



OFFICERS & EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President	Christina Gold	VP Faculty Development	Briita Halonen
VP Compton Educ'l Center	Saul Panski	VP Finance and Special Projects	Lance Widman
Curriculum Chair	Lars Kjeseth	VP Legislative Action	Chris Wells
VP Educational Policies	Chris Jeffries	Secretary	Claudia Striepe

Senate Mailing List

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

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")

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 (1st and 3rd Tuesdays, usually)

<u>FALL 2010</u>		<u>SPRING 2011</u>	
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	Alondra 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)

<u>FALL 2010</u>		<u>SPRING 2011</u>	
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
A. CALL TO ORDER		
B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES		5-9
C. REPORTS OF OFFICERS	A. President B. VP – Compton Center C. Chair – Curriculum D. VP – Educational Policies E. VP – Faculty Development F. VP – Finance G. VP – Legislative Action	10-11,18-21 22-23 12-17
D. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES	A. Assessment of Learning Comm. B. Report on Council of Deans	24-34 35-36
E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (1:00pm)	A. Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Award (second reading)	37-40
F. NEW BUSINESS		
Information Items	A. Attendance Accounting – Bill Mulrooney B. Discussion: “Student Success” C. Discussion: Faculty Morale D. Discussion: Winter Session/Academic Calendar	
G. AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS		
H. PUBLIC COMMENT		
I. ADJOURN		



Committees

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

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES
7 September 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>Exc.</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>X</u>
<u>McGinley, Pat</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Rosales, Kathleen</u>	
<u>Colunga, Mina</u>	<u>Exc.</u>
<u>Hicks, Tom</u>	

Humanities

<u>Isaacs, Brent</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Marcoux, Pete</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>McLaughlin, Kate</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Peppard, Bruce</u>	
<u>Simon, Jenny</u>	<u>X</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>	

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>X</u>
<u>Fry, Greg</u>	<u>X</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>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>X</u>
<u>Pratt, Estina</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Halligan, Chris</u>	

Assoc. Students Org.

<u>Casper, Joshua</u>	
<u>Safazada, Ana</u>	
<u>Stokes, Philip</u>	
<u>Begonia Guereca</u>	

Ex- Officio Positions

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

Guests, Dean's Rep, Visitors:

Jacqui Thompson, Dave Vakil, Carolyn Pineda, Irene Graff

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

The first Academic Senate meeting of the Fall 2010 semester was called to order at 12:34pm. Academic Senate President Gold welcomed all to the Fall Academic Senate session.

Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes [pp.5 -11 of packet] from the June 1st Academic Senate meeting were reviewed. Ms Palos wanted the statement "Ms. Palos suggested a 20% residency and CJ noted that 12 units was from Title V" amended to "Ms. Palos felt that a mere 20% residency did not seem right for a degree from a college or institution".

The minutes were approved as amended following a motion from Mr. Marcoux, seconded by Mr. Widman.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

President's report – Christina Gold (henceforth CG)

CG noted that Ms. Graff and Ms. Pineda would be talking about the Winter Intersession and Campus Climate surveys after her report as they had other commitments.

CG reported that she had taken over from Mr. Vakil as Academic Senate president and year earlier than expected as Mr. Vakil had accepted a position at the Compton Education Center. CG congratulated Mr. Vakil.

CG said she teaches History at ECC and one of her aims is to archive the physical documents belonging to the Academic Senate and to create a space on the portal to archive electronic documents.

CG said that she had included the Academic Senate Constitution in the packet [see pp.30 35] and the Constitution is also on the ECC web site at

<http://www.elcamino.edu/academics/academicsenate/docs/ECCAS/2004FINALProposedConstitutionAcadSen.pdf> CG had noted that there are a few amendments to the constitution that still need to be approved by the faculty at large.

CG spoke of the need to elect two adjunct faculty to the Senate and will get that process started soon.

CG asked all members of the Academic Senate to briefly introduce themselves, stating their name, Division, and length of Senate service.

The President gave the floor to Ms. Graff and Ms. Pineda for an Information Item on two survey reports. Ms. Graff thanked everyone for their survey contributions. The survey results will help inform decisions made on both the ECC and CEC campuses.

Winter Intersession Survey – Irene Graff (IG)

IG gave a powerpoint presentation on the survey findings. Some highlights included:

The survey polled both faculty/staff and students at both the ECC and Compton campuses.

In answer to the question- Should we change the Winter Session? – faculty at the Torrance campus voted 47% to keep the session and 46% to eliminate the session; faculty at the Compton campus voted 66% to keep and 33% to eliminate. In answer to the same question the student responses were combined and students voted 56% to keep the session and 41% to eliminate.

As far as enrollment is concerned 79% of ECC students enrolled for the session, and 80% of Compton students enrolled, and the main reason for enrollment was to make faster progress in their academic careers.

The full presentation of results can be found on the Institution Research web page at http://www.elcamino.edu/administration/ir/docs/surveys/WinterIntersessionSurvey_2010.pdf and the survey can be accessed from the Institutional Research page at <http://www.elcamino.edu/administration/ir/surveys.asp>

Mr. Marcoux asked whether there is any information on success and retention rates for Summer and Winter sessions. IG said yes, and that Winter sessions typically had a high success rate.

Employee Campus Climate Survey – Irene Graff (IG) and Carolyn Pineda (CP)

IG noted a 39% response rate at both campuses, which she rated as good. The full presentation of results can be found at

http://www.elcamino.edu/administration/ir/docs/survey/Employee_CampusClimateSurvey_2010_2.pdf

The results for the ECC and Compton surveys can be access from the Institutional Research page at

<http://www.elcamino.edu/administration/ir/surveys.asp>

The survey looked at five sections of interest: the College Mission, the Campus Climate, Communication, Student Services, and Relations between the campuses.

Some highlights included:

Morale has dropped on both campuses since the 2006 survey.

Relations between the two campuses are good overall, though there is a feeling at the Compton campus that they are not “treated like equals”

Torrance employees felt that the best aspects of their campus are the quality of faculty and staff, the students and faculty commitment to students, the beautiful campus, and the work environment and collegiality.

Compton employees felt that the best aspects of their campus are the community feel and collegiality, the quality staff and faculty, the commitment to students and the students themselves.

Suggestions for change at both campuses were also highlighted.

CP talked about the general comments employees made at the end of the surveys. Some common themes that came up on the Torrance campus were staff/faculty recognition, morale, professional development and training opportunities. At the Compton campus the common themes were morale, the campus infrastructure, and the partnership.

More focus groups were held on the past Flex day, and more groups will be convened. The results from these group findings will also be made available.

Recognition of Faculty – Christina Gold (CG)

CG handed out certificates recognizing the hard work and milestones in the careers of faculty recently made professors or instructors.

- ▶ Ashod Minasian, Instructor Peggy Kidwell-Udin, Instructor
- ▶ Albert Britton, Professor Deborah Conover, Professor
- ▶ Susan Corbin, Professor Dana Crotwell, Professor
- ▶ Eyal Goldmann, Professor Charles Herzig, Professor
- ▶ Deborah Herzig, Professor Harold Hofmann, Professor
- ▶ Lyman Hong, Professor Cynthia Mosqueda, Professor
- ▶ Teresa Palos, Professor Bruce Peppard, Professor
- ▶ John Ruggirello, Professor Jenny Simon, Professor
- ▶ Jacquelyn Thompson, Professor Lijun Wang, Professor

CG also recognized the service and accomplishments of past Academic Senate President 2009 – 2010, Dave Vakil.

CG briefly introduced the members of the Senate Executive Committee
Saul Panski, VP Compton Educational Center, Chris Jeffries, VP Educational Policies,
Lars Kjeseth, Curriculum Chair, Briita Halonen, Co-VP Faculty Development,

Lance Widman, VP Finance and Special Projects, Chris Wells, VP Legislative Action, and Claudia Striepe, Secretary

VP Compton Center - Saul Panski (SP)

SP noted that Ms. Graff will be making the same Surveys presentation at the Compton campus on the 23rd September. He also said that Compton is very glad to have Mr. Vakil join the campus.

