

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES
4th May 2010 @ Distance Education Center

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

Adjunct Faculty

Mangan, Michael(Hum) X

Behavioral & Social Sciences

Firestone, Randy X

Gold, Christina X

Moen, Michelle X

Widman, Lance X

Wynne, Michael X

Business

Siddiqui, Junaid X

Lau, Philip S X

Counseling

Jackson, Brenda X

Jeffries, Chris X

Key, Ken

Pajo, Cristina EXC

Fine Arts

Ahmadpour, Ali X

Bloomberg, Randall X

Crossman, Mark

Schultz, Patrick

Wells, Chris X

Health Sciences & Athletics

Hazell, Tom

McGinley, Pat X

Rosales, Kathleen

Humanities

Isaacs, Brent X

Marcoux, Pete X

McLaughlin, Kate X

Peppard, Bruce X

Simon, Jenny X

Industry & Technology

Gebert, Pat X

Hofmann, Ed X

MacPherson, Lee

Marston, Doug X

Learning Resources Unit

Striepe, Claudia X

Ichinaga, Moon X

Mathematical Sciences

Boerger, John X

Fry, Greg X

Glucksman, Marc

Taylor, Susan X

Yun, Paul X

Natural Sciences

Cowell, Chas

Herzig, Chuck X

Jimenez, Miguel

Palos Teresa X

Vakil, David EXC

Academic Affairs

Chapman, Quajuana

ECC CEC Members

Evans, Jerome X

Norton, Tom

Panski, Saul X

Pratt, Estina X

Smith, Darwin

Assoc. Students Org.

Casper, Joshua

Safazada, Ana

Stokes, Philip

Begona Guereca

Ex- Officio Positions

Arce, Francisco X

Nishime, Jeanie X

Shadish, Elizabeth

Kjeseth, Lars X

Guests and/Other Officers: Barbara Jaffe, Caroline Pineda, Barbara Perez, Bill Keg.

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

The fifth Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2010 semester was called to order at 12:35pm in the Distance Education Center and the Compton Board Room – via live feed connection for a teleconference session.

Academic Senate President David Vakil was not able to attend, and the meeting was chaired by Pete Marcoux.

Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes of the Special Meeting of April 1st [pp. 7 -11 of packet] and the minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of April 6th [pp. 12 – 17 of packet] and April 20th [pp. 18- 23 of packet] were discussed. A move to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Widman and the motion passed.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

President's report – Dave Vakil (henceforth DV)

[See pp. 5-6, and pp.35-38 of packet]

Pete Marcoux (henceforth PM) noted that a **Senate Survey** is coming soon. The survey will include a question about Friday meetings, among many others. Thanks to Claudia and Chris Gold for working on this.

On the issue of **Priority registration**, the policy and procedure have been included in the packet on pp. 75-85 for your examination, per request. DV noted that currently faculty are not included on the “Priority Registration Committee”, and wondered if this might pose a potential problem. Bill Mulrooney offered to come next time if there were any questions to address.

A written explanation is to be provided soon re: the **Hiring process deviation**.

PM said that he would be at the afternoon's meeting on **Faculty computers** to discuss needs & allocation and would bring a report to the next meeting. According to College Council reports Compton faculty will also be getting computers.

With reference to the recent **Senate meeting @ Compton** – should we have the meeting after Spring break at Compton every year? Possible justifications in favor of this would be that there is little senate business to conduct, and lots to report from Plenary from the two Plenary representatives (ECC & CEC)

PM talked about the need to elect the President-Elect of the Academic Senate, and reminded the senators that the Term will be 1-year as President-elect in 2010-2011, to serve side-by-side with him. After which the incumbent would become the next Academic Senate President, to serve a two-year term in 2011-2012, 2012-2013. Pete Marcoux volunteered to chair the election committee. Mr. Marcoux noted that he would be calling for nominations under “New Business” later in the meeting.

VP – Compton Center - Saul Panski (SP)

No report.

Curriculum Committee – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

LK said he would be presenting some CurricUNET Program Review slides later in the meeting.

VP - Educational Policies – Chris Jeffries (CJ)

No report. CJ noted that the Committee minutes were in the packet [see p 24 of packet] and said she would be speaking on BP 4100 later under “New Business”.

VP - Faculty Development – Chris Gold (CG)

[See pp. 25-28 of packet for 3 sets of (abridged) minutes]

CG noted that she did not include the draft of PT faculty award in this packet.

CG said that the list of **Committee members** is growing, but they still need a rep from Industry and Technology.

