to apply. All material including supporting documentation must be submitted by the deadline. There will be no extensions.

**B. Committee Review Period**

The Priority Registration Committee shall establish a period of time to review, collectively or severally, the application material submitted by the student groups.

**C. Committee Vote**

The Priority Registration Committee shall meet to discuss, evaluate, consider, and vote on the applications submitted by the student groups.

1. Those student groups who do not qualify to apply (student clubs), have not submitted the required documentation, or have failed to demonstrate that the minimum criteria have been met will not be considered.
2. Those student groups who have met all criteria and have supplied all the documentation required may be considered as a priority registration group by the Priority Registration Committee. However, meeting all the criteria and supplying all the documentation does not guarantee approval.
3. Those student groups who have supplied all the documentation required but for whom questions remain with regard to meeting the criteria set forth above may be asked to appear before the committee to answer questions and provide clarification.

D. Committee Decision

The Priority Registration Committee shall make its determination on the applications for priority registration by a date established within the Guidelines.

E. Notification of Decision

- 1) The student groups shall be notified in writing of the committee's decision.
- 1) The committee may at its discretion limit priority registration within a group by seasonality of activities.
- 2) A copy of the notification shall be provided to the Vice President Student and Community Advancement.
- 3) A copy of the notification shall be provided to the El Camino College Division of Information Technology Services.
- 5) The decision of the Priority Registration Committee is final.
- 6) Any group whose request is denied may reapply for consideration after waiting a period of two (2) years.

X. Automatic Granting of Priority Registration Status

A. By Statute

Any group or cohort that is granted priority registration by statute following the passage and adoption of this procedure shall receive priority registration in accord with that statute and will not need to apply for priority registration as cited in VII of this procedure.

B. By Grant or Other Contractual Arrangement

Any group or cohort that is dependent on a grant or other legally binding arrangement that requires priority registration will not need to apply for priority registration as cited in VII of this procedure. However, the Vice-President of Student and Community Advancement will need to certify in writing that this group or cohort is legally entitled to priority registration under the terms of the grant or other legally binding arrangement.

XI. Loss of Group or Cohort Priority Registration

A. By Statute

Any group that has received priority registration by statute shall lose priority registration if that statute is repealed or declared null and void by a court of law.

B. By Grant or Other Contractual Arrangement

Any group or cohort that received priority registration based on the terms of a grant or other legally binding arrangement shall be subject to the loss of priority registration if the terms of the grant or arrangement have materially changed. The Priority Registration Committee may subject the group to the conditions of VII of this procedure.

C. Other Groups or Cohorts

Other groups or cohorts that have been granted priority registration may be subject to review by the Priority Registration Committee if, in the opinion of the committee, the group or cohort no longer meets the criteria to continue to receive priority registration. District granted priority registration status must be reviewed every five years. In all such cases, the group or cohort will be subject to the provision of VII of this procedure.

XII. Other Limitations

A. Cohort Limitations

The district may limit enrollment and allocate available seats to those students judged most qualified in courses of intercollegiate competition, honors courses, or public performance courses. The district may also limit enrollment in one or more sections to students enrolled in one or more other courses, provided that a reasonable percentage of all sections of the course do not have such restrictions.

B. Probation and/or Dismissal Limitations

The district may limit enrollment for students on academic or progress probation or subject to academic or progress dismissal. Limitations on enrollment may be by one of the following methods:

- (1) Total number of units a student may enroll in for a term;
- (2) By limiting the student to enroll in specific courses;
- (3) By requiring a student to follow a prescribed education plan;
- (4) Or any combination thereof.

XIII. Challenge to Enrollment Limitations

A. Grounds for Challenge

A student may challenge an enrollment limitation on the following grounds:

- (1) The enrollment limitation is either unlawfully discriminatory or is being applied in an unlawfully discriminatory manner;
- (2) The district is not following its policy on enrollment limitations; or
- (3) The basis upon which the district has established an enrollment limitation does not in fact exist.

B. Burden of Proof

The burden of proof is on the student to show that grounds exist for a challenge to an enrollment limitation.

C. Process for a Challenge

1. A student challenging an enrollment limitation on the grounds cited in Section XIII, A must file a petition with the Admissions Office and provide documentation supporting the challenge.
2. The petition will be considered within 10 business days by the Director of Admissions & Records or his/her designee.
3. The student will be notified the decision on the petition.

XIV. Effective Date

1. This Administrative Procedure shall be effective for the academic year following the calendar year in which it receives final board approval or in another period of time deemed suitable by the El Camino College Cabinet. The purpose of establishing this effective date provision is to allow the development, testing, and implementation of the software necessary to support this change; allow for catalog and schedule updates; and educate and prepare the college community to these changes.
2. The Director of Admissions & Records will prepare an annual list of cohorts approved for priority registration for approval by the Board of Trustees at their regular meeting - specific month to be determined.

Reference:

Title 5, Sections 51006, 58106, 58108



## **BOARD POLICY 4055**

### **Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities**

The El Camino Community College District provides reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities in accordance with compliance measures established by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, sections 504 and 508, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 (ADAAA). El Camino College shall provide reasonable accommodations to students with documented disabilities without compromising the student's course of study or the integrity of the college's academic standards. Reasonable accommodations are determined on an individual basis.

Reference: Title 5, Section 56006 (DSPS Regulations), 56027 (Academic Accommodations), 55063 (Minimum requirements for the Associate Degree)  
Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504 and Section 508  
Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA)  
ADA Amendments Act of 2008  
Title 5

El Camino College  
Adopted: October 20, 2003

**Educational Policies Committee of the Academic Senate of El Camino College**  
**Procedure on Academic Accommodations for Students with a Disability**

The El Camino Community College District intends that its graduates master the competencies required by Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. This entails the completion of required courses to obtain a degree or certificate with appropriate documentation as specified in Title 5, Section 56006 (DSPS Regulations). El Camino Community College District's policy is to respond to a student request for reasonable accommodations in a timely manner. However, provision of these accommodations does not guarantee the outcome of the student's endeavors. The Superintendent/President or designee shall establish standards of review for academic requirements to ensure that such requirements do not discriminate against students with disabilities or have the effect of excluding students solely on the basis of disability.

Verification of educational limitations and prescriptive planning of academic accommodations with otherwise qualified students with a disability is the responsibility of the Special Resource Center. The El Camino College District shall provide students with a disability a process to request reasonable accommodations, which may include course substitution of degree requirements. As outlined in the SRC student handbook, it is the student's responsibility to request accommodations. Additionally, it is the student's responsibility to provide documentation of disability along and identified educational limitations to support their request for accommodations. Accommodation requests are considered on an individual basis. Considerations include, but are not limited to, whether the student is an otherwise qualified student with a disability, documentation of educational limitations, the essential nature of the course and program, accommodations and disability management strategies previously utilized by the student.

#### Overview of Academic Accommodations

There are 2 levels of academic accommodations:

Level 1- Reasonable Accommodations – an adjustment that allows a student with a disability an equal opportunity to complete course requirements;

Level 2 – Course Substitution – the replacement of a required course with an approved alternative course;

#### **Level 1: Reasonable Accommodations**

The District recognizes the provision of reasonable accommodations is intended to mitigate functional limitations to facilitate student's academic access and ability to complete a course or achieve proficiency. For most students with documented disabilities, this first level of

accommodation will involve an attempt to complete the course with additional help such as learning facilitation, in-class support services, educational material in alternate formats, assistive technology, auxiliary aids, test accommodations, and note-taking assistance. Other options may include a request to complete an extended version of the course, and/or advisement to complete developmental courses or courses in an alternate format to promote academic success.