VP Educational policies – Chris Jeffries (CJ)

CJ made a plea for more faculty, especially new senate members, to join the Ed Policies Committee. CJ noted that the Ed. Policies committee aims to help students, and requested that a sign-up sheet be passed around at the senate meeting. The Committee meets on the second and fourth Tuesdays in Room 106 from 1:30 or 2:00pm.

VP Faculty Development – Briita Halonen (Co-VP)

CG announced that Ms. Halonen would be a co- VP of this Committee. The committee would continue to work on the Faculty Handbook, and the Adjunct Faculty Award, amongst other projects.

VP Finance and Special Projects – Lance Widman (LW)

LW reported that the PBC completes its review of the Tentative Budget and makes its recommendation to the President for Board consideration in June. The PBC then meets throughout the summer, with meetings scheduled every Thursday in August, to review the Final Budget and makes its recommendation to the President for Board consideration in September - the Board meets tonight. The minutes included in the packet illustrate the PBC's typical activities over the past two months:

pp. 17-18, 7/1 Minutes: Area planning priorities for Academic Affairs and Human Resources. The planning priorities for the other Area plans were also reviewed by PBC, with particular emphasis given to the processes through which these priorities were established, as well as the recommended priorities themselves. The process starts at the program (department) level, Division review, and finally the Area priorities are determined. Program review plays an absolutely key role in this process. These are then reviewed by the PBC for inclusion in the Final Budget.

pp. 19-21, 8/19 Minutes: This is one of the most important meetings of the year, where Pres. Fallo meets with the PBC to review in a very informal session the assumptions for the Final Budget. There is a great deal of discussion among campus constituent groups, VPs and the President. Please read these Minutes carefully because this becomes the basis for the game plan (Final Budget) for 2010-11.

LW reported that ECC had \$22.7 million in reserves which would likely drop to \$16.5 by the end of this fiscal year, and noted that ECC was in good financial standing.

Senators wanting a copy of the budget can contact Janice Ely or Arvid Spor. LW also asked senators to join the PBC if they want to have a say in where the money goes – and to see him re: joining the committee.

VP Legal – Chris Wells (CW)

CW reported on a number of Senate Bills, which, if signed, could have ramifications for community colleges; namely SB 1440, SB 1143, SB 1425 which includes language to prevent salary spiking to preserve equitable pension payouts, and a mandatory 180 day break for retirees before returning to the workforce, and SB1460. More information on these Bills will be forthcoming.

CW announced the CSUs have extended their open admission date to September 27th, all contingent upon the budget.

Curriculum Committee – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

LK had no report, but announced that he would be giving an overview of the CurricUNET system in New Business.

NEW BUSINESS

CurricUNET Overview – Lars Kjeseth (LK) – Information Item

LK introduced himself as Chair of the Curriculum Committee, a standing Committee of the Academic Senate, noting that one has to be nominated by one's Division to join the Curriculum Committee.

LK reported that ECC is up-to-date re: course review, and that ECC is officially ready to go live with the curriculum portion of CurricUNET. This will be an education for all involved this Fall. LK distributed a handout to give an idea of what is expected over the next few months.

Beginning this semester the committee will work within CurricUNET to create, review and approve all new course proposals. The primary contact for CurricUNET matters is LK, Ms. Chapman (as Curriculum Advisor, Dr. Simon, Ms. Less and Mr. Vakil.

Mr. Panski asked if this was all online? LK said yes, and all course outlines had been loaded onto the system as well. And one need just go through the CurricUNET website accessed via the ECC Portal. Dr. Simon said that the SLO statements are there too.

Mr. Ahmadapour wanted clarification on the process for joining the Curriculum committee. LK said he should refer to the Curriculum bylaws which state that the representatives should be solicited and elected in the Divisions. If no-one steps forward, the Division Dean may nominate someone, but the election process must still be carried out. CG referenced pg. 39 of the Academic Senate Constitution.

Ms. Taylor asked about the older CurricuWARE system. LK said the committee would leave that link up for a while yet, and that the course outlines could be found there, but they lacked the SLOs, and for Program Review faculty are advised to use the CurricUNET system instead. Ms. Taylor asked if CurricuWARE would eventually be taken down, and LK replied in the affirmative.

LK urged the senators to read the section on Program Review [see pp. 22-29 of packet] containing highlights from the final draft of the ECC Follow-up Report to the ACCJC due Oct 2010, which emphasizes the importance of Program Review.

Program Review Highlight – Communication Studies – Chris Wells (CW) – Information Item

CW distributed a handout on the Communication Studies Program. CW detailed the history of the program, the role and assistance of such entities as Institutional Research and the National Communication Association, and shared some interesting facts about the program.

CJ advised telling students to get their communications course out of the way early, as this could be an advantage when applying for CSU admission. Ms. McGinley asked if there was now a permanent Dean in the Fine Arts Division and CW said yes.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

CG asked that items be sent to her in advance via email.

PUBLIC COMMENT.

None.

The Academic Senate meeting was adjourned at 2:00pm with the information that the next meeting would be on September 21st in the Distance Education Room and that CG was still negotiating with Mr. Story re: a link to Compton.

Cs/ecc2010

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Office of the President
Minutes of the College Council Meeting September 7, 2010

Present: Francisco Arce, Thomas Fallo, Ann Garten, Irene Graff, Jo Ann Higdon, Jessica Lopez, Jeanie Nishime, Susan Pickens, Gary Robertson, Lynn Solomita, Luukia Smith, and Jose Villalobos.

1. Board Agenda

- a. Page 135 number 4 – this item is being withdrawn.
- b. Page 143 item E – this item is being withdrawn.
- c. Page 148 number 2 – the wrong gender is cited. The first instance of “her” will be changed to “him” and the second “her” will be changed to “his.” These changes will be made during the Board meeting.
- d. We have a public hearing and adoption for the 2010-2011 budget. The biggest issue is that the State has not approved a budget. This affects our cash flow.
- e. We will have a presentation from the baseball team.
- f. The Accreditation follow-up report is in this agenda.
- g. Page 151 number 5 – a numerical version of this item will be brought back to College Council for clarification.
- h. Page 128 number 9 – The Business Training Center is providing training through a Workplace Learning Resource Center contract. They contract with us for training which is free through our TPT grant. The Trainer goes to the business.

Agenda for the September 13, 2010 Meeting:

1. Minutes of August 30, 2010 and September 7, 2010
2. Student Parking Report
3. College Council Self-Evaluation Results 2009-2010
4. Employee Campus Climate Survey
5. College Council Goals 2010-2011
6. Team Reports

Policies completed 2009-10

- 3430 – Prohibition of Sexual and Other Forms of Harassment Adopted 11/16/09
 4050 – Articulation – Adopted 3/15/10
 AP 4050 – Articulation 3/15/10
 4250 – Probation, Dismissal and Readmission – Adopted 2/16/10
 5310 – Student Grievance deleted 1/19/10
 5500 – Academic Honesty & Standards of Conduct Adopted 12/21/09
 AP 5520 – Student Discipline & Due Process Procedure 11/16/09
 AP 5530 – Student Rights and Grievances 1/19/10

College Council Goals 2009-2010

1. Improve internal college communications.
2. Communicate fiscal issues facing the College and Center throughout the year.
3. Review – El Camino Community College District – Vision Statement, Mission Statement, Statement of Values. Recommend revisions, as appropriate, to Guiding Principles & Strategic Goals for new 2010-2013 document.
4. Support, review, and discuss results of a Campus Climate survey.
5. Complete 10 + 1 policies and accompanying procedures.
6. Continue to build a sense of community.
7. Increase the amount of recognition for work well done.
8. Incorporate evidence-based decision making.