A **mission statement** has been created for the Committee following recent past discussion on the Committee goals.

The recent **“Getting a Job” workshop was videotaped** and is available on the ECC website.

The **Faculty Handbook** is still in progress. It will be online, and it is hoped to finish this project over the Summer. CG hopes to co-ordinate with Staff Development to have some themed workshops on the topic on Flex Day.

The **Mentorship program** will continue, as will the successful **faculty book club**.

The **“You Want It...” series** will be featuring reworking final exams.

The Committee hopes to get the **Outstanding Adjunct Faculty award** to Senate soon.

Dr. Arce noted that CG had made an SLO video. It is on the SLO website. Dr. Arce congratulated CG on her good job.

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

[See pp. 39-41 of packet] for the March 18 PBC Minutes:

- Proposed budget assumptions for the Tentative Budget, the starting point for developing the 2010-11 budget. See also pp. 44-46.
- Planning Summit discussions

[See pp. 42-43 of packet] for the April 1 PBC Minutes:

- Planning Summit debrief

LW noted that it is anticipated that the May Revise will be released by the Governor within the next two weeks. Ms. Taylor queried the blanks [see pg71 of packet] in the Tentative Budget Assumptions section. LW said that everything is so tentative at the moment that it was decided to wait for the revise.

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

[See pp. 47-48 of packet] MI noted that there had been discussion on the topic of off- campus field trips. It seems some problems have surfaced related to sexual assaults and alcohol. Mr. Tyler is investigating these allegations. It appears there is some confusion relating to the procedures and rules covering off-campus field trips.

VP – Legislative Action – Chris Wells (CW)

No report.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

VP – Technology Committee – Pete Marcoux (PM)

[See pp.29-30 of packet] PM noted that the committee has been discussing software, but are hampered by the budget. Dr. Arce noted that the proposals in place are base on the submitted plans. The Library/LRU is the biggest requestor of software. A proposal has been made to devote a “chunk” of money for regular software updates, but costs are still being investigated. PM said that items like Adobe usage is hard to track.

Dr. Arce noted that we had lost the block grant which had been a major source of funding. Faculty will be getting their laptops. As yet there are no updates on Compton Computers, but an announcement will be forthcoming.

SLO Committee – Jenny Simon (JS)

[See pp.65-69 of packet] JS noted that the list of upcoming deadlines for SLOs which had been sent out via email a few weeks ago, will be updated and resent. There are two tables to note. One contains one-time dates, and the other contains ongoing due dates. The college is currently at 94% compliance of

courses having SLOs, and JS is chasing down the remaining few. Faculty should now be working on course assessment. The Deans and facilitators are helping with this. After that the assessments will be tied to course and program Review cycles, and the committee is awaiting the Program Review cycle dates. At the end of the year JS will need a complete set of SLOs for course and programs. By a “complete set” JS explained that there were two things to bear in mind. Firstly the core competency map and ratings- all 4 and (to a lesser extent) 3 rankings need SLOs. One can have one SLO that speaks to many competencies, it does not have to be a one-to-one correlation. Secondly is it complete according to your field and expertise. Dr. Arce wondered, looking at the table of maps, whether people would have done things differently if they had the opportunity to do it again. He thought some did not make complete sense. JS said that this was the college’s first attempt and that we would live with it until we have the results of the first complete assessment and then we could fine-tune it next year. JS intends to list all the courses and maps in a color-coded format online.

JS noted that the updated core- competency assessment plan could be found on pg.65 of the packet. First up is core competency #3- Communication and Comprehension. It has been slightly changed to read “written, spoken or signed...”

The Assessment of Learning Committee has developed a student survey, which will be very short. Faculty teaching those courses will volunteer to give the survey in class and faculty will then follow up with another online rating of their students. This semester JS is working with Institution Research to finish the survey and run some pilots. The survey will be pen& paper. The risk of “survey burnout” was noted. Mr. Wells asked whether the classes have been selected? JS said they would be selected this week, noting that “we are building the ship as we steer it.”

Dr. Jaffe noted that students from UCLA’s Dept. of Education were conducting research and running a survey here and at the CEC and would share their findings.

Dr. Arce thanked JS and the Committee for doing so much work in a short time, and noted that we have moved ahead of some other schools. JS said that we have tried to build a sustainable process. Dr. Jaffe thanked the facilitators for their efforts.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Copyright Policy BP 3750 and Administrative Procedure AP 3750 – A. Grigsby (AG)

[See Introductory memo: pp. 56-57, Board Policy 3750: pg. 58, Administrative Procedure 3750: pp. 59-64 of packet]

AG and Heather Parnock attended to present the policy. AG thanked the Senate for the comments and suggestions received and noted that the Committee had made some changes. AG noted that copyright is the law; it is ethical and protects bodies of work. AG hoped the senators would support the policy.