Procedure for requesting an accommodation:

1. It is the student's responsibility to provide appropriate documentation of a disability and to request course accommodations with a counselor or disability specialist in the Special Resource Center. As an alternative, students who do not want to use the services of the SRC may contact the Dean of Enrollment Services and request reasonable accommodations.
2. The SRC professional staff, in collaboration with the student, will evaluate and determine reasonable accommodations based upon the student's educational limitation(s) related to a documented disability. Reasonable accommodations will commence in a timely manner relative to the term of enrollment, and are not retroactive.
3. After consulting with the SRC, if the student disagrees with the SRC's recommendation for accommodations, the student may request a review of the accommodations through the grievance procedure outlined in the SRC student handbook. Additionally, if a conflict arises regarding the recommended accommodations at this level with the instructor, the SRC will initially attempt to resolve the conflict. If a resolution is not attained between the SRC and the instructor, the student, instructor, or SRC professional staff will refer the matter to the 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative for review.
4. The 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative will convene an Academic Accommodations Committee (defined below) to investigate and resolve the issue within ten business days.
  - a. The Academic Accommodations Committee will evaluate and determine the appropriateness and feasibility of the accommodation to ensure access, and whether the requested academic adjustment fundamentally alters the course or program of instruction, or if implemented, will conflict with a direct licensing requirement or jeopardize a requirement essential to the program of instruction.
  - b. If necessary, the academic accommodations committee will evaluate and determine alternative academic adjustments that may be considered to ensure the student is not denied the benefits of, or is excluded from participation in the academic program without impacting the integrity of the course.

- c. During this time period the SRC will continue to provide interim accommodations pending a final resolution.

## **Level 2: Course Substitution**

A course substitution is the replacement of a required course with an approved alternative course. The substituted course must provide concept mastery comparable to that of the required course.

1. A course substitution may be appropriate provided that a student with a verified disability believes that a) level 1 reasonable accommodations offered do not enable him/her to successfully complete a required course and b) that attempts with additional or different accommodations have been exhausted or if that his/her identified educational limitations are of such magnitude that any attempt at completing the course would be futile.
2. A course substitution can be granted under the following conditions:
  - a. The required course is found by the Academic Accommodations Committee (defined below) to be nonessential to the student's course of study.
  - b. The student is not likely to successfully complete the required course even with the provision of all reasonable accommodations by the college.
  - c. A suitable course for substitution exists.
3. The institution shall explore alternatives such as Independent Study, but is not required to develop a substitute course should one not exist. Academic requirements the college considers essential to the program of instruction being pursued by the student, or directly related to licensing requirements, will not be regarded as discriminatory.
4. As specified in Title 5, Section 56006 and the Special Resource Center's student handbook, the student submits an Academic Accommodations Request form with supporting documentation to the 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative.
5. Once a complete request is received, the Academic Accommodations Committee shall meet and resolve the issue within twenty business days within the primary (fall and spring) term.
6. Completion of a substitute course shall not be construed as meeting the prerequisite for any course for which the substituted course was a requirement.
7. A course waiver is the elimination of a required course from a student's program of study. A course waiver may be considered under the following conditions:

- a. There is evidence the student has met all of the requirements noted above for substitution.
  - b. There are no viable alternative courses offered at El Camino College, as determined by judgment of the Academic Accommodations Committee.
  - c. The required course is peripheral to the student's course of study or major, and the student must not require any further classes or training in the specified area.
8. A waiver of the course requirement will not be considered a waiver of the student's responsibility to complete the minimum number of units required by the institution for completion of the course of study. A waiver of a course requirement shall not be construed as a waiver of any prerequisite for any other course. The absence of a substitute course does not automatically establish grounds for a waiver.

**Exceptions to Timeline:**

An exception to the timeline will be made if the petition is received so late in the primary term creating a challenge for the committee to complete its process within the current term. In such case, the Chair of the Academic Accommodations Committee would convene the committee at the earliest possible time during the following primary term. The timeline for the committee's decision would remain the same, and begin the first day of instruction of the following primary term. Pending the decision of the Academic Accommodations Committee, accommodations will be made in this interim period as recommended by the 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative.

**Recognition by Other Institutions:**

El Camino College grants course substitutions or waivers for degrees and certificates conferred by El Camino College only. Students shall be informed that a substitution or waiver granted by El Camino College may not be recognized by another educational institution. It is the responsibility of the student for contacting potential transfer institutions regarding the acceptability of the substitution to meet transfer requirements.

**Academic Accommodations Committee:**

An appropriately qualified DSP&S Specialist will review all submitted documents for accuracy and completeness prior to submission to the Academic Accommodations Committee. The Committee shall be constituted as follows:

1. The El Camino College 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative (chair)
2. The dean of the division or a designee from the department in which the course is taught

3. A full-time instructor who teaches the course in question or an instructor from the department in which the course is taught, or if not available, from a closely related discipline
4. A full-time faculty member or representative from the department of the student's major or field of concentration
5. The El Camino College DSP&S faculty member knowledgeable with the disability and/or educational limitations of the student.

### **Review Meeting**

The Academic Accommodations Committee will convene to review the student's request in the specified timeframe. The student will have an opportunity to present his/her request accompanied by any relevant documentation for academic accommodations to the committee. If desired by the student, an advocate of the student's choice may accompany the student. Thereafter, the committee will deliberate and reach a consensus for the appropriate academic accommodations - course adjustments or substitution. The El Camino College 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative shall maintain records of all decisions of the Committee and notify the student of decisions.

### **Notification:**

The El Camino College 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative shall notify the student, the Special Resource Center, the Director of Admissions and Records and all other pertinent offices of any changes allowed by the Academic Accommodations Committee to the student's course of study in writing within five business days after a decision has been determined.

### **Appeals:**

In the event a request for academic accommodations is denied, the student may appeal the Academic Accommodations Committee's decision. In the event there is new information available, the student may only appeal the decision one (1) time and submit documents or information not previously submitted that s/he and DSPS specialist believes are pertinent in support of the request. If the appeal is denied, the student may submit a written request to the 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer that the appeal be forwarded to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for review. This request must be submitted within 30 days of notification of the committee's decision. The decision of the Vice President of Academic Affairs is final.

**Board Policy 4010 Academic Calendar**

The Superintendent/President shall, in consultation with the appropriate groups, develop and submit to the Board for approval an academic calendar.

Reference:

Education Code Section 70902(b)(12)

El Camino College

Policy

Adopted: 4/15/02



El Camino College  
Office of the Vice President-Student & Community Advancement  
Dr. Jeanie Nishime, Vice President

October 6, 2010

TO: President Thomas M. Fallo

SUBJECT: WINTER INTERSESSION RECOMMENDATION

According to the Winter Intercession Survey, keeping the current schedule was overwhelmingly favored by Compton Center employees (66% vs 33%) while evenly divided at El Camino College (ECC) (47% vs 46%). The Calendar Committee was divided in its preference, with four managers and one classified representative preferring the proposed calendar which eliminates winter intersession and adds two, back-to-back summer sessions. The second classified representative, two faculty members and student representative favored the current calendar. The third faculty member had some misconceptions regarding the impact of the calendar changes so his preferences were not clear. He thought ECC would lose students to Santa Monica College during the winter. However, moving the spring semester into January would not allow students to take a winter intersession elsewhere. He also thought faculty could meet during the winter intersession, but did not realize that option would be voluntary.

*Pros for the winter intersession:* The Transfer Coordinator and Honors Transfer Faculty Coordinator argued that the winter intersession was critical for students transferring to the UC and CSU systems. Admission requirements stipulate that all required courses be completed by the spring term prior to a fall transfer. Because of the budget situation, winter and spring transfers to UC and CSU have been curtailed. In addition, many Ed Plans have been completed with winter intersession in the mix. Honors Transfer students were surveyed and overwhelmingly (85%) supported having a winter intersession. One classified representative indicated that winter was an important time for classified staff in divisions to “catch-up” from the constant scheduling mode. A faculty member advocated for more winter offerings because of the greater success rate among students. The overall success rate in winter is 18% higher in winter than fall and 11% higher than summer.



Cons for the winter intersession: The major argument in favor of eliminating winter intersession is that it causes major organizational dysfunction in governance processes, hiring committees, program improvement initiatives, planning and evaluation processes, curriculum review, program review and continuity.