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Planning & Budgeting Committee
Minutes
Date: August 26, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input 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 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: Janice Ely, Katie Gleason, Jo Ann Higdon, Ken Key, Luis Mancia, Jeanie Nishime, Emily Rader, Lynn Solomita, John Wagstaff

Handouts: Final Budget 2010-2011 – September 7, 2010 (Blue Book)

The meeting was called to order at 1:02 p.m.

Approval of August 12, 2010 Minutes

1. Page 1, Categorical Backfill, #2 – change “problems” to *programs*.
2. The minutes were approved as amended.

2010-11 Budget:

1. Pages 1 and 2 – Summary of all budgets in book. Total appropriations and reserves of \$484.7M. Overall general unrestricted budget appropriations and reserves is \$129.3M. Reserve = \$16.5M or 14.57%
2. Pages 3 through 6 – General fund unrestricted budget.
 - a. Pages 3 and 4 – Federal, State, and Local revenue. First two columns provide historical perspective of the actual revenue for past two years. Received Federal funds last year, but don’t know if we’ll receive any for this year. Expected total revenue for all sources is \$106.6M.
 - b. Pages 5 and 6 – Expenditures. Additional funding for new classified and certificated positions in this budget. Change of almost \$3M between the tentative and final budget was covered at last meeting. Projected to spend \$112.8M. Deficit spending of \$6M – revenue minus expenditures (\$106.6M - \$112.8M). Still ending with a \$16.5M reserve. Was 14% increase for PERSCare taken into consideration? Projected an overall 6% benefits increase – did not have solid numbers. Numbers released today: PERSChoice increasing 17%, Blue Shield increasing 14%, and Kaiser was even at 5%. Budget may have to be adjusted. Effective date for new rates is January 1, 2011.
 - c. 2010-11 budget opened at \$22.7M, but 2009-10 ending balance was \$18.7M. Ended with \$4M more because not all of budget was spent last year. What does this mean in terms of the way the budget was calculated last year and the implications this has for this year’s budget? Projected full funding for all certificated and classified positions that weren’t filled for the entire year. Another significant savings was converting utilities to the Central Plant - budgeted utilities at \$4M last year, but actual expenditure was \$2.9M. In addition, \$.75M collected from old accounts receivables through COTOP. Five-year Performa grid assumes

- \$2M more budgeted in actual ending balance almost every year. Budgeted for deficit spending of \$6M this year – in reality may be \$3M. Opinion was stated that this may send the wrong message if budget projection isn't realistic. Statement was made that over budgeting could off-set unforeseen increases (i.e. health care) and balance out the budget.
- d. Why budget more for utilities this year if there were savings last year (page 6, account 5500)? Did not want to risk under budgeting since there was a big change last year.
 - e. Page 5, Academic Salaries – slight increase from last year, from \$31.6M to \$32.3M. Two additional counselors were added to the budget. Class reductions are the reason for the drop in account 1300 - Other Schedule Teaching, from \$17.2M in 2008-09 to \$14.3M in 2009-10. Target FTES last year was 18,900, but increased to 19,400 this year.
 - f. \$16.5M reserve is kept with the County and earns interest – listed on page 4, account number 8860 – Interest and Investment Income.
 - g. There is a significant increase in account 5100 – Contract for Personal Services (page 6) because paramedic/fire department salaries are budgeted each year as a contract service but allowed by the State to move amount spent on those salaries into certificated category at the end of the year.
3. Pages 7 through 10 – Restricted funds from grants and local programs. Pages 9 and 10 – Restricted funds expenditures. This section changes more than any other section in budget book. J. Ely will bring to next meeting a 'cheat sheet' for the abbreviations/acronyms. Residual costs related to Egypt Initiative (8650) on page 8 will be paid from revenue carried over from the end 2009-10. The only transfer from the general, unrestricted fund is for parking (8980) on page 8.
 4. Page 11 – Compton Center related expenses (fund 14). Page 12 – Special Programs Fund (fund 15). Dr. Fallo covered Special Programs Fund with PBC last week. Refer to pages 75-76 for Compton Center and Special Program Fund related expenses.
 5. Page 13 – Financial Aid fund. The asterisks under revenue and expenditures include Compton Center students.
 6. Page 14 – Workers' Compensation fund. Decreased in 2009-2010.
 7. Pages 15 and 16 – Child Development Fund for the Child Care Center. Ended with negative ending balance in 2009-10. Supplemented \$150,000 from general fund for a total of \$225,000. Reductions were also made to their budget.
 8. Pages 17 and 18 – Capital Outlay Projects Fund – local scheduled maintenance projects, construction funded by State (Library addition, Social Science remodel, etc). Also includes deposit for Capital Outlay fees charged to out-of-country students.
 9. Pages 19 and 20 - General Obligation Bond Fund. Best estimation of how monies will be spent. 8940 account –entire amount is budgeted. Will review sales (whole or partial amount) in May or June. Breakdown on bottom of page 20 that shows how monies will be spent. Already voter approved.
 10. Pages 21 and 22 – Property and Liability Self-Insurance Fund and Dental Self-Insurance funds. Holds steady year-to-year.
 11. Page 23 – Special Reserve Fund – Retiree Health Premiums. Amount on this page shows district (Fund 17) contribution held at LACOE. Total contribution into retiree health premium fund is shown on page 67, which at the end of 2009-10 was \$10.6M, and another \$1.4M will be added this year. The last actuarial study done in October 2009 identified \$18.8M as the accrued liability. A study is required every two years.
 12. Page 24 – Bookstore Fund – self-supporting. \$276,000 is given to Auxiliary Services Fund. Interest shows zero, because funds are not invested with the County – kept separately. Profits are declining. Compton Center sales are included.
 13. Pages 25 and 26 – Associated Students Fund and Auxiliary Services Fund. Holds steady from year-to-year. Student representative fees take care of conferences, memberships with state

organizations and travel on behalf of student advocacy. Can groups target investment without adverse risk? Not a good idea in this economy.

14. Members were asked to email J. Ely if they had further questions.

15. Appendix

- a. Pages 27 and 28 – Appropriations Limitation – issues if income from the State is more than calculation. ECC will not have this problem.
- b. Page 29 – Assessed Property Value for entire District. Dropped a little compared to last year. Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes (TRANS) Issued – this year allowed to borrow \$8.85M, earning 2% interest.
- c. Page 30 – Base Revenue. Apportionment received from enrollment fees, property taxes, and State General apportionment. State still using rate \$4,565 for every credit FTES based on 18,910 FTES this budget.
- d. Pages 31 and 32 – Budget Development Criteria and PBC responsibilities. Page 33 – Strategic Initiatives and Mission Statement.
- e. Pages 34 through 42 – Budgeted Positions – some additions were made after book printing, but money is included in budget.
- f. Page 43 – Five-Year Capital Construction Plan 2011-2015 – created by Bob Gann/ Facilities – projects, timelines and approximate costs.
- g. Pages 44 through 47 – recapitulation of general restricted fund 12. Various grants and programs listed in alphabetical order, departmental location number, estimated amounts for 2010-11, and project directors. Few programs missing appropriations designations (Federal, State, Local). EWD/CTE – state funded. Excelencia in Education was a grant awarded a few years ago for First Year Experience partnered with CSUDH. RTF – State funded. IRDC should be IDRC – State.
- h. Page 48 – Compliance with 50% Law – still well within compliance. 2009-10 calculation will be done before report is due to the State on October 10th.
- i. Page 49 – COLA Adjustment – anticipating zero or negative for 2010-11 (not yet available from the State).
- j. Page 50 – head count enrollment – dipped in Spring 2009-10 due to reduction in classes.
- k. Page 51 – Facilities Master Plan Funding – accounting of total budget. Page 52 – Facilities Master Plan current projects timeline.
- l. Page 53 – Recap of Enrollment Fee – holding steady at \$26 per unit. No word from State if fees will increase.
- m. Page 54 – Other Fees charges to students including non-resident fees, calculated each year. F-1 Visa Student Health Insurance dramatically increased this year.
- n. Page 55 – Full-Time Faculty Obligation.
- o. Page 56 – Analysis of Revenue and Expenditures – beginning balances, revenue, expenditures and ending balances throughout the years.
- p. Page 57 – Insurance coverage for the District through the years.
- q. Page 58 – Interfund Transfers – added \$150,000 to supplement the Child Development Fund.
- r. Page 59 – 2008-09 (3:1 Match) on library materials/instructional equipment/technology; 2007-08 (3:1 Match) on page 60; and 2006-07 (3:1 Match) on page 61. Aren't these funds phased out? Some may be carryover – will confirm with J. Ely.
- s. Page 62 – Analysis of Lottery Funds – lottery income stayed fairly stable the last three years.
- t. Pages 63 and 64 – list of memberships. Page 65 – shows drop in interest rates.
- u. Page 66 – Resident FTES by Division – shows increases and decreases within divisions over the past several years. Missing headings: *Fall/Spring* for upper section and *Summer* for bottom section. This page is used to calculate the number of academic awards per division (percentage times 80).

