

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES  
SPECIAL MEETING 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010

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

Adjunct Faculty  
Mangan, Michael(Hum)

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

Business  
Siddiqui, Junaid EXC  
Lau, Philip S

Counseling  
Jackson, Brenda X  
Jeffries, Chris EXC  
Key, Ken  
Pajo, Christina X

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

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

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

Industry & Technology  
Gebert, Pat X  
Hofmann, Ed  
MacPherson, Lee X  
Marston, Doug X

Learning Resources Unit  
Striepe, Claudia X  
Ichinaga, Moon X

Mathematical Sciences  
Boerger, John  
Fry, Greg X  
Glucksman, Marc  
Taylor, Susan X  
Yun, Paul

Natural Sciences  
Cowell, Chas X  
Herzig, Chuck X  
Jimenez, Miguel  
Palos Teresa EXC  
Vakil, David

Academic Affairs  
Chapman, Quajuana

ECC CEC Members  
Evans, Jerome X  
Norton, Tom X  
Panski, Saul X  
Pratt, Estina X  
Smith, Darwin X

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

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

Guests and/Other Officers: Janet Young, Barbara Jaffe, Lars Kjeseth, Katie Roller (UCLA)

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

The first SPECIAL Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2010 semester was called to order at 1:05 pm in the Distance Education Classroom

Only one item was on the agenda, and that was discussion of a potential vote of no confidence in the leadership of the ACCJC, and to guide AS President Dave Vakil's (DV) thinking as he casts his vote as our representative at the upcoming (April 17<sup>th</sup>)ASCCC Plenary Session.

DV noted that there were 5 options: to support the resolution, to oppose the resolution, to abstain from voting on the resolution, to amend the resolution, or to propose a new resolution.

DV opened the floor for discussion.

Ms. Ichinaga asked about the Appendix XX mentioned in the Resolution. DV apologized, saying there is no appendix XX, but the XX was put in as a place- holder for an expected appendix, not available as yet.

DV pointed out that the original resolution from Area A appears on pg 7 of the packet, and the resolution as amended by Area C appears on pg 6 of packet. The amendments are minor, and the two might be combined and attributed as being initiated by the Area A member.

Ms. Ichinaga asked whether the ACCJC is indeed arbitrarily holding us to standards that other areas do not have to follow?

Mr. Firestone asked why the ACCJC was the accrediting body and why we did not change?

Mr. Panski said the intent was not to leave the ACCJC necessarily, but to criticize their leadership.

Mr. Firestone felt that for the ACCJC to change their ways they would need to have something to lose.

Mr. Panski noted that they get most of their monies from Community Colleges, and said that we want the agencies that work with and/or oversee the ACCJC to be aware of the situation so that they can bear a hand in getting them in line.

Mr. Wells agreed noting that CHAE and WASC were all aligned with the ACCJC in some respects and they are all accountable to each other as well, so the resolution decision should be sent to all to use as leverage.

Ms. Ichinaga said it was important that these points be substantiated, and again asked if the standards we are held to are arbitrary.

Mr. Kjeseth said he felt that the Standards, as written, are quite strong and good, but that the ACCJC were not treating them as Standards, but as a way of making Regulations. The aim should be to have Standards and then see how we as a college are meeting or exceeding the Standards, but the ACCJC seems to want to tell us what it means to meet the Standards , and in this is overstepping its' bounds.

Mr. D. Smith noted that it had been observed that the ACCJC were not abiding by their own bylaws and the issue took off from there.

Mr. Wells agreed, saying that the perception was that Standards had been applied differently in different places at different times.

Mr. Kjeseth used SLO's as an example, saying that the Standards say that outcomes can be many (measurable) things that a college promotes and meets, but the ACCJC has made regulations and rules to accompany the Standards stating that to meet the Standards you must do this and that...which is contrary to the original intent. So the Standards themselves are OK, it is the move to Regulations that is troubling.

Mr. Marston agreed, saying it was important to stand up and speak out. He felt the tone of some of the ACCJC replies to documentation were insulting in their tone.

Mr. Smith noted that this move is not a knee-jerk reaction, but a considered response to things that have been brewing since the tenure of the previous President of the Statewide Academic Senate.

Ms. Striepe asked about the recommendations [pg. 19 of packet] and whether these were linked to the resolution, and DV answered that these were not being considered today, only the Resolution, and that the recommendations would be considered at a later date.

Mr. Firestone repeated his opinion that the resolution should have “teeth”, and suggested adding another point stating that the colleges would seek to change leadership if the issues could not be resolved.

Mr. Panski noted that the colleges could bypass the ACCJC and go directly through WASC.

DV said he would like to get suggestions for amendments and suggested people send him these suggestions in writing with specific wording.

Ms. Taylor asked if we were going to be voting on the issue today, as if we were, she would prefer to hear all the suggestions now so that she could make a considered vote. If suggestions were emailed to DV she would not be able to consider them.

DV said that he was seeking guidance on how to respond. He would also be hearing more arguments at the Plenary Session that he would have to consider and might influence his final vote.

Ms. Taylor felt that changes and amendments needed to be aired here and now so that we could all be privy to them.

Mr. Wells said it would be good to talk over the merits of the resolution and possible amendments, but not get bogged down in wordsmithing the specifics because of time constraints.

DV agreed.