In addition, we are currently scheduling four terms as opposed to the three, fall, spring, summer, in the proposed calendar revision. We pay for a full-time workforce of classified and administrators during winter break and we repeat the cycle in summer, this seems like a waste of tax payer resources. Transferring the winter's 150 sections to summer will allow for a more robust summer that will serve more students, including recent high school graduates, a group that has no chance of enrolling in winter. A classified and a management representative also expressed concerns about our ability to hold disciplinary hearings during the winter when faculty is not present. Another concern expressed was the purchasing deadlines in April which are problematic when the spring semester ends so late in June.

Recommendation:

The Calendar Committee recommended that any calendar changes be postponed for one year (beginning in 2012-13) to give students in the pipeline an opportunity to complete their Ed Plan. Any changes will need to be adequately advertised to incoming students so they can plan the sequencing of their courses. It would also allow Academic Affairs an opportunity to develop eight-week schedules for the fall and spring terms with time for preparation and advertising. The committee also suggested holding forums to adequately discuss and inform the campus community of the proposed scheduling changes.



---

Jeanie Nishime, Ed.D.

Vice President-Student & Community Advancement

JN/mre

**A G R E E M E N T**  
**between**  
**EL CAMINO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
**and**  
**EL CAMINO COLLEGE**  
**FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,**  
**LOCAL 1388, AFT, AFL-CIO**  
**July 1, 2007**  
**through**  
**June 30, 2010**

ARTICLE 7

CALENDAR

Section 1. Calendar

During the fall semester of each school year, the District shall establish a calendar committee which shall be comprised of a representative or representatives of various campus organizations. A majority of the members of this committee shall be appointed by the President. The function of this committee is to recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees of the District a school calendar for the following two years, through the end of the summer session of the second year, to be adopted by the District. The Federation shall be entitled to appoint two (2) voting members as its representatives on the committee. The Academic Senate shall be entitled to appoint two (2) members as its representatives on the committee. Calendar changes that impact working conditions will be subject to negotiations.

Section 2. Committee Recommendations

The calendar committee shall make recommendations for a school year in compliance with the Education Code. The calendar shall include an academic year consisting of fall and spring semesters, summer and winter sessions, and other academic sessions as may be developed in the future. It is understood that the District may add an additional unscheduled day or days to the calendar in the event that any day or days are "lost" due to uncontrollable circumstances. The recommended calendar shall include the stipulated holidays as provided by Article 15.

ARTICLE 9

WINTER AND SUMMER SESSION ASSIGNMENTS

Section 1. Procedure

Each academic year, during the first week of scheduled development for the winter session or summer session, the Deans of the instructional divisions will provide Faculty members who desire to teach, a tentative schedule and the opportunity to submit their requests for winter or summer session teaching assignments. The Deans of the instructional divisions will review these requests and will make tentative winter or summer session assignments to Faculty members in their divisions based on the priority position of Faculty members in accordance with Section 2 of this Article.

Section 2. Priorities

(a) Faculty Members shall have a preference in priority order in choosing among winter and summer session classes which are to be offered (which they are qualified to teach) and among the times the classes are offered.

(b) Each Dean shall determine, among those Faculty Members by department in the division who request a teaching assignment during the winter or summer session, those who are qualified by virtue of prior experience and training for such assignments. For ITV courses, preference will be given in priority order to Faculty Members who have taught ITV courses. For purposes of this Article, a Faculty Member will be considered a member of that department in which the Faculty Member teaches the majority of his/her teaching load, including overload, during the then-current academic year. No Faculty Member will earn priority in more than one (1) department; however, priority in one department does not preclude a teaching assignment in another department. For purposes of this Article, a list of departments will be developed and maintained by each division council.

(c) (1) WINTER SESSION: A list of Faculty Members by department in the order of their current year winter session priorities will be prepared and distributed to all the members of the division by each Dean within twenty (20) working days after the beginning of the spring semester.

(2) SUMMER SESSION: A list of Faculty Members by department in the order of their current year summer session priorities will be prepared and distributed to all the members of the division by each Dean within twenty (20) working days after the beginning of the fall semester. Any problems respecting the equitable application of departmental designation for winter or summer session priorities will be resolved by the concerned Dean and the President of the Federation, or designee, prior to June 1<sup>st</sup> for winter session and December 1<sup>st</sup> for summer session. The decision of the Dean and the Federation President, or designee, is final and binding and is not subject to the grievance procedure.

(d) Assignments to winter or summer session teaching will be made among those qualified according to the priorities designated in Section 4. If there are more qualified Faculty Members in any priority than there are positions available in that priority, the choice among the qualified Faculty Members in that priority will be based on the Faculty Member's length of service with the District. Where the length of service is equal, the selection will be determined by highest placement on the seniority list.

(e) If there are more positions in a given division available than there are qualified Full-Time Faculty Members who desire to teach, and if currently employed Part-Time Faculty Members in that division are qualified for those positions, those Part-Time Faculty Members who have been continuously employed for three (3) semesters or more shall have priority.

(f) The Dean may offer the assignment to any other qualified person if the position remains unfilled after the procedures of this Section have been complied with.

### Section 3. Adjustments

(a) It is understood that the list of classes to be taught in the winter or summer session is a tentative list, that classes may be dropped or changed, and that changes in assignments must be made to accommodate those situations. It is also understood that most assignments will be full assignments as defined below in this section, but that some assignments will be partial either due to original planning or later adjustments. For the purposes of assignment distribution in the winter or summer session and establishing winter or summer session priority under Section 4 or Section 5 of this Article, a full teaching assignment equivalency shall be eighteen (18) hours per week. A partial teaching assignment of ten (10) or more hours per week for six or eight-week sessions or twelve (12) or more hours per week for five or seven week sessions shall count as a full assignment for the winter or summer it was incurred. A partial teaching assignment of twelve (12) or more hours per week for five or seven-week sessions shall count as a full assignment for the winter or summer it was incurred. A partial teaching assignment of less than ten (10) hours per week for six or eight-week sessions, or less than twelve (12) hours per week for five or seven-week sessions, shall not be counted as a winter

or summer assignment except when such assignment combined with a partial assignment for a previous winter or summer within a three (3) year period exceeds fourteen (14) or more hours per week. In such a case, the combined partial assignments totaling more than fourteen (14) or more hours per week shall be counted as a full session teaching assignment for the most recent session in which the Faculty Member has taught.

(b) Each division, by majority vote of the Full-Time Faculty Members in the division, will establish the rules that division will apply in the event that a Full-Time Faculty Member's winter or summer session class is canceled. Such rules will determine if a Faculty Member with a higher priority position may displace another Faculty Member with a lower priority position and the procedures that are to be followed if displacement is to be permitted. Any such decision by a division may be changed by vote of the division's faculty. If displacement is permitted, Part-Time Faculty Members will be displaced prior to Full-Time Faculty Members.

#### Section 4. Winter Session Priority Schedule

The following schedule is based on a consideration of winters eligible for assignment to winter session teaching and the number and sequence of winters taught (or otherwise employed by the District at a rate of compensation based on the regular salary schedule) during the past three winters. For Full-Time Faculty Members, eligibility for assignment to winter session teaching begins with the first winter following their initial service as contract Faculty Members. Leaves of absence shall have no effect on eligibility for winter session priority. All winter classes taught by a Faculty Member, regardless of the division in which such classes are offered, shall be counted in determining winter session priority....

# **Alternative Calendars: Recommendations and a Progress Report**

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

*Adopted April 2000*

## **1999 - 2000 Educational Policies Committee**

Hoke Simpson, Chair, Grossmont College

Lacy Barnes-Mileham, Reedley College

Kate Clark, Irvine Valley College

Elton Hall, Moorpark College

Mary Rider, Grossmont College

Ian Walton, Mission College

Susan Carleo, Los Angeles Valley College, CIO Representative

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	1
Recommendations Regarding Alternative Calendars.....	2
Introduction .....	4
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) About Alternative Calendars .....	5
Appendices.....	17

## ABSTRACT

As a consequence of changes to the 175-day rule, many colleges are considering moving to alternative calendars. To assist in the deliberations on the multiplicity of issues involved in such a change, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges is offering what are essentially two documents: 1) a set of recommendations regarding alternative calendars that was adopted by the Plenary Body; and 2) a series of frequently asked questions, or FAQs, regarding alternative calendars, along with their answers. The second document is not offered for adoption, but rather is offered in the nature of a “progress report” on the implementation of alternative calendars. This second document is the product of a breakout at the Fall 1999 Plenary Session of the Academic Senate and of interviews conducted by Kate Clark of the Educational Policies Committee. Both the breakout presenters and Ms. Clark’s interviewees were faculty and administrators from Santa Monica College and faculty from Riverside College. Santa Monica College actually implemented a 16-6-16-6 calendar prior to the 175-rule change, and has thus been functioning in this mode for many years. Riverside College has just moved to the 16-6-16-6 calendar for the 1999-2000 academic year.