- v. Page 67 Retiree Health Premium Fund (companion to page 23) – includes money with third party *Southern California and Community College District (SCCCD)* pool.
 - w. Page 68 – PERS – shows increased percentage for this year at 10.707%.
 - x. Page 69 – Revenue per FTES – \$4,565 for 2009-10.
 - y. Page 70 – Scheduled Maintenance Plan reported to the State. Some may be paid out of local capital outlay funds.
 - z. Pages 71 and 72 – Final Budget Assumptions. Page 74 – projected FTES. Summer numbers not listed. Page 75 – Fund 14. Page 76 – Fund 15.
16. Corrections will not be made before going to the Board.
17. Statement was made that \$8M left on GASB obligation could possibly be paid from reserves – as long as funds are not in irrevocable fund. Not general priority of the campus. Would satisfy current figure until next actuarial report is released – calculation is a ‘moving target.’ Actuarial estimates do not assume College going out of business; based on the amount of retirees expected to grow over the years. Age of employee pool important factor. Suggestion made to table topic for further discussion.
18. Members were asked to email their questions to J. Ely and copy J. Higdon.
19. Will address final questions and budget endorsement at next meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled on September 2, 2010.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

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 19th 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 7th Management Forum and will focus on annual plans and evaluation components. New Strategic Initiatives go into effect on July 1st. 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 13th and 14th; CEC – October 19th and 20th. 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.



September 7, 2010

TO: Member Institutions
Chief Executive Officers
Accreditation Liaison Officers

FROM: Accreditation Task Force

SUBJECT: Accreditation

You recently received a letter from Barbara Beno, President of the Accrediting Commission (ACCJC), concerning a complaint sent to the U.S. Department of Education from the Task Force. We, the members of Accreditation Task Force, believe it is helpful to review the history of this matter and clarify some issues.

The Consultation Council formed the Accreditation Task Force in the spring of 2009 in response to many concerns expressed by constituent groups about the processes and actions of the ACCJC. Members of the Accreditation Task Force were carefully selected to represent the entire college community: Board of Governors, CEOs, CIOs, Chancellor's Office, CSEA, CTA, FACCC, and the Academic Senate. After conducting a survey of college presidents and accreditation liaison officers (ALOs), the task force developed seven recommendations for improving the ACCJC processes. The document enumerating the recommendations is enclosed.

These recommendations were communicated to the ACCJC, but the Commission has indicated little interest in addressing the seven areas except one. The ACCJC did take action on training. ACCJC has been working with the CIO Board to incorporate accreditation liaison training at the Fall CIO Conference and the Commission has sought input on training from the Vice Presidents of Instruction and the Academic Senate.

The Commission has not been willing to openly discuss the other recommendations. The Chair of the Commission denied the request of the Accreditation Task Force to meet with the Commission at its January 2010 meeting. The Commission overruled the Chair at that meeting but then only granted the Task Force five minutes at its January 8, 2010 meeting and indicated that no discussion of the matter would be permitted at that time. There remained some hope that the Commission might engage with the Task Force at its retreat in March, but this too failed to materialize.

It was only at this point that the Accreditation Task Force decided to file a complaint with the U.S Department of Education. It should be made clear this complaint was not filed by

Chancellor Jack Scott as asserted in Barbara Beno's letter of August 27, 2010; instead the complaint was filed by the entire Accreditation Task Force. In the letter from the Department of Education to Barbara Beno on May 12, 2010, asking her to respond to the complaint, it specifically states that the Department "received a letter of concern from the Accreditation Task Force."

Furthermore, the Academic Senate filed a similar complaint on May 27, 2010 pointing out that the "Commission Selection Committee is supposed to include faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges." The Academic Senate has no knowledge of the Accrediting Commission contacting them in the past eight years with regard to the nomination of faculty members to the Commission Selection Committee.

The letter from the Department of Education to Barbara Beno clearly states that there are five areas in which the Commission is "out of compliance" with the Secretary of Education Criteria for Recognition. The letter cites serious concerns such as "lack of transparency to the selection process," failure to implement guidelines "to avoid conflict of interest," and "the Commission's practice does not promote a diversity of membership." The letter concludes by directly the Commission to take "immediate steps to correct the areas of compliance identified in the letter."

It is unfortunate that the Accrediting Commission (ACCJC) failed to meet collaboratively with the Task Force to work on these issues. The concerns could have been addressed and a complaint to the Department of Education would not have been necessary. The only goal of the Accreditation Task Force is to strengthen and improve the accreditation process for our colleges. We believe that the changes indicated by the Department of Education will be a step toward this goal, and we remain hopeful that the Accrediting Commission (ACCJC) will eventually take action on the other Task Force recommendations.

As the academic year begins, the Accreditation Task Force will discuss next steps and report to the Consultation Council to maintain constituent input. We will keep the colleges informed about future developments.

Approved by the Accreditation Task Force

Barbara Davis-Lyman, Board of Governors

Rich Hansen, Faculty Association of California Community Colleges

Nicki Harrington, Chief Executive Officers

Renee Kilmer, Chief Instructional Officers

Jane Patton, Academic Senate

Manuel Payan, California School Employees Association

Ron Norton Reel, Community College Association/California Teachers Association

Jack Scott, Chancellor

P.S. Along with our recommendations, we have also enclosed a recent article in the Chronicle of Higher Education.

THE CHRONICLE

of Higher Education

Community Colleges

[Home](#) [News](#) [Community Colleges](#)

August 26, 2010

Accreditor of California Colleges Lacks Conflict-of-Interest Protections, Federal Review Says

By Josh Keller

San Francisco

The association that accredits community colleges in California and Hawaii violated federal rules in choosing its commissioners and lacks sufficient controls against conflicts of interest, the U.S. Department of Education has found.

The opinion is a narrow victory for the California community-college system in an increasingly public fight between the system and its accreditor, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, which is part of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Community-college officials have complained that the accreditor handpicks its commissioners and is too quick to punish colleges, while accrediting officials believe that the colleges should meet higher standards.

In a letter dated Tuesday, a copy of which was obtained by *The Chronicle*, Kay W. Gilcher, director of the accreditation division of the Education Department's Office of Postsecondary Education, wrote that the accreditor was in violation of several federal regulations in the way it selects its commissioners. The review was undertaken in a response to complaints lodged in May by the community-college system's chancellor, Jack Scott.

For instance, the letter says, public members of the group that selects the commissioners are not sufficiently independent from the community colleges they oversee.