Ms. Striepe asked if any punitive measures were possible (for instance, against the Compton Center) if we voted one way or another. Ms. Pratt felt that the votes would be considered as a body, and that the votes of individual colleges would not be noted. “No names would be taken”

Mr. Panski said that he appreciated the sentiment, but agreed with Ms. Pratt that it would be seen as a total area/region vote.

Mr. Marston said he did not appreciate the tone, and that these problems had been brewing for a while, and not being taken seriously by the ACCJC.

Mr. Caspar asked what the Senate really expected to happen after we had sent the Resolution on to various people like Secretary Duncan and President Obama? What did we expect the outcome to be? The Student Senate is also considering a similar Resolution.

DV felt this was a good question. Mr. Panski said that this was a vote of No Confidence and what was wanted was a change of leadership. Mr. Wells said that if the ACCJC was engaged in robust discussion with its constituents, we might not need the whereases.

Ms. Ichinaga had a question about the composition of the Body listed on the letter to Mr. Scott. Who are these people? Are any of them educators, or representatives of institutions? Mr. Kjeseth said that one could find this information on their website. Some were faculty members, others community and business/industry representatives.

DV asked Dr. Arce to make some comments on how he felt the ACCJC might possibly respond.

Dr. Arce noted that he was an Accreditation officer of El Camino to the Commission, and is responsible for reports and responses to the Commission.

In his opinion the Commission HAS made some changes in response to outcries and concerns expressed from around the State. He felt that many schools had been slow in responding to recommendations to change (for instance) their planning and review processes. The colleges did not seem to take the recommendations seriously. Many were also slow to respond to the issue of SLOs. So we and many others have had a problem meeting the Standards. So some of the Commission actions were warranted. There had been shock in the Community College system re:

the sanctions, terminations and probations, as with Compton in 2006. But as colleges have started responding and improving, so the Commission has responded, and some colleges are now off warning and probation.

Dr. Arce pointed out that he is NOT a spokesperson or apologist for the Commission, although he personally would not support a vote of no confidence.

The Commission IS increasing training opportunities. ECC and Compton will be sending folks to workshops on how to respond to the Standards. To some laughter, Dr. Arce said the Commission felt like they WERE being responsive to concerns.

Dr. Arce noted that many of the members of the Commission are members of Community Colleges and they are not comfortable with the criticisms. He noted that we had been on probation, which forced us to improve and become better at what we do. Dr. Arce noted that the improvement has been dramatic in some areas.

Dr. Shadish said that the Commission may be changing as we comply with their demands...but are they changing in ways that we want, and that are meaningful for us?

Dr. Arce agreed that they could have approached things differently, like making recommendations and visits before warnings, etc.

Mr. Wells said that either the Commission is right and other Accrediting Commissions have got it wrong, or vice versa...but someone is out of step.

Dr. Arce said to remember that our system is the largest by far, with over 100 colleges. At any one time there may be 15- 30 colleges under full review and some 60 on warning. He urged being rational over being emotional.

Mr. Panski said he hoped this would be a wake- up call for the Commission.

DV said there were now 2 issues before the Senate.

1. To accept, in principle, the proposed amendment to the resolution as suggested by Mr. Firestone by adding “teeth” in the form of “exploring a change in leadership” – specific wording to be worked out later.
2. To vote on the Resolution of No Confidence.

The ECC/CEC Academic Senate voted in favor of adding the amendment to the resolution, and strongly supported a proposed resolution to the statewide Academic Senate asking the statewide Academic Senate to vote no confidence in the leadership of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC, ECC’s accrediting body).

The meeting was adjourned at 2:02pm  
Cs/ecc2010

### **2.03 S10 Vote of No Confidence in the Leadership of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) Shaaron Vogel, Butte College, Area A**

Whereas, The purpose of accreditation is to ensure quality in higher education through the use of a peer review process that focuses on self-study, a meeting of standards that represent best practices, and identification of areas of needed improvement;

Whereas, To effectively carry out the accreditation peer review process, which the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges highly supports, the leadership of the body that accredits must model openness, frank discussion, robust dialog, honesty in communications, and willingness to improve, and the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) leadership has consistently failed to model any of these;

Whereas, The leadership of ACCJC has exhibited no evidence that they hold themselves accountable to their own standards of improvement, was unresponsive to the recommendations from official statewide representative bodies, denied representatives from those bodies the opportunity to speak at a public meeting, and is unwilling to improve its own dysfunctional processes; and

Whereas, Collaborative and collegial communication to ACCJC leadership from CEOs, CIOs, CSSOs, and faculty indicating specific areas of concern received a answer from the ACCJC president that was not responsive to any of the suggestions that ACCJC should address for its own improvement, and which was at variance with the facts (See Appendix B);

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges vote no confidence in the leadership of ACCJC;

Resolved, that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with its Consultation Council partners to send this no-confidence vote to Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (CRAC), the U.S. Secretary of Education, and the President of the United States.

**2.04 S10 Accreditation Options  
Richard Akers, Contra Costa College, Area B**

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges greatly values and respects the essential components of peer review and external accreditation in the educational process;

Whereas, The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges' (ACCJC) approach to accreditation has been punitive and publicly divisive, causing additional and unnecessary expenses and re-appropriation of resources from the classroom; and

Whereas, Alternative accrediting bodies other than the ACCJC exist and are utilized by our transfer institutions;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges conduct research as to the options available for peer review and accreditation other than the ACCJC and make the results of this research available by Spring 2011