The Executive Committee is grateful to representatives of both Santa Monica and Riverside Colleges for sharing their experiences, and believes that the account of those experiences reflected in the FAQ document will be useful in informing deliberations around the state. However, because of the very small “sample size” - one college, Santa Monica, whose representatives feel their alternative calendar has worked out splendidly, and a second college, Riverside, that as attempted to anticipate and address the issues, but where the jury is still out the Executive Committee did not think it appropriate to offer the FAQ document for adoption, as this would be to endorse specific solutions on the basis of too little evidence. On the other hand, the “Recommendations” serve to remind local academic senates that in deliberations on alternative calendars, as elsewhere, the longstanding Academic Senate commitments to access, equity, and academic quality should remain paramount.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING ALTERNATIVE CALENDARS**

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges makes the following recommendations to local academic senates:

1. Local academic senates should consult collegially and take a leading role in developing the process to determine calendar changes, including, but not limited to the formulation of criteria for selection to which all models will be subjected. Clearly such criteria will give primacy to student access and student academic success before desires to increase enrollment or to serve other administrative ends.
2. Local academic senates must ensure that the quality of educational programs and curricular offerings are not diminished by any change; rather, the desire is to improve both.
3. Local academic senates must work closely with their bargaining units to identify issues of concern and clarify appropriate provenances for decision-making as it affects faculty. Such decisions, within the shared governance process, will ensure respect for the delegated authority of the senates and the statutory and locally-negotiated responsibilities of the bargaining units.
4. Faculty should debate—within and between disciplines—the academic and pedagogical advantages and disadvantages of any proposed calendar.
5. Flex and Staff Development Officers must work with the local senates to ensure full opportunities for continued professional growth, exchange, and development within the contractual obligations, regardless of the calendar model.
6. Local academic senates, working with students as shared governance participants, should identify those populations of students most likely to be negatively impacted by changes and to identify their concerns.
7. Local academic senates should be advocates for unique programs or activities whose special or contractual demands must be considered.
8. Local academic senates should work with their bargaining agent to identify faculty (e.g., librarians and counselors) on whom differential responsibilities or opportunities might fall and to seek resolution of inequities.
9. Local academic senates must identify services and facilities necessary to instruction and to full college participation by their students; such faculty services as computing facilities, administrative support, duplication services, and the library must be matched by services that will provide full access to all students, regardless of their term of enrollment.



10. Faculty must remain sensitive to the demands these changes would place on staff and hourly employees and to understand how their own senate-adopted policies and practices might impact their workload.
11. Finally, the local academic senates must insist on mechanisms to retain shared governance and resist any efforts—inadvertent or intentional—to silence the voice of faculty by making significant decisions when faculty are not present on campus.

## INTRODUCTION

This document emerges at a time when California community colleges are exploring mechanisms to better utilize facilities, plan for enrollment surges, and meet changing student needs. One particular mechanism, modifying academic calendars, comes in response to the 1992 changes in the Education Code's 175-day rule governing the length of the school calendar. Acknowledging this interest, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges held a breakout on Alternative Calendars during its Fall 1999 Plenary Session.

More specifically, this document responds to several charges, the first of which arose in Academic Senate resolutions:

### **9.05 S99 Compressed Courses**

*Study and research compressed course offerings, including the effects on student learners and make recommendations for possible changes in Title 5 regulations regarding such cases.*

### **11.10 F97 New Calendar for Technology Age**

*Study and report on models of instructional calendars that are reflective of technologically influenced modes of instruction.*

Further, in response to a request from the Consultation Council to examine model academic calendars, it was determined that, as one college currently employs a quarter system, and only two colleges have today adopted and implemented calendars significantly different from the conventional models, it might be premature to suggest a single model or to prescribe a standard approach. Rather, what follows, are the *inquiries* college faculty might employ to begin their deliberations. These questions should be used to initiate further discussions of the implications any calendar change would have for faculty on curriculum, pedagogy, staff development, governance, and collective bargaining.

General recommendations for involvement and action of local academic senates are included, as well as suggestions to faculty in general. At the conclusion of this paper is an appendix that includes materials of other institutions as they conducted inquiry and deliberated the options now available to any college.

The Academic Senate's Educational Policies Committee wishes to acknowledge the following individuals who provided materials and presentations, making possible this FAQ sheet. Duplication of their ideas and comments has been done with their kind and generous permission.

- Riverside Community College: Faculty Member David Waxman
- Santa Monica College: Faculty Members Charles Donaldson; Randy Lawson, Ruth Logan; Espy Nieto (Registrar's Office)
- Los Angeles Pierce: Darroch F. Young (President)

## THE FAQs ABOUT ALTERNATIVE CALENDARS

### *What is Meant by an "Alternative" Calendar?*

The California Education Code §58142 requires community college districts, in order to receive “full apportionment, to maintain the colleges . . . for at least 175 days during the next preceding fiscal year.” A recent change in the Education Code (§58120. Conditions for Inclusion As A Day) now allows that “for a day to count towards meeting the requirements of §58142, courses of instruction must be offered for a minimum of three hours during the period of 7 a.m. to 11 p.m.” While California community colleges had routinely offered classes Monday through Saturday, Sundays could now be added, encouraging colleges to consider such programs as weekend colleges, seminars, and other configurations of those “days.” Regardless of the possible mode, however, the Carnegie unit/hour relationship needed to be maintained.

The calendar traditionally used by most districts has been a 18-18-6-6 model that included two semesters of 17.5-18 weeks, and one or more summer sessions of 6, 8, or 12 weeks in length. Within that 175-day parameter, flex activities are then tacked onto this standard calendar, sometimes preceding fall or spring semesters—or both. Alternative calendars, which might be introduced for a variety of reasons, seek to define those 175 days outside that traditional construction while preserving the same number of instructional hours per course. As an alternative, those calendars may be compressed (wherein the students have more contact with faculty per day, for fewer days or weeks, with no loss of instructional time over the course of the primary term).

Other alternatives might be designed to accommodate various mediated instruction. Given that students taking courses in a distance learning mode might access the material at their convenience, conceivably they could compress their own calendar by completing all required work in a shorter period of time than the semester serving as the college’s standard; on the other hand, students needing additional time for personal or academic reasons, could seek to define a “semester” in yet another fashion. Currently, changes in software that track a student’s “time on task” and other mechanical measurements of instructional time are under review by faculty across the state. From the students’ point of view, an open entry/open exit arrangement—free of the current semester parameters—would allow them to complete an online course at their own pace; and indeed, many colleges now have the technology whereby to track their enrollment and the progress they make through a course. Local academic senates should have in place a curriculum review process to ensure that the course meets the Carnegie Unit Requirement (Appendix A) to satisfy demands of any transfer institution. What remains a stumbling block for colleges, however, is the matter of apportionment funding. At present, the funding mechanism is based upon attendance during a percentage of a full semester. Just how differential enrollment periods would be figured remains a dilemma that may ultimately call for redress by the Legislature.

For that series of reasons—the changes in statute, the shifting concept of a traditional “term,” and the fluid semester boundaries that seem a benefit of mediated instruction—herein our discussion of alternative calendars will focus on models of compression and expansion through the use of intersessions.