In addition, faculty, staff, and trustee representatives of the committee that selects commissioners are chosen using an informal process that "does not provide transparency to the selection process and, therefore, does not provide clear and effective controls against conflicts of interest," the letter says.

The letter, which asks the accreditor to submit a plan to comply with the rules by November 1, does not attempt to mediate the colleges' broader complaints against the accreditor. But Mr. Scott said the findings validate the system's view that the accreditor has failed to

listen to the colleges it oversees.

"There's an issue of control, of unwillingness to allow the field to have the kind of input that their own bylaws require," Mr. Scott said. "That's all I'm saying, and that's at the base of what the Department of Education is saying to them: You have not worked hard to avert the conflict of interest. You need to reach out to the field."

Officials of the accrediting association said on Thursday that they planned to make changes after fully reviewing the letter. But they said the department's findings resulted from changes in how the federal rules were interpreted, not from any policies that would lead to potential conflicts of interest.

"Each of the people selected for appointment to the commission are outstanding, independent professionals who would take umbrage that they don't exert their own professional judgment with regards to the decisions the commission makes," said Michael Rota, chair of the accrediting commission and chancellor of Honolulu Community College.

Copyright 2010. All rights reserved.

The Chronicle of Higher Education 1255 Twenty-Third St, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037

Minutes for Ed Policies meeting 9/14/10

Members present: C. Jeffries, V. Robles, C. Wells, M. Odanaka, L. Suekawa, J. Shankweiler

- 1) C. Jeffries welcomed Jean Shankweiler as the dean's representative to Ed Policies.
 - a) C. Jeffries presented to J. Shankweiler two policies forwarded by Dr. Arce that he would like her to take to the Dean's Council for input. Those are BP and AP 3750 – Use of Copyrighted Materials and BP 6160 – El Camino Community College District Email, Internet, and Network Use. J. Shankweiler will meet with Alice Grigsby and John Wagstaff to discuss these two policies.

- 2) C. Jeffries pulled up the ECC website to look over the Academic Affairs (4000 series) policies and procedures that may need to be reviewed in 2010/11 school year.
 - a) 4010 – Academic Calendar may need to be revisited if we do have a change in calendar based on the Winter Session Survey.
 - b) 4025 – Philosophy and Criteria for the Associate Degree & General Education. Discussed possible changes with this policy based on SB 1440. Also suggested that the AA/AS Task Force be consulted to see if they want input even though it was thought the Task Force was winding down. C. Jeffries will forward to Virginia Rapp and Ken Key (co-chairs of the Task Force) our current policy and the CCLC templates to see if they want to make any updates.
 - c) 4027 – Administration of Relations with Academic Senate. Members believe this has been brought forward before, but always is stalled somewhere in the process. It hasn't been updated since 1972, so we know there is some history behind it! C. Jeffries will check with Cindy Constantino and/or Chris Gold to see if they can dig up the history.
 - d) 4020- Program, Curriculum and Course Development was approved by the Board in February 2010.
 - e) 4030 – Academic Freedom may be in the faculty contract and not a Board Policy. C. Jeffries will ask D. Brown about this.
 - f) 4040 – Library and other Instructional Support Services. V. Robles felt it was current enough and did not need to be looked at right now.
 - g) 4055 – Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities is being reviewed once again with the Math Department and D. Patel and will come back to Ed Policies this semester.
 - h) 4070 – Auditing and Auditing Fees. C. Jeffries felt it may need to be looked at since the fee is only \$15/unit and our current tuition fee is \$26/units, so maybe the audit fee should be increased? After looking at the CLCC template, it was noted that the fee can be no more than \$15/unit. C. Jeffries will ask B. Mulrooney about this. The website only had the policy; maybe B. Mulrooney can shed some light on the procedures.
 - i) 4100 – Graduation Requirements for Degrees and Certificates was Board approved in July, 2010, so finally for the first time ever, ECC has a policy and procedure in place for this very important function!
 - j) 4115 – Remedial Coursework is actually numbered 4222 in the CCLC template, so a number change may at least be required. No one was really sure who this policy affected and thought maybe financial aid was affected. C. Jeffries will ask B. Mulrooney about this and possibly also consult with H. Cooper in Financial Aid.
 - k) 4225 – Course Repetition has to definitely be looked at, but must wait until the State comes up with the final interpretation.

- l) 4235 – Credit by Exam hasn't been looked at since 2003, but it seems to be working fine, but if time permits, may be looked at.
- m) 4240 – Academic Renewal has been reviewed recently and is up to date.
- n) 4250 – Probation, Disqualification and Readmission was recently revised and Board approved on 2/10/10, but we need to make sure ITS has or will be able to make the programming changes to enforce the new policy and procedure. C. Jeffries has already recommended a sub-committee consisting of ITS, Administration, Admissions, and Counseling to discuss this item.
- o) 4255 – Student Progress Earl Alert and Referrals should be looked at since it hasn't been reviewed since 1995, but not sure whether it is needed now or should be eliminated. C. Jeffries will talk to A. Spor regarding this since it seems to fall under matriculation.
- p) 4231 – Grade Changes. Need to make sure procedures are updated in the catalog and make sure the steps are carefully explained for students to avoid confusion. C. Jeffries will talk to B. Mulrooney about this.

The Assessment of Learning Committee
cordially invites you to take part in
ECC's First Core Competency Assessment Summit.

ECC has now assessed its first core competency (college-wide learning outcome):

Communication and Comprehension: Students effectively communicate in written, spoken or signed, and artistic forms to diverse audiences. Students comprehend and respectfully respond to the ideas of others.

In the Spring 2010 semester, survey data from both students and faculty was collected, as well as student grades in courses in which the "Communication and Comprehension" core competency is very important. Now it is time to reflect on the data, discuss its implications for our programs and the college as a whole, and most importantly, set a course for improving student learning.

To take part in this exciting process and to make sure your voice is heard, come to the **Core Competency Assessment Summit** on one of the following dates:

Thurs., Oct. 14	1-3 pm	Library, West Basement
Fri., Oct. 15	9-11am	Alondra Room

Refreshments Will Be Served!

All faculty, staff, and administrators from both the Torrance and Compton campuses are strongly encouraged to attend. More details to follow! For more information on ECC's core competencies, please visit www.elcamino.edu/academics/slo/corecomps.asp.

Jenny Simon, Ed.D.
SLO Assessment Coordinator
Professor, ESL
El Camino College

El Camino College and Compton Center

SLO Assessment Results

Core Competency III: Communication and Comprehension

In the spring of 2010, El Camino College's Core Competency III was assessed to determine how well exiting students¹ have mastered the following "Communication and Comprehension" competency.

III. Students effectively communicate in written, spoken or signed, and artistic forms to diverse audiences. Students comprehend and respectfully respond to the ideas of others.

Methodology

El Camino College assessed the Communication and Comprehension core competency in courses that are typically taken as students exit the college (either through degree/certificate completion or transfer to a 4-year institution) in order to create the greatest opportunity to gain such skills through interaction with the College. These included advanced career/technical courses, transfer-level courses, and transferrable English and math courses.

The assessment of this core competency was conducted in two ways:

1. Student self-assessment of aspects of the Communication and Comprehension core competency
2. Faculty assessment of students' overall competency of Communication and Comprehension
3. Academic performance of exiting students courses with an emphasis in communication and comprehension

Sample Selection

Student self-assessments and faculty assessments of students were carried out for a sampling of sections from courses that students typically take towards the end of their time at El Camino College. Two samples of sections were taken:

1. Random sample of sections: Both Student and Faculty Assessments
2. Purposeful sample of sections (aka "volunteers"): Student Self-Assessment Only

The intention of adding a second, purposeful sample was to gather more information and promote greater discussion of results by including sections of faculty participants who serve on

¹ Exiting students are defined as those who appear to be in their last semester at El Camino College, enrolling in courses that students typically take during their last term.

the Assessment of Learning Committee or are active in Student Learning Outcomes assessment at El Camino College or Compton Center. This first assessment also serves as a pilot to determine how best the College should evaluate each core competency in the future. Therefore, active contribution from faculty on the design and results of the assessment was important. Since the student self-assessment is the primary source of detailed competency feedback, only this piece of the assessment was distributed to the volunteers.