AG noted that the Committee had added “including but not limited to” to the policy statement, and had made some minor changes in language based on senate recommendations last meeting, on pg. 62 of the Procedures.

Mr. Wells made a motion to adopt the policy, seconded by Mr. Isaacs. Questions and comments were invited. Ms. Taylor had a question regarding who would make the judgment as to whether something meets the copyright conditions. The staff at the copy center would do so. PM noted that this issue was addressed on pg 62 of the packet, and noted that the patrons would be referred to their Deans/Directors and the service request would not be fulfilled until the issue was resolved. Ms. Pratt asked whether this applied to Compton as well, and Dr. Arce answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Wells asked if one course has 20 sections, could one make copies for all 20 sections? The answer was yes.

PM asked whether this policy applied to the students and AG noted that this policy was more for the employees of the college. Dr. Arce noted that schools have been sued by publishers for copyright violations. AG noted that copied items could not be sold in the campus bookstore. What is copied off-campus is not under our control, but ethics should be a consideration for the employee considering this issue. Ms. Parnock said the policy was intended to cover services offered by ECC, like copy services and Reserves. The vote cast, and all were in favor of passing BP 3750 and associated procedures.

NEW BUSINESS

BP 4100 AP 4100 Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates. Chris Jeffries (CJ)

[See pp. 63-64 of packet] This constitutes the first reading of the Policy and Procedure. CJ noted that the college had never had a policy on granting degrees and certificates before. The Ed. Policies Committee had consulted with all the groups on campus and CJ thanked Dr. Arce for helping to organize the meetings. This policy is from a template. We grant two Associate degrees – the Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degrees. Students must maintain a 2.0 gpa. Student must complete 18 units to earn a Certificate of Achievement.

CJ went on to discuss the Procedures. Formerly, if a student took a course at another community college and we did not offer it at ECC we could not use it to fulfill requirements, and the student had to take another course to make up the requirements. This does not benefit the student, and we have a population that moves about a lot. The Committee has altered this – see Procedure 1a. This will help the students. If the classes are taken outside of the California Community College system, or if there are other questions, then Procedure 1ai, and 1aii should cover the queries. CJ said that the Committee will develop a form to deal with these issues with the assistance of Admissions and Records. CJ noted we will also honor catalog rights if the student started prior to Fall 2009.

CJ invited feedback from senate. Once question concerned the meaning of ‘study in residence’ and CJ said that meant 12 units at ECC. Mr. Wells asked about testing. CJ said that there were all sorts of assessments to test competency, mentioning AP exams, and testing out as examples.

Mr. Firestone was of the opinion that the word California should be added in front of “originating institution” in 1a. PM suggested CJ take this suggestion back to the Committee. PM asked about international school units. CJ said it could be added in somewhere, noting that foreign transcripts are usually evaluated by a service. Military course must be on a college transcript, not a military transcript. Regarding Item 3 – filing with the Chancellor’s Office, CJ said she had never had to do that before, and might require some assistance. The Senate wondered why the State Chancellor’s Office had not challenged ECC on this matter before. Dr. Arce thought maybe they accepted our broad policies. CJ noted the addition of #6. whereby additional certificates/courses would be added to the student’s transcript and not just be noted by a follow-up letter.

CJ said that it had been a battle to construct the policy and procedure, but she was proud of the work and felt it was a victory for students. The College could award more degrees this way, and it works with the ideals of reciprocity.

This was the first reading. Please email CJ with other comments. CJ noted that the Committee will meet again on the 25th.

Nominations for Academic Senate President.

At this point PM called for nominations for the position of Academic Senate President. Ms. Striepe nominated Dr. Chris Gold. PM asked Dr. Gold if she was willing to stand and Dr. Gold replied in the affirmative. Hearing no other names, PM asked for other nominations to be sent to him by email.

Annual Program Review Update – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

[See pp. 70-74 of packet] showing a mock-up of how the CurricUNET Annual Program Review might look.