### ***What Exactly are Intersessions?***

Like those offered by many California State University (CSU) campuses, community college intersessions occur between “regular” or full semesters, generally identified as the “primary” terms. As we see with those colleges offering or now planning intersessions, usually courses run 4-6 weeks in length, though the courses may be as short as several days or a single week, so long as they retain the Carnegie unit/hour relationship. These sessions do not attempt to offer a full contingent of courses or to attract the same number of students attending a full semester, yet these additional offerings can serve as a “safety valve” for students needing to repeat an essential course, to pick up additional units, or to satisfy prerequisites.

According to some, a winter intersession improves student success because it allows an accelerated completion of a course sequence or allows unsuccessful students to repeat class in sequence without losing time or that sequence; further, Santa Monica College’s experience, as you will see below, demonstrated that fewer weeks of instruction resulted in greater student retention and success. (See Appendix B.)

### ***What Prompts These Discussions About Alternative Calendars Now?***

Faculty and administrators have expressed curiosity about these calendars, especially since two colleges, Riverside College and Santa Monica College, have switched to such scheduling. As contracts come up for renewal throughout the state, faculty and boards have a vested interest in examining the potentials for such a change. Recognizing the building momentum, the Academic Senate offered a breakout discussion at its Fall 1999 Plenary Session that was well-attended and reflected the serious questions faculty raise. Given the impact such calendar changes would have on faculty and on their curriculum, their students, and their contractual obligations, it is important to be informed about the advantages—and disadvantages—of any academic calendar model.

California’s changing demographics also encourage examination of alternative calendars as a mechanism to accommodate students affected by changes in the welfare law, technology, workplace demands, and career changes necessitated by corporate downsizing. As evidenced by the offerings of proprietary and private schools, many students today seek an alternative to the traditional school calendar of 18 weeks.

Further, while community college districts once attempted to align their calendars with those of their local unified school districts, such efforts today are more difficult—and seemingly less important. As college districts often encompass multiple K-12 districts, each with its idiosyncratic calendar, this former alignment is now made virtually impossible given the many year-round schools within those unified districts. Additionally, college districts already attend to a variety of

calendars: the administration 175 days, the State Teachers Retirement System (STRS) calendar, and the personnel calendars of individual districts. Superimposing an alternative or compressed academic calendar no longer represents the administrative burden it might once have.

Finally, the wide-spread anticipation of a surge of students of college age, poised to enter California colleges and universities (often referred to as Tidal Wave II), has prompted discussions among chief executive officers and chief instructional officers about potential enrollment management strategies to accommodate these increased numbers despite current constraints on their physical plants and their fiscal condition. Given the interest that the University of California (UC) and CSU Systems have in boosting transfer rates, aligning calendars with the start of nearby transfer institutions may, in fact, increase transfer rates and benefit the students attempting to pace their work. At the same time, such alignment may benefit CSU students redirected to local community colleges to complete necessary remediation.

### ***What are the Advantages and Disadvantages of the Current, Traditional 18-18-6-6 Model?***

This calendar, a conservative model, is familiar to us all and consequently, it is easily scheduled and manipulated. It is observed widely, and makes it easy to coordinate inter-college meetings or sharing of employees (hourly staff, part-time faculty, etc.). On the other hand, its early end in May, while perhaps popular with faculty, may not offset problems associated with its early start: it precludes admission by parents who encounter child care problems, and at some colleges, the August start exacerbates problems from the heat. Further, the length of the semester may contribute, according to some, to a higher student drop-out rate and offers fewer opportunities for students to complete course requirements in a timely fashion.

### ***Do Students Perform Better With the Traditional Model?***

Some faculty argue that the longer semester favors some students who need a “slow rate of information flow.” Other faculty, however, argue that the length is detrimental to “effective collegiate instruction.” While more extensive research should be done, a preliminary study cited later in this paper suggests that students may be more successful with shorter semesters. (See Appendix B.)

### ***What are the Forms of Such Alternative Calendars?***

Though any variety might be considered, the three models currently below seem to attract the most discussion. Some of the advantages and disadvantages are noted here and discussed more fully later in this document. Bear in mind that in each of these three calendars, the number of classroom hours per semester remains constant. (Samples of several models appear in Appendix C.)

**15-5-15-5-5**

Example (2000-2001)

September 5 - December 21	Fall Semester (70 instructional days)
January 2 - February 2`	Winter Intersession
February 5 - June 4	Spring Semester (72 days of instruction)
June 18 - July 21/July 24-August 31	Summer Sessions (2)

Advantages:

- later start may encourage greater enrollment;
- preferred by many students;
- allows for three intersessions, including two summer sessions;
- allows completion of three semesters' work in one year;
- fewest weeks taught in hottest weather;
- three intersessions may, depending upon negotiations, permit three opportunities for extra pay;
- has longer break between two primary (or longest) semesters; and
- lengthened class sessions means no class time lost.

Disadvantages:

- increases faculty contact hours per day, though because the semester is shortened as noted above, the total instructional time remains the same;
- spring semester ends in early June;
- assignments for counselors, librarians and certain classified positions must be carefully reconsidered and perhaps redesigned;
- some special programs and activities (nursing, vocational experiences, athletics, etc) may need to be specially scheduled beyond the shortened semester; and
- increased registration and grade collection periods may necessitate additional classified staffing or complex scheduling; offers fewest number of final exam days (5).

**16-6-16-6**

Example (2000-2001)

August 28-December 20	Fall Semester (73 instructional days)
January 2 - February 9	Winter Intersession
February 12-June 14	Spring Semester (74 instructional days)
June 18-July 28	Summer Session (1)
(Includes 4 professional development days, 1 of which is mandatory 8/25)	

Advantages:

- fall semester starts one week later than usual and ends prior to Christmas; and
- closer to unified school times.

Disadvantages:

- has few final-exam days (6);
- offers only a single summer session;
- increases weekly faculty contact;
- longer class-meetings may not be best learning mode for some students
- creates increased difficulty with classroom scheduling;
- assignments for counselors, librarians and certain classified positions must be carefully reconsidered and perhaps redesigned; and
- as with previous model, some special programs and activities (nursing, vocational experiences, athletics, etc.) may need to be specially scheduled beyond the shortened semester.

**Trimester (three terms of equal length, in this case 15 weeks)**

Example (2000-2001)

September 7- December 20	Fall Trimester
January 4 - April 15	Winter Trimester
May 15 – August 14	Spring-Summer Trimester (often sub-divided further)

These terms can continue to be subdivided into 3- or 5-week modules, or combined, space allowing, with 8-week courses as well as 8- or 12-week weekend colleges. While no California community college has yet adopted this model, it is used in some four-year universities across the country.

Advantages:

- is closest to many unified school district calendars;
- has short, intensive semesters; offers break between each session;
- spring-summer trimester can be divided to accommodate California fiscal year;
- full-time faculty may elect to teach their load in any two of the three, or may teach fewer courses in all three terms;
- begins, typically, in early September and ends in April/May; and
- is particularly favored by faculty seeking to do post-graduate work at another institutions.

Disadvantages:

- fragments faculty, making it difficult hold collegewide or department meetings at which all will be present.

### ***What Advantages do These Alternatives Provide to Faculty?***

Clearly faculty would have additional “down time” for their own personal or professional enrichment and development. As we have noted, such calendar models may also provide additional opportunities for employment for both full- and part-time faculty. Or, depending upon the arrangement negotiated, faculty may extend their contracted periods over additional terms each year to allow more attention to be focused on each course.

Instruction may also improve because of the more concentrated time students would presumably allocate to the class in which they are enrolled. For example, a 5-unit course might typically meet 4 days a week for 1.5 hours; both math and modern language instructors have noted particular advantages to their instruction and to their students under this model. Three unit courses would typically continue to meet twice a week for a slightly extended period of time. (See Appendix D.)

Some faculty may object, however, to the resultant need to retool their pacing or delivery to accommodate that newly extended classroom period; for example, a class that formerly met for 50 minutes would now meet for 65 minutes under a 16-6-16-6-6 model. Other faculty, on the other hand, welcome the opportunity to revise and revamp, noting that for those who teach the same course on Monday, Wednesday, Friday and on Tuesday, Thursday, such modifications are already commonplace.