Final Sample Size

For the Spring 2010 assessment, faculty from a total of 16 sections returned the student surveys. Eight faculty completed the faculty assessment of students. A total of 440 students submitted self-evaluations (margin of error: $\pm 4.6\%$). Faculty submitted evaluations on 287 students (margin of error: $\pm 5.7\%$).

Table 1: Sample Selection and Size

Surveyed Group – Section Count			Evaluations Received	
Location	Random	Volunteers	Student	Faculty
Compton	1	3		
Torrance	7	5		
Total	8	8	440	287

Student Self-Assessment Results

Students were asked to rate their own competence with respect to five skills or activities that reflect aspects of Communication and Comprehension. Students rated themselves using the following scale:

- 5 = very competent (easily able to do the activity at school or work)
- 4 = mostly competent
- 3 = somewhat competent
- 2 = slightly competent
- 1 = not competent

Mean scores were calculated from 412 valid responses for each activity (Table 2, “Mean” column). All mean scores rated well above 3 (“somewhat competent”), with all but one activity rating over 4 (“mostly competent”). The lowest scoring items were communicating a message through art and the highest by far was expressing your own ideas. Of note were the mean scores that were close to 4 which include delivering a presentation and communicating ideas to diverse audiences. No students believed that they were “not competent” in writing a paper and respectfully critiquing and discussing ideas of others (see Appendix).

It is very likely that all students exiting El Camino College would rating themselves above 3.5 on the art communication activity, above 3.8 on delivering a presentation and communicating to diverse audiences, and above 4.0 on all others (Table 2, “Population Means” columns).

Table 2: Mean Scores by Activity – Student Self-Assessment

Activity/Skill	Mean*	Population Means*	
Writing a paper	4.25	4.06	4.45
Delivering a presentation	4.01	3.82	4.19
Communicating a message through art	3.70	3.53	3.87
Expressing your own ideas	4.41	4.21	4.61
Respectfully critiquing and discussing the ideas of others	4.27	4.07	4.46
Communicating an idea to diverse audiences	4.06	3.87	4.25

* The “Mean” column represents the self-assessment rating from the sample. The mean rating of ALL students (had they all been surveyed) would likely fall inside the range of scores under “Population Means.” Additional descriptive statistics can be found in the appendix of this report.

In terms of raw percentage responses (see Appendix), over 74% of students indicated that they were “mostly” or “very competent,” except for communicating a message through art. Further, well over 80% of students assessed themselves in these categories in terms of writing a paper, expressing one’s own ideas, respectfully critiquing and discussing ideas of others.

Faculty Assessment of Students

Faculty from selected sections (described above) were asked to give a holistic rating of general competence of their students in the areas of communication and comprehension. A total of 8 faculty submitted student assessments in 8 sections (N=281 valid responses). Using the same scale as the student self-assessment, the average rating was **3.52** (If all students were assessed, the average rating would fall within the 3.32 – 3.72 range), placing El Camino College’s exiting students into the “somewhat” to “mostly competent” range of the scale as assessed by faculty. This overall rating is lower than most of the average scores for the activities associated with this competency on the self-assessment.

Course Grades

During the student self-assessment phase, ID numbers were collected so that historical enrollments and course grade performance could be collected from exiting students. Due to the fact that course enrollment and grade information are divided by instructional location, parallel course grade information is provided for both the ECC Torrance campus and Compton

Center—its purpose is to inform rather than compare. Overall, exiting students performed well in their courses where Communication and Comprehension were emphasized (courses that were rated with a maximum score of 4 in terms of coverage of this Core Competency were included in this analysis).

For the Torrance campus, success and retention rates were 81% and 90%, respectively, for these courses. At the Compton Center, students achieved success and retention rates of 74% and 85%, respectively, in these courses. Although these rates are higher than overall college rates, comparison is inappropriate since this analysis does not include all courses that students take during their college careers. Overall GPAs in Communication and Comprehension courses were healthy for ECC and Compton at 3.20 and 2.83, respectively.

On average, exiting students at the Torrance campus enrolled in 8 to 9 courses that emphasized this core competency during their career. At Compton Center, students enrolled in between 5 and 6 Communication and Comprehension courses.

Table 3: Grades and Course Performance – Communication and Comprehension Courses

Grade	Count	% Tot
A	977	36%
B	694	26%
C	340	13%
P	176	7%
D	95	4%
F	118	4%
Inc.	12	<1%
NP	22	1%
DR	39	1%
W	220	8%
Total	2693	100%
Success Rate		81%
Retention Rate		90%
GPA *		3.20
Undup students	313	
Avg courses taken	8.6	

Grade	Count	% Tot
A	98	18%
B	111	20%
C	101	18%
P	92	17%
D	28	5%
F	25	5%
Inc.	0	0%
NP	10	2%
DR	20	4%
W	61	11%
Total	546	100%
Success Rate		74%
Retention Rate		85%
GPA *		2.83
Undup students	97	
Avg courses taken	5.6	

* GPA excludes P, NP, DR, & W notations

Conclusion

This report summarized the assessment process for Core Competency III: Communication and Comprehension, the first in a series of assessments of El Camino College's core competencies. In general, the vast major of exiting ECC students rate themselves as mastering skills of communication and comprehension, except in areas such as the arts, a field of study in which perhaps fewer students have participated. Highest rated skills include writing, and the expression and discussion of ideas. Holistic competency ratings of respondents by their instructors yielded somewhat lower average assessments of competency, but with an average well above "somewhat" competent. Finally, analysis of course grades in this competency showed high performance in terms of course success, retention and GPA for exiting students in courses with greater emphasis on communication and comprehension, with students enrolled in numerous courses with this emphasis. Student comments were classified and summarized in the Appendix. Individual (anonymous) student comments will be available at a later date.

One follow-up assessment is planned for this core competency, which involves a parallel assessment of "entering" students to help estimate the growth that students experience in this competency. That process is planned for Fall 2010. The remaining core competencies will be assessed in future years according to the *Core Competency Assessment Plan*.

Appendix – Additional Information

This appendix contains additional statistical information for each assessment along with comments that students shared on their self-assessment.

Descriptive Statistics – Student Self-Assessment

Activity/Skill	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Writing a paper	436	2	5	4.25	0.774
Delivering a presentation	414	1	5	4.01	0.930
Communicating a message through art	405	1	5	3.70	1.056
Expressing your own ideas	426	1	5	4.41	0.762
Respectfully critiquing/discussing others' ideas	405	2	5	4.27	0.813
Communicating an idea to diverse audiences	436	1	5	4.06	0.874

Comments – Student Self-Assessment

Students were asked to list one to three experiences that *contributed most to their skills in communication and comprehension*. These experiences were combined into one list and categorized by theme and summarized. The table below shows 688 out of the 900 individual comments categorized (76%). Only categories with more than 10 responses were included. Some overlap occurred since in some cases multiple themes are found in a single response.

Category	Terms*	Count
English Class	8	156
Communication Studies Class	7	97
Other Classes	14	65
Library / Library Svcs	6	76
Counseling & Student Services	10	85
Good Teachers **	9	53
Clubs / Extracurricular Activities	12	52
Online Classes	3	31
Doing Presentations	2	27
Writing Center	2	27
Group Projects	6	25
Workshops	1	23
Fine Arts / Performances	2	22
HTP / Honors Classes	3	16

*Terms refers to the number of ways this category was referenced by students. For “Other Classes,” it reflects the number of unique course subjects cited by students.