LK said there were 2 tasks:

1. **Amending Current Program Review** – only if and where necessary
2. **Managing Recommendations** which could take 3 forms:
 - Annual Recommendation Progress Reports
 - Recommendation Modifications
 - New Recommendations

LK gave an example of a sample **Amendment**:

III. Curriculum – Courses, Degrees, and Certificates:

CurricUNET will automatically bring up the

- current Curriculum Narrative and previous amendments
- curriculum proposals completed in the previous twelve months, including new courses, degrees and certificates; course reviews; and updates of degrees and certificates

1. After reviewing the curriculum activity over that last year, is an amendment needed for the Curriculum section?

YES NO

[If YES is chosen, a textbox will appear with the following instructions: Provide a brief summary of the changes in curriculum. This summary will be an amendment to your Curriculum section.]

[Also, if YES is chosen on question 1 this second question below will appear.]

2. Based on the amendment to the Curriculum section, will any new recommendations need to be created?

YES NO

[If YES is chosen, then you will be reminded to create a new recommendation on the Recommendation Management Page.]

LK then gave an example of **Recommendation Management** Tasks:

On the Recommendation Management Page, CurricUNET will list each existing recommendation. There are three tasks on this page:

1. **Recommendation Progress Reports:** For each recommendation, a progress report is required.
2. **New Recommendations:** Based on amendments, any NEW recommendations will be created.
3. **Reprioritization of Recommendations:** New set of recommendations will be reprioritized and submitted.

LK then called for questions and comments. Mr. Ahmadapour asked if it was OK if there were no recommendations? Yes, then one would just give a progress report on existing recommendations.

Mr. Wells asked if we could make new recommendations as they arise. LK said he had not thought about that issue. PM asked if this would be done every June, or when else? LK had not thought that far, but Dr. Jaffe felt it should be done constantly.

LK asked for suggestions and concerns to be sent to him and he would supply a further mock-up at the June 2nd meeting. There is no time crunch other than deciding on whether to move to a 4 year cycle. At the 4year point the idea would be to put the annual reports together and tweak them. Dr. Simon asked if we could bring in new data for the 4 year report that had not appeared on the annual reports and Dr. Jaffe said yes.

Mr. Panski asked if this was related to Curriculum Review, and LK said that this concerned Program Review. Mr. Panski and Mr. Wells asked how this was different from Plan Builder and Dr. Jaffe said it was hoped to drop Plan Builder eventually and keep just the annual review. Mr. Panski asked if we would have to do both for now, and the answer is yes. PM noted that we still had to vote on the issue. Dr. Jaffe said that the intent is to streamline the process.

Strategic Initiatives – Dr. Jeanie Nishime (JN)

[Seepg. 75 of packet] Dr. Nishime had initially thought to put this out as a survey, but the PBC asked to adopt all 7 initiatives, as did the Dean’s Council. JN was now presenting this to the Academic Senate and asking for endorsement . The item will be added to the next meeting agenda.

Distance Education Guidelines and Best Practices – Alice Grigsby (AG) & Howard Story (HS).

[See pp. 49-55 of packet] Pg.49 contains the introductory memo, and pg. 50 the classroom visitation protocols. Pp.51-55 contain a draft of “best practices”

All DE faculty would be asked to complete a worksheet/technical review of their course to see if they had all the appropriate technologies, etc. This would then be filed with the Dean and in the DE office.

Senate feedback sought and/or first reading. Mr. Panski asked how DE faculty would know if they were ADA compliant? AG said that certain DE staff had gone through training and could work with faculty. The Special Resource Center would also collaborate to make it work. Mr. Panski asked if DE faculty should do this now or wait until a disabled student took the class. SG said it should be done at once. PM noted that if the shell is ETUDES, DE faculty would be ADA compliant. HS noted there is also a State grant with funds for compliance.

This is not a voting item, and the presentation was purely informational.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Basic Skills counseling presentation
- ARCC report results for ECC/Compton
 - Accountability Report for Community Colleges
- Survey results from deans regarding thoughts on department chairs
- Evaluating the Academic Senate
- Program Discontinuance/Support
- Disciplines List revisions

PUBLIC COMMENT.

Strategic Initiative G: Ms. Ichinaga asked Dr. Nishime if the Facilities and Master plan would incorporate environmental sensitivity? Dr. Nishime said that the architects are using sustainable materials. Ms. Ichinaga said she had in mind campus recycling. Dr. Nishime said that individuals and departments could recycle. Ms. Ichinaga noted that such attempts on campus had repeatedly failed. PM noted that recycling was a very expensive proposition.

Mr. Ahmadapour mentioned the Cultural activities for International Day, occurring on the Library Lawn. Mr. Panski thanked all for coming to the CEC for the meeting.

The Academic Senate meeting was adjourned at 1:57pm
Cs/ecc2010