### ***And What Disadvantages Might These Alternative Calendars Have for Faculty?***

In one case, the newspaper advisor had to be present longer, and nursing and vocational programs with separate modules within the semester had additional responsibilities. Counselors and librarians, who already must adjust to a year-long calendar, must make additional shifts to accommodate new “peak” periods prior to the commencement of new terms. On the other hand, some of these demands can be offset by technological advances such as phone-in registration or online admissions procedures.

Librarians and counselors now have available to them an 11-month contract, while other “teaching” faculty have a 10-month contract, thus creating, in some cases, differential incomes. While greater opportunities for additional pay may accrue to faculty who then teach during the summer, the base rate for the 11-month contractual year has long-term implications for STRS. Depending on the outcome of any negotiation, it is possible to exacerbate this differential scale; this matter remains a concern for bargaining units and for faculty who do not wish to see their ranks further divided. Related to this differential bases are the current STRS considerations of whether or not to include summer school teaching in the annual base pay tallies, and the legislative interest in pro rata pay for part-time instructors. It is immediately apparent, then, that increasing the number of these shorter segments increases the importance of completing administrative and



legislative discussions at the state level.

More locally, part-time faculty teaching at multiple colleges—and their administrators—found it difficult to coordinate their schedules with nearby colleges which did not have a similar calendar; their difficulty lay less with the dates of the calendar than with the changes in contact hours.

The calendar changes also made it difficult to hire interpreters for deaf at one college, and, when faculty relied on hourly staff for instructional or other purposes, they found themselves compelled to create novel schedules to abide by district limitations on such hourly workers, as we noted below.

At some colleges, the handling of flex hours is the most problematic. These calendars favor distribution of flex days or opportunities throughout the year as opposed to a concentrated period preceding the semester as often occurs. Santa Monica, for example has negotiated a single mandated flex day that precedes the start of the fall term.

Of considerable concern to faculty, however, are the impacts such calendars might have on collegial governance. While the local academic senate, coordinating councils or collegewide committee meetings and departmental meetings would generally meet only during the primary fall and spring sessions, and not during intersessions, faculty must ensure their representation even in their absence.

### ***Do Alternative Calendars Provide Some Advantages to Students?***

In general, students favor shorter semesters. These calendars also attract members of the community whose life circumstances only permit them to make short-term commitments. Intersessions particularly enable students to complete prerequisites and take general education courses under a more intensive and focused manner, often experiencing a “total immersion,” since they take fewer courses than they would in a full term.

Ruth Logan, Professor of Life Sciences and the college Research Coordinator at Santa Monica College, completed an initial study reported in *The Standard Deviant* (Edition 5, November 1, 1999; see Appendix B). The study found that, in an examination of math courses, English courses, and 5 unit chemistry lab courses, the students in 6 and 8 week summer school courses, as compared to those in 18-week courses, were less likely to withdraw, had higher grade point averages on average than those of students in full semesters, and earned higher grades—regardless of ethnicity or their enrollment in the class of a full- or part-time instructor. These early findings or measurements of “student success,” based on a summer school population that may be atypical of students enrolled during other terms, call for additional research and longitudinal studies, particularly of intersession courses of shorter duration. The author also suggests that they were unable in their study to determine “if students obtain a better educational experience from full-semester or compressed sessions.” While this study provokes discussion among faculty about optimal teaching and learning paradigms, it reminds us all that student success should be primary in our considerations about alternative calendars and that evaluation

and research subsequent to adoption and implementation seems a necessary component of our planning.

### ***What Kinds of Courses Seem to Work Best for Intersession Courses?***

A good place to begin consideration is with those courses traditionally offered in 4-6 week summer sessions. Now, to attract new students and encourage additional enrollments by those who attend the primary term, experimentation and innovation seem in order. Those who have implemented intersessions report that many vocational or applied technology courses are ideal and attract students who might otherwise not enroll in a full-semester course. Additionally, general education courses, particularly those designed for non-majors (e.g., biology or geology) are well-received. Other popular choices have included field studies classes (art history field trips, or classes requiring travel or overnight stays); art or photography classes; foreign languages (particularly conversation courses); laboratory classes (chemistry or biology); some literature or film studies classes; personal enrichment courses (study skills, career options); review courses, or other courses for which compression, concentration, and intensity can be advantageous. Intersessions offer faculty an opportunity to design new classes or offer shorter modules of existing classes for fewer hours of general education credit; they may also want to consider other courses for which intense immersion can be an educational benefit for the student.

### ***How are Intersessions Staffed or Funded?***

Intersessions are considered a “special session” and thus, depending on what has been negotiated by the bargaining unit, may provide opportunities for additional pay for faculty who wish to teach during that abbreviated period. Intersessions also provide part-time faculty with additional opportunities for employment. In some cases, the bargaining unit has negotiated that, with permission, full-time faculty may use such employment to make load or bank units for later use.

In claiming state apportionment funds for intersession offerings, colleges implementing such sessions generally “attach” them to the fall or spring semesters. This mechanism also supports the approach of giving the full-time faculty the option of fulfilling part of their load by teaching during the intersession.

These intersessions, however, have hidden costs of which all must be aware. The college must make a determination about its willingness to offer courses—and *support* those offerings—with the range of student services that make their college experience complete and meaningful. While it seems self-evident that students must have full access to college services regardless of their term of enrollment, providing those services can be more difficult. For example:

Will students enrolled in intersessions or even weekend colleges have access to:

- administrative services (admissions, records, registration);
- financial aid offices;
- counseling or health services;
- the bookstore;
- the cafeteria or food services;
- the library; and
- tutorial centers or college computing facilities?

Will the faculty who teach them have access to:

- copying services;
- emergency services in the event of a lab accident;
- registration or administrative assistance for dropping, adding or processing student enrollments; and
- computing facilities or media services?

### ***What Advantages do Administrators or Staff see in Such Calendars?***

As we suggested earlier, administrators see an alternative calendar either as a means to increase and manage enrollments or to maximize room utilization, or both, allowing the college to make full use of its facilities 7 days a week, throughout the day and evening, all year long.

There are disadvantages, however, of which administrators and staff must be cognizant. In addition to some of those hidden costs associated with compressed or alternative calendars, for a college already close to maximum room utilization, a change in calendar may decrease the number of classes offered during any given day (since a longer class period reduces the number of classes that can be offered in that room); the increase in numbers of terms could, however, increase the total number of classes over the course of the year.

### ***What Other Disadvantages Must Administrators or Staff Consider?***

Of course, any change requires adjustment in thinking; our familiarity with the 18-week calendar model means that any new practice will likely encounter some resistance from faculty, students, and college staff. Fortunately, because Santa Monica College and Riverside College have implemented such calendars, some strategies and models for our consideration already exist. So long as administrators and staff recognize the need for broad participation of all groups during the planning stages, suspicions and doubts can be aired and reservations addressed.

On a practical level, obviously salaries and benefits need to be examined carefully; yet increased offerings imply other related costs that may or may not be offset by increased enrollments: staffing of additional registration periods, utilities, heating and cooling, printing and duplication

of both instructional and administrative materials; mailing (of class schedules, applications, etc); transcripts and grade reports are among the many costs that would have to be identified by each unit.

More concretely, and on a very pragmatic level, if the buildings are being used more fully throughout the day and across the year, the maintenance and repairs are likely to increase; however, because there is little “down time,” there are now few opportunities for scheduled repairs, replacement or general maintenance such as painting, carpet replacement, overhauls of heating/cooling systems, rewiring, cabling for computers, and so forth.

Scheduling of classified staff, notably hourly staff, has proven to be an issue, particularly during peak registration since many districts limit the number of hours an employee can work in a calendar year. Administrators, staff, and their bargaining units—for indeed wages, benefits, and working conditions may be affected—must work to find practical solutions to already thorny problems. For example, consider these administrative dilemmas: new scheduling patterns must be devised because of continual scheduling and publication deadlines. Grade collection and reporting is compressed and enrollment/registration periods often overlap—both of which impact staff and faculty significantly. Students seeking enrollment in courses for which they are just completing the prerequisite must have a mechanism for enrollment—and withdrawal—pending their successful completion of that prerequisite. Students enrolling throughout the year during various sessions must still complete matriculation.