**“Good teachers” include both general and specific references to college professors at ECC and Compton Center.

Core Competency Communication & Comprehension

439 Responses

Writing a paper

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.25
5	192	44.04	
4	171	39.22	
3	65	14.91	
2	8	1.83	
1	0	0.00	

Delivering a presentation

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.99
5	137	33.09	
4	172	41.55	
3	75	18.12	
2	25	6.04	
1	5	1.21	

Communicating a message through art

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.70
5	109	26.91	
4	128	31.60	
3	120	29.63	
2	35	8.64	
1	13	3.21	

Expressing your own ideas

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.41
5	235	55.16	
4	138	32.39	
3	45	10.56	
2	7	1.64	
1	1	0.23	

Respectfully critiquing and discussing the ideas of others

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.27
5	191	47.16	
4	142	35.06	
3	61	15.06	
2	11	2.72	
1	0	0.00	

Communicating an idea to diverse audiences

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.07
5	152	34.86	
4	189	43.35	
3	71	16.28	
2	21	4.82	
1	3	0.69	

Core Competency Assessment Plan

A core competency describes what students are able to do upon graduating or transferring from El Camino.¹ Assessing core competencies gives faculty, staff, and managers at the college a broader view of the college as a whole and how their area or program fits into it than they would get from program-level or course-level assessment. El Camino College's Core Competencies are as follows:

Students completing a course of study at El Camino College will achieve the following core competencies:

- I. **Content Knowledge:** Students possess and use the knowledge, skills and abilities specific to a chosen discipline, vocation or career.
- II. **Critical, Creative and Analytical Thinking:** Students solve problems, make judgments and reach decisions using critical, creative and analytical skills.
- III. **Communication and Comprehension:** Students effectively communicate in written, spoken or signed and artistic forms to diverse audiences. Students comprehend and respectfully respond to the ideas of others.
- IV. **Professional and Personal Growth:** Students exhibit self-esteem, responsible behavior and personal integrity. Students are reflective and intellectually curious; they continue to improve themselves throughout life.
- V. **Community and Collaboration:** Students appreciate local and global diversity and are respectful and empathetic during personal interactions and competitions. Students effectively collaborate and resolve conflicts. They are responsible, engaged members of society, who are willing and able to assume leadership roles.
- VI. **Information and Technology Literacy:** Students locate, critically evaluate, synthesize, and communicate information in various traditional and new media formats. Students understand the social, legal, and ethical issues related to information and its use.

In a process starting in the Spring semester of 2010, ECC will begin assessing these core competencies. The first core competency assessment will be the "Communication and Comprehension" competency. Every year, the college will assess one core competency in the following order:

1. Communication and Comprehension (Fall 2010)
2. Critical, Creative, and Analytical Thinking (Fall 2011)
3. Professional and Personal Growth (Fall 2012)
4. Community and Collaboration (Fall 2013)
5. Information and Technology Literacy (Fall 2014)
6. Content Knowledge (Fall 2015)

¹ According to the California state Academic Senate's "SLO Terminology Glossary," "core competencies are the integration of knowledge, skills, and attitudes in complex ways that require multiple elements of learning which are acquired during a student's course of study at an institution. Statements regarding core competencies speak to the intended results of student learning experiences across courses, programs, and degrees. Core competencies describe critical, measurable life abilities and provide unifying, overarching purpose for a broad spectrum of individual learning experiences. Descriptions of core competencies should include dialogue about instructional and student service competencies."

Then, the order will repeat starting in Fall 2016. Thus, core competency assessment will take place in a six-year cycle. Other core competencies may be added later on as needed; if this happens, the core competency assessment cycle will be lengthened.

Mapping Course- and Program-Level SLOs to the Core Competencies

In order to start the process of assessing core competencies, during spring flex 2010, the college will map their courses and programs to the core competencies. That is, for each course, the faculty will determine which core competencies match up with the outcomes for that course; at the program level, the faculty will determine which core competencies match up with the outcomes for their program. This will accomplish several things:

1. One of the ways that the college plans to assess these core competencies is by survey. Thus, the mapping will help the college determine which courses may be targeted for administering the survey.
2. An additional way that the college plans to assess the core competencies is by matching the survey results to student grades in the courses which align with the core competency being assessed. Thus, mapping will help the college determine which course grades should be included.
3. A third way that the college plans to assess these core competencies is by having the faculty rate their students in the various competencies. Thus, the mapping will help the college determine which courses should be targeted for this rating.
4. The mapping will help faculty determine whether or not they have a complete list of SLOs for their courses and programs and whether the SLOs they currently have match up with the college's core competencies.

Methods for Assessing the Core Competencies:

The college will collect data for each of the core competencies in three ways:

1. **Student Survey:** For each core competency, the Assessment of Learning committee will develop a survey to assess to what extent students feel they have met the core competencies. The survey will be administered in courses which rate a "4=very important" for the core competency being measured and which tend to be ones that students take at the end of their studies at ECC. Students particularly targeted for the survey will be ones who are about to graduate with a degree or certificate from the college; however, in the process of administering the survey, students at various stages of their studies will be surveyed. This will give the college a good means to compare achievement of core competencies between students at various stages.
2. **Faculty Survey:** The faculty whose courses were targeted for the student survey will then be asked to rate their students with respect to the core competency being assessed. They will be asked to rate student competence in general, not with respect to specific skills within the competency.
3. **Course Grades:** In the process of surveying students, the college will collect the identity numbers of these students and match them to their course grades. Then the college will pull out only the grades from courses where the core competency being

assessed played a significant role (determined by mapping). The college will average these grades in order to compare them with the survey averages. The college will not look at grades of individual students nor will it disaggregate grades based on individual instructor. In this way, the college insures the privacy of students and instructors.

Reporting the Results:

After the data is collected, a core competency summit will be planned to bring together faculty, staff, and managers from various parts of the college to reflect on the data. These summits will take place on the Friday of the Assessment of Student Learning Week. (the tenth week of the semester). After reflection and input from summit participants, the Assessment of Learning Committee will be responsible for writing and disseminating a report.

The Summit:

1. Faculty and staff who have performed assessment in the core competency area being assessed will be asked to give a short presentation on their findings and conclusions. At the end of these presentations, a facilitator will ask summit participants to think about commonalities and differences in the presented assessment studies.
2. The Assessment of Learning Committee will present the data from the core competency assessment.
3. Summit participants will be broken into groups based on their general area of the campus (e.g. Basic Skills, GE, CTE, etc.). The groups will be asked to reflect on the data and its implications for their particular area.
4. The groups will report out their findings and conclusions.

Timeline for the First Core Competency Assessment (“Communication and Comprehension”):

Spring Flex Day, 2010	Mapping of courses, programs to core competencies
Spring 2010	Survey instrument for “Communication and Comprehension” developed Survey planned and administered Faculty survey planned and administered.
Fall 2010	Core Competency Summit takes place
End of Fall 2010	Report written and disseminated

Report on the September 9, 2010 Deans' Council Meeting

Moon Ichinaga
September 10, 2010

Note: This meeting was held jointly with CEC through a videoconference.