### ***How is Matriculation Handled? And What About Prerequisite Satisfaction?***

Clearly there is some strain on staff and faculty responsible for matriculation and for turn-around reporting, though most colleges have already wrestled with this problem as it occurs in the crunch between the fall and spring semesters as currently configured. Eligibility rosters can be prepared, identifying students taking prerequisite courses to allow them to enroll in the target course in sessions or terms immediately following. As this mechanism is already in place at many colleges, faculty and staff are familiar with their local procedures necessary to ensure students’ enrollment. Clearly, continued cooperation and consideration are essential to minimize impacts on student enrollment. At several colleges, general orientations have been reduced: a summer orientation for summer/fall and a December orientation for winter/spring.

### ***How are Traditional Holidays Incorporated Into an Alternative Calendar?***

Just as unified school districts do not observe holidays uniformly, community college districts have some flexibility to designate and fix various observations. The Education Code, §79020 states, albeit ambiguously, that all community colleges may continue in session or close on specified holidays as follows: “January 1st, the third Monday in January, commencing in the 1989-90 fiscal year, known as “Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day,” February 12th known as “Lincoln Day,” the third Monday in February known as “Washington Day,” the last Monday in May known as “Memorial Day,” July 4th, the first Monday in September known as “Labor Day,” November 11th known as “Veterans Day,” the Thursday in November proclaimed by the President as

“Thanksgiving Day,” and December 25th.

Education Code (e.g., §1318, 45203, and 88203) also identifies other holidays that may be locally negotiated. Given such broad latitude, a college’s traditional spring break need not be tied to the Easter or Passover calendar date but rather could simply be observed each year, say, in the ninth week of the spring session, or it may be done away with entirely in the compression process.

To ensure that students receive the requisite number of instructional days and minutes, compressed and alternative calendars must attempt to balance out terms in which a number of holidays are scheduled. While establishing the annual calendar is a matter of between governance groups and bargaining agents, faculty will want to remain vigilant that the students’ academic needs are fully considered.

***What of Athletic Programs or Special Vocational Programs That Mandate Enrollment or Modules of a Certain Length?***

There has been no reported disadvantage to athletic programs or scheduling; in fact, coaches and athletic directors often favor an intersession as it offers additional opportunities for their scholar-athletes to complete enrolled-hour requirements and maintain their grade point averages.

While nursing programs and other vocational programs may need to respond to regulatory demands, these can be anticipated in advance of any calendar modification and can either be built into the new model or superimposed upon it. In fact, some college faculty report that the new calendars are more amenable to the creation of such modules.

Faculty, though, must encourage all decision-makers to examine the needs of any special groups on their campus and to review any agreements such as those governing veterans, GI benefits, or SACMORE plans.

***Would all Colleges in a Multi-college District Have to Agree on a Single Calendar?***

No, and that’s the delight of such calendar options for some colleges. In fact, an argument could be made that multiple options within a district would increase student options and attract more students to the district as a whole. An alternative calendar may provide a competitive edge to a college in a multi-campus district or in an urban area with neighboring districts. This versatility will be seen, for example, in 2000-2001 within the Los Angeles Community College District. Pierce College, Los Angeles Valley College, and Los Angeles City College have adopted a calendar with a 15-week primary term; West LA College has chosen a 16-week primary term, and all others will remain on an 18-week primary term calendar. In this instance, the negotiated contract permits such options for the contract period and was decided upon first by the local college faculty within a shared governance framework and then was agreed to by the bargaining unit and the chapter chair.

***So who Decides on Whether a College Should Adopt Another Calendar Model or Remain With its Present Practice?***

By now it should be apparent that this decision is a monumental one, calling upon the wisdom of all members of the college community and necessitating the best and most collegial of shared governance practices, and ensuring—above all—that the resulting decision is made in the best interests of students and their academic needs. Boards of trustees must clearly articulate their objectives and make clear any fiscal constraints; college administrators and management must examine honestly their goals and the limitations on college resources—whether they are financial, physical, or human; classified staff must feel free to contribute plans and voice reservations; faculty—full and part-time faculty together, bear responsibility to see that the principles for coming to a decision, and the decision-making process itself is clearly articulated and observed, and bargaining units must be ever-vigilant about the impacts such changes would have on wages, benefits, and working conditions. In the list of recommendations on page 2, we remind you of the ideas noted above and suggest some appropriate practices for faculty whose campuses are considering such significant changes.

# APPENDICES

## **The Carnegie Unit: An Overview**

*The following information was compiled to present an overview about the application the Carnegie Unit, a longstanding practice of establishing uniform standards for students' workloads.*

### Background

Various methods of assessing units of student course credit are and have been in use throughout American institutions of higher education. The attempt to articulate and implement a common system has taken particular impetus from the combination of two social factors: the widespread growth of public institutions (which in many cases has involved the absorption of private colleges into a state system) and the general mobility of students, who frequently complete course work for degrees at a number of different institutions. A third impetus has been the general effort to normalize workloads against standards first defined within the context of labor laws- -i.e., to define "full-time" employment with respect to weekly hours of obligation of an employee.

The so-called "Carnegie System" for establishing standards for student units emerged as a consequence and in response to these three pressures. In brief, the system attempts to establish minimum and common standards for full-time student workloads in higher education, in the understanding that (1) students are engaged in a variety of different, supervised and unsupervised activities over varying periods of time; and (2) any student graduating with a total of 120 units from any college or combination of colleges will have undertaken a common minimal workload; and (3) a full-time college student is akin to a full-time employee with respect to weekly workload standards.

### Method and Definition

In the Carnegie System, all full-time student workloads are established at 15 semester units, with each unit being equated to a minimum weekly workload of three student hours. Thus all full-time students assume a minimum weekly workload of 45 hours over the length of the semester, a minimum taken to be necessary for the average student to achieve a passing grade in the courses in which he or she has enrolled.

The Carnegie system responds to the different types of classes and activities in which any student might be engaged by distinguishing between lecture and laboratory instruction, this distinction reflecting the relative proportion of student work undertaken in class as opposed to out of class. A lecture course is defined as any course in which the student must assume a minimum weekly workload of two out-of-class hours for each in-class hour. A laboratory course is defined as any course in which the student



assumes a maximum of one out-of-class hour for each in-class hour.

The thought here is that in lecture courses the great preponderance of student work and learning occurs outside the lecture hall and that a student cannot succeed in the objectives of the class absent this independent work. Conversely, it is assumed of laboratory instruction that the majority of student work and learning occurs in the classroom and under the direct supervision of the course instructor, and that a student cannot succeed without this direct contact.

To achieve the common standard of 15 units and 45 work hours for all students in all combinations of activities, the Carnegie Unit System assigns 1 unit of student credit for each weekly class hour of lecture instruction and 1/3 of a student unit for each weekly class hour of laboratory instruction. Thus, for any combination of lecture and laboratory courses in which a student is enrolled, a 15-unit student workload will translate to a minimum student work week of 45 hours.

Faculty workloads as set in the current contract define a different relationship between classroom contact hours of a lecture and laboratory type and related “grading and preparation hours.” In this system, a lecture hour is an instructional hour in which the faculty member is compensated for a minimum of one weekly out-of-class hour for each weekly hour assigned in class. A laboratory hour is one in which the faculty member is compensated for a minimum of 40 minutes out-of-class for each hour in class. And a learning center or tutorial hour is one in which the faculty member has minimum or no out-of-class obligations for each hour in class (and is therefore not compensated for preparation and grading). These workload distinctions apply only to contract faculty working contracted teaching loads. Specifically, they do not apply to any part-time, summer, or overload classes, for which all instructors are paid only for classroom hours (although held responsible for any necessary out-of-class work).

If the college were to adopt the Carnegie Unit Standard as the universal basis for assigning units of student credit to all courses in the curriculum, and current contract language remained without modification, definitions such as the following would therefore go into place:

Lecture instruction- - Any activity which requires of the successful (passing) student a minimum of two out-of-class hours per week per semester for each in-class hour; and requires of the contractual faculty member a minimum of one out-of-class hour per week per semester for each in-class hour; and for which such minimum student and faculty requirements are specified in the outline of record for the course. For each assigned lecture hour per week per semester, the student is granted one student unit of credit and the faculty member one faculty workload unit (LHE).