- I. Introductions – Nishime
 - A. Tim Linehan is a new A.S.O. representative for Deans' Council meetings. He will be alternating with C. Smith in attending the meetings.
 - B. Roy Natividad attended his first Deans' Council meeting as the Dean of Health and Athletics.
- II. Fall Semester Enrollment Update – Nishime
 - A. The latest report has ECC enrollment at 92% of census, 500 FTES short of plan.
 - B. CEC is 106% of target.
 - C. What the state will be doing to community college student tuition is still unknown.
- III. Drop for Non-Payment – Nishime
 - A. The drop for non-payment process has been “a little rough” so far.
 - B. A common complaint from students is that they should not have been dropped because they are waiting for financial aid.
 - Some summer financial aid awardees do not realize that they have to re-apply for the fall.
 - The processing of financial aid application paperwork takes significantly longer than students think, in part due to the number of applications and Financial Aid Office staffing.
 - Some students are applying for financial aid too late.
 - C. Students are not checking their ECC email accounts for notification that they have moved from waiting list to registered status for classes. When they don't pay for the additional class (es), they get dropped.
 - There was an extended discussion about student and faculty resistance to using the ECC email system and possible solutions to the problem.
 - D. In response to a recommendation to get input from students who experienced problems, Ann Garten will work with a student focus group.
 - E. An evaluation will be made of the workload in the Financial Aid office.
- IV. No Shows – Nishime
 - A. B. Perez and others have proposed moving the no-show deadline from Wednesday of the 2nd week of school to a later date, e.g. Friday of the 2nd week of school since faculty are not allowed to use the portal, to drop additional students, for example, during the interval between the no-show deadline and the census date, which is this coming Monday.
 - B. It was argued that faculty can still tell students that they have been dropped, and students can still drop themselves from classes in order to receive timely tuition refunds.

- C. There was an extended discussion about the purpose of the “no-show” report, and an argument made by several people in attendance that if any change is made to the deadline, the deadline should be moved to an earlier date, after the first meeting of all classes.
- D. A consensus was reached to NOT move the no-show deadline closer to the census date because of the negative impact that would have on wait-listed students.

V. Accreditation Follow-Up Report – Nishime

- A. Feedback on the Accreditation Follow-Up Report should be sent to Dr. Nishime no later than the end of next week so that the Report can be finalized and sent to the Accreditation Commission in October.
- B. Feedback particularly on recommendations #1 and #2. Recommendation #1 deals with linking program reviews to institutional planning and budgeting. Recommendation # 2 deals with SLOs, their definition, assessment, use in improving student learning, and the associated milestone scheduling.

VI. Perceptions of the First Two Weeks of the Fall 2010 Semester – All

- A. The student enrollment help center in the East Lounge of the Student Activities Center has not been as busy as in previous semesters.
- B. Most of the division offices were not busy after 6 p.m., so they are reconsidering whether it is still necessary to extend open hours to 7 p.m.
- C. There were many students in the Testing Center, the Financial Aid Office, and in the Counseling Office.
- D. Some of the students are receiving ECC I.D. cards that are associated with multiple bar codes, and this has created a problem for the Library.
 - J. Wagstaff reported that this is due to the recent discovery of a “bug” in the new photo I.D. system. The system was purchased and installed late because of the late availability of funds.

VII. Report on the September 7, 2010 Academic Senate Meeting – M. Ichinaga

VIII. Miscellaneous Announcements

- A. The California Community Colleges Board of Governors will be meeting at ECC on November 8 and 9. Ann Garten would like to showcase some areas of the college on a tour. Send suggestions to her.
- B. The assignment of majors to the various counselors has been changed. R. Smith distributed a handout of the new assignments. She asked for this information to be passed to the faculty.

THE ECC ACADEMIC SENATE OUTSTANDING ADJUNCT FACULTY AWARD

Background

The ECC Academic Senate Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Award honors one adjunct faculty member each year. These excellent faculty members have demonstrated the highest level of commitment to their students and teaching at ECC. In addition, they show a commitment to the ECC mission and to campus, professional and/or student activities. The candidates are evaluated on the following:

1. Serving students.
2. Commitment to education and discipline.
3. Commitment to the El Camino College mission.
4. Involvement in campus, professional, and/or student activities.

Eligibility, Nominations, and Awards

1. Any current, certificated adjunct faculty member (teaching and non-teaching) who has worked at ECC for a minimum of 4 semesters is eligible for nomination (excluding winter and summer sessions).
2. Any employee or student may nominate any adjunct faculty member for the award. Nominators' letters are submitted to the Staff Development Office, which will ensure that the nominated faculty members are notified of their nominations. The nominated candidates will submit the remaining required application materials if they choose to be considered.
3. The adjunct faculty member selected for the award receives a plaque and a reserved, on-campus parking spot for one year. The recipient will be honored at an Academic Senate meeting.

NOMINATION AND APPLICATION PROCESS

Letters of Nomination

The nomination letter should explain the candidate's qualifications for consideration as a recipient of the ECC Academic Senate Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Award. The letter should be no more than 2 pages long, written using 12 point Times New Roman font with double spacing and one-inch margins. Please discuss the ways in which the candidate meets the four criteria outlined in the attached rubric.

The letter of nomination must be received by the Staff Development Office no later than 4:30 p.m. on the second Friday of October (Oct. 15, 2010). The letter of nomination must be submitted in a sealed envelope and may NOT be faxed or submitted on-line.

Candidate Application Materials

After being notified of their nominations, nominees are invited to submit the remaining required application materials, including:

1. Application cover sheet
2. Curriculum Vitae
3. Educational Philosophy Statement
4. Supporting documentation.

Only applications following the instructions will be considered.

Selection Committee

The Selection Committee will include the Chair of the Faculty Development Committee, 2 members of the Academic Senate (from different divisions), the President of the Associated Students Senate (or designee), and an academic dean.

Questions may be directed to: The Academic Senate Office, 310-532-3670 x3254

**RUBRIC FOR SELECTION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
OUTSTANDING ADJUNCT FACULTY AWARD RECIPIENT**

The application materials should reflect a commitment to the following:

Categories	Possible Points	Points Given
1. Serving students: The candidate should be committed to serving students, either within the classroom as an instructor or outside the classroom as a librarian, counselor, or other student services faculty member.	20	
2. Commitment to Education and Discipline: The candidate should be committed to education. There should be evidence that the candidate maintains currency in the discipline and communicates to students and colleagues an enthusiasm for the discipline and for education in general.	15	
3. The El Camino College Mission: The candidate’s pedagogy should reflect the fundamental principles of the El Camino College mission: “El Camino College offers quality, comprehensive educational programs and services to ensure the educational success of students from our diverse community.”	5	
4. Campus, Professional, or Student Activities: The candidate should demonstrate service to El Camino College through participation in campus, professional and/or student activities. There should be evidence of participation in institutional, division, departmental, and/or student groups.	5	

ECC ACADEMIC SENATE OUTSTANDING ADJUNCT FACULTY AWARD

CANDIDATE APPLICATION COVERSHEET AND INSTRUCTIONS

Candidates for the ECC Academic Senate Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Award are nominated by any employee or student. Candidates are then invited to complete their application for this award as follows:

APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

The materials in the following checklist must be submitted in a sealed envelope to the Staff Development Office by 4:30 p.m. on the first Friday of November (Nov. 5, 2010):

Checklist of Application Materials

- This completed application cover sheet.
- Curriculum Vitae, using the format outlined on the attached page (2 pages, single-spaced maximum).
- Statement describing your educational philosophy and how you apply your philosophy to achieve student success at El Camino College (1 page, single-spaced).
- Supporting documentation, which may include letters of support by students, colleagues and administrators; teaching evaluations; publications, etc. (3 pages maximum).

Application materials should reflect a commitment to the five categories in the “Rubric for Selection of the Academic Senate Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Award Recipient.”

Materials should be submitted in a sealed envelope to the Office of Academic Affairs and may NOT be faxed or submitted on-line. Any application that does not follow the format will not be considered.

Name: _____

Division: _____

Department: _____

Number of Semesters Taught and Dates: _____

Campus extension: _____ Off-campus phone number: _____

Email: _____

ECC ACADEMIC SENATE OUTSTANDING ADJUNCT FACULTY AWARD

CANDIDATE'S CURRICULUM VITAE

Candidates must use the following format to submit the information in their Curriculum Vitae. The Curriculum Vitae may be no longer than 2 pages. Please use 12 point Times New Roman font.

Professional Experience

1. Educational Background

2. Positions Held

3. Campus Activities

4. Professional Affiliations

Awards and Honors

Publications and Presentations

Community Activities