Laboratory Instruction. - Any activity which requires of the successful (passing) student no more than one out-of-class hour per week per semester for each in-class hour; and requires of the contractual faculty member a minimum of 2/3 of an out-of-class hour per week per semester for each in-class hour; and for which such minimum student and faculty requirements are specified in the outline of record for the course. For each assigned laboratory hour per week per semester, the student is granted 1/3 student unit of credit and the faculty member 5/6 of a faculty workload unit (LHE).

Learning Center Instruction- - Any activity which requires of the successful (passing) student no more than one out-of-class hour per week per semester for each in-class hour; and requires of the

contractual faculty no minimum number of out-of-class hours per week per semester for each in-class hour; and for which such minimum student and faculty requirements are specified in the outline of record for the course. For each assigned learning center hour per week per semester, the student is granted 1/3 student unit of credit and the faculty member 1/2 of a faculty workload unit (LHE).

It is particularly important to observe that in this system the distinction between a “lecture” and “laboratory” course or hour is not one based on the types of activities that might typically take place within a classroom, but only on the amount of out-of-class work required of the student involved in that activity. *If a course is designed and taught such that at least half of the required student learning occurs during actual class hours, that course is a laboratory course or learning center course by definition. Conversely, if a course is designed and taught such that at least 2/3 of required student learning occurs outside of class hours, that course is a lecture course by definition.*

Such a method supposes that all course outlines and course syllabi will demonstrate and adhere to these standards, and that lecture classes will not be designed and taught as if they were laboratory classes (i.e., with a primary emphasis given to in-class activities) nor laboratory classes designed and taught as if they were lecture classes (i.e., requiring a greater amount of out-of-class than in-class work on the part of students). It also supposes that the average student will not be able to pass a lecture class absent the minimum out-of-class work established by the Carnegie standard. If the college were to adopt this system of assigning and crediting student units, it is therefore likely that the faculty would need to review the existing outlines of record, course syllabi, and classroom practices to assure that the courses accurately define the extent of student workload actually required of the average student earning a passing grade.

### Evaluation of Benefits

There are substantial benefits to adopting the Carnegie unit standards for all curriculum in the college. Because this system is based on a measure of student workload that considers all aspects of the student’s work (not simply time spent in contact with an instructor), the unit value of any possible course can be used to express the general consent of the faculty regarding the average amount of time any student would need to plan for any course. In turn, this provides the faculty clear guidance regarding the design of outlines of record and course syllabi, and the Academic Senate and Committee on Courses with a clear set of standards by which to evaluate a wide variety of course proposals.

The system helpfully distinguishes between any particular classroom activities designed and conducted by the instructor and the actual body of work assumed by the student; in so doing, it enables the college to express a common workload value for all class enrollments. Thus any student paying tuition for 15 semester units will be subscribing to an identical minimum weekly workload, irrespective of his or her choice of classes. Thus the tuition fee will not be applied in a discriminatory fashion, emerging as a result of any arbitrary assignation of units to any particular course or set of courses.

Finally, the system offers the possibility of baseline grading standards for the institution, since it defines a minimum workload that would be required of the average student earning a passing grade (“C”) in any class. Faculty who ask and expect students to complete a minimum amount of work external to class will be provided with a college policy explicitly validating that expectation. Similarly, new faculty to the college will be provided with a set of common standards against which to develop course syllabi and define appropriate student workloads for their classes.

### Variations and Exemptions

Should the college adopt the Carnegie Unit System, exceptions from the standard would necessarily specify a condition in which the faculty maintained either that the average and successful student must commit to less or more work than that amount predicated via the Carnegie standard. In the former case, students are then credited with more than 1 unit for each three hours of work per week. In the latter case, the faculty would determine that the average student could not pass a class unless the workload measures as they are expressed in the Carnegie system are exceeded. Thus in the former case, the faculty acknowledges that a full-time student (15 units) may face a minimum weekly workload of less than 45 hours. In the latter case, the faculty determines that an average full-time student (15 units) cannot succeed unless he or she exceeds the norm of 45 hours per week as defined in the Carnegie system.

Although the current curriculum does include some classes in which students are awarded units of credit in excess of the values which would be assigned by the Carnegie standards, no arguments have been advanced in support of these variations. In contrast, four different arguments have been advanced as grounds upon which a particular course or set of courses should be assigned a lesser number of units than projected by the Carnegie standards. These arguments are as follows:

1. In certain instructional programs, students must complete extensive work in the major. Given standards for general education requirements and degree based on the accumulation of 60 or 120 units, an insufficient number of units remain for the major. Thus unit values for courses in the major must be deflated and students not fully credited for the work they must actually complete. These courses should therefore be granted exemption from the Carnegie standards.
2. Transfer courses are articulated, and the values that would be set by the Carnegie System might not match with the values the transfer institution would accept. This would be misleading and unfair to students.
3. In certain programs, the Carnegie System would set course unit values in a manner that would make the course too expensive for students, who pay tuition according to units of credit.
4. In certain instructional programs of a preparatory, developmental, pre-collegiate, or non-degree granting variety, units of credit may be meaningless, since the course work frequently cannot be applied for degree purposes, or, if so, only under secondary limitations and restrictions. In certain instances, students must complete a number of these courses, and the consequent accumulation of units would be meaningless. Students in these courses undertake the minimum workloads defined in the Carnegie standards but should not be granted the full value of units as set by that system.

Title V 2010 Summary

**Focus: Improving Graduation and Completion Rates**

*Overcoming skill deficiencies, earning degrees and certificates, and achieving transfer readiness*

Award:

Year 1: \$637,207  
 Year 2: \$650,000  
 Year 3: \$650,000  
 Year 4: \$650,000  
 Year 5: \$650,000

Total amount of award: \$3,237,207

Project Director: To be hired (100% FTE)

**COMPONENT I: GET READY**

**STRENGTHENING STUDENT, FACULTY, INSTITUTIONAL, AND COMMUNITY READINESS FOR THE RACE TO THE ASSOCIATE DEGREE**

Component One Lead: Claudia Lee (to be replaced)

<b><u>Strategy #1:</u></b> <b>Improve assessment testing and placement processes.</b>	<b><u>Strategy #2:</u></b> <b>Provide students with tools for educational and financial planning and staying on track.</b>
<b><u>Impacts:</u></b> (1) Accuracy of placement testing; (2) Students’ ability to manage their educational and financial planning; (3) Efficiency of assistance for students experiencing difficulties	

**COMPONENT II: GET SET:**

**STRENGTHENING STUDENT LEARNING AND FACULTY TEACHING IN PRE-COLLEGIATE READING, WRITING, MATHEMATICS AND GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES**

Component Two Leads: Barbara Jaffe and Arturo Martinez

<b><u>Strategy #1</u></b> <b>Improve student success in the key English and mathematics courses via Faculty Learning Teams/Cohorts and specialized “success” services</b>	<b><u>Strategy #2:</u></b> <b>Build institutional expertise in developmental teaching and learning and in effectively supporting academic progress of Latino students</b>
<b><u>Impacts:</u></b> (1) Consistency of teaching and grading in multiple sections of the same courses; (2) Quality of teaching and learning, particularly in the perennial “problem areas”; (3) Student outcomes in English and math courses; and (4) Faculty expertise + ability to meet student needs.	

**COMPONENT III: GO FOR THE ASSOCIATE’S DEGREE  
GETTING STUDENTS ACROSS THE FINISH LINE**

Component Three Lead: Margaret Quinones-Perez

<b><u>Strategy #1</u></b>	<b><u>Strategy # 2:</u></b>
Outreach to and assistance for students who are close to completion.	<b>Raise student, faculty, staff and community awareness of degree benefits --“Get a Degree” campaign.</b>
<b><u>Impacts:</u></b>	Alignment of institutional resources to support degree attainment Re-engagement of students who completed 45 or more units Student, faculty/staff and community perception about value of associate’s degree