

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES

3rd April 2012

Adjunct Faculty

Sue Ellen Warren

Leah Pate

Behavioral & Social Sciences

Firestone, Randy X

Gold, Christina X

Moen, Michelle X

Widman, Lance X

Wynne, Michael X

Business

Siddiqui, Junaid X

Lau, Philip S X

VACANT

Counseling

Pajo, Christina

Sabio, Sabra

Vaughn, Dexter X

Key, Ken X

Fine Arts

Ahmadpour, Ali X

Bloomberg, Randall X

Crossman, Mark X

Schultz, Patrick X

Wells, Chris X

Health Sciences & Athletics

Hazell, Tom

Colunga, Mina X

Baily, Kim X

Holt, Kelly X

Hicks, Tom X

Humanities

Isaacs, Brent X

Marcoux, Pete EXC

McLaughlin, Kate

Halonen, Briita EXC

Simon, Jenny EXC

Industry & Technology

Gebert, Pat X

Hofmann, Ed X

MacPherson, Lee X

Winfree, Merriel EXC

Marston, Doug X

Learning Resources Unit

Striepe, Claudia X

Ichinaga, Moon X

Mathematical Sciences

Bateman, Michael X

Hamza Hamza X

Sheynshteyn, Arkadiy X

Taylor, Susan X

Barajas, Eduardo X

Natural Sciences

Doucette, Pete X

Herzig, Chuck X

Jimenez, Miguel X

Palos Teresa X

VACANT

Academic Affairs & SCA

Arce, Francisco

Nishime, Jeanie X

Lee, Claudia

Lam, Karen

ECC CEC Members

Evans, Jerome

Norton, Tom X

Panski, Saul

Pratt, Estina

Halligan, Chris X

Odanaka, Michael X

Assoc. Students Org.

Asher, Rebekka

Valdez, Cindy X

Ex- Officio Positions

Elizabeth Shadish X

Guests, Dean's Rep, Visitors:

Carolyn Pineda, Jo-Ann Higdon, Georgiana Coughlin, Suzanne Herschenhorn

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

The fourth Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2012 semester was called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:35pm.

Approval of last Minutes:

[See pp.6-16 of packet]The minutes of the 20th March 2012 meeting were approved as written.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

Academic Senate President's report – Christina Gold (henceforth CG)

CG noted that we would forego the majority of the Officers' Reports to allow for full discussion of agenda business items.

- CG reminded all that the CCLC-ASCCC informational presentation would be held later today from 4 – 6pm in the East Dining Room. 2 hours of Flex credit are offered.
- The Senate was also reminded of Thursday's meeting in the Marsee Auditorium when Dr. Fallo will be presenting a "State of the Economy" address. 1 hour flex credit will be offered.
- CG reported that a call for adjunct faculty nominations to the Senate had resulted in 3 responses. One faculty member is uncertain. If all 3 run, an online election will be held. If not, the 2 remaining persons will be elected by acclamation.
- CG reported that the Associated Students Organization had passed a Resolution on Collegial Consultation, arguing that consideration of student opinion on the campus is not consistent, and asking the Board of Trustees to address this issue. CG passed the Resolution around for the Senators to look at.

VP Compton Education Center - Saul Panski (SP)

No report.

Curriculum Committee – Jenny Simon (JS)

No report.

VP Educational Policies Committee – Merriel Winfree (MW)

No report. See Unfinished Business.

VP Faculty Development Committee – Briita Halonen (BH) (Co-VP) and Moon Ichinaga (MI) (Co-VP)

No report.

VP Finance – Lance Widman (LW)

No report.

VP Academic Technology Committee – Pete Marcoux (PM)

No report.

VP Instructional Effectiveness – Kelly Holt (KH)

No report.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Nominations for Academic Senate President, and Co-VP Faculty Development

- **Co-VP Faculty Development Committee**

CG reminded all that nominees must currently sit on the Faculty Development Committee. Hearing no nominations, CG said she would ask for nominations again at the next meeting.

- **Academic Senate President**

CG noted that there had been only one nomination. Hearing no other nominations, CG said she would serve another term as Academic Senate President.

CG noted that this is a 2 year term running from Fall 2013 through Spring 2015.

Resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of the Collegial Consultation Process at El Camino College, Torrance Campus. 2nd Reading.

[See pg. 17 for a clean version and pp32-33 of packet for marked up version of Resolution]

CG noted that “Torrance campus” had been added per a request from the CEC. CG briefly stepped through the revisions and noted that the final Resolved clarifies the level of service requested by the Senate, which is further described in the Appendix to the Resolution. CG recommended the Senate vote only on the Resolution and view the Evidence only as a working document as items are still being added and statements refined.

Mr. Marston moved that the floor be opened to discussion. Ms. Taylor seconded the motion.

Mr. Widman asked whether the document would be submitted at the informational program this evening. CG answered that she would formally present the document to the Board at the next Board meeting on April 17th. CG noted that the President of the Statewide Senate has seen the document as it is so far.

Mr. Widman said that even if the Evidence is to be seen as a work in progress, it should accompany the document as a dated addendum with a note that evidence is still being added. He felt there was so much in the Evidence portion that was useful. Ms. Taylor agreed with this statement. Mr. Marston noted that a Resolution normally just included Resolves, but saw no reason why the additional document could not be included. CG asked if this then should be included as Appendix B, and noted the motion should be changed to include Appendix B.

Mr. Wells asked, if the Resolution moved ahead, would we be able to refer to other documents as well, or would we be limited to documents submitted?

Prof. Herschenhorn asked permission, as a faculty visitor, to speak, saying that she questioned not presenting the documents to the Board this evening at the meeting. CG replied that the meeting tonight is not a regularly scheduled Board meeting and so the item is not on the agenda. CG felt it should be on the Board agenda as part of the official record.

CG moved to add examples/evidence to the end of the Resolution as an appendix (noting the date and that the document would be subject to revision) to be included with the Resolution and Appendix A.

A vote was called and all replied Aye, there were no Nays or Abstentions.

CG moved to vote on moving the Resolution forward. The vote reflected a majority of Ayes, no Nays, and 5 Abstentions. CG noted the motion passed with 5 abstentions. The next step would be to request this item be put on the Board agenda for their next meeting.

BP/AP 4225 Course Repetition – Ed. Policies - Merriel Winfree(MW) (Second reading)

[See pp.34-41 of packet]

CG noted that MW was not able to be present today, but that she (CG) had been at the meeting so would lead the discussion. Changes are being made in response to changes to the law which allows students to attempt a course only three times, and the third attempt would trigger a request for intervention and a plan. W's will count as attempts, as will an F grade.

Discussion at the first reading had brought requests for some minor revisions to be made.

Ms. Taylor had a question on the Procedures, noting that the statement in Repeatable Course II.4 seemed confusing, unless there were other circumstances not noted here. Mr. Mulrooney said that the student attempts max out at the numbers of times approved by the Curriculum Committee (as indicated by the abc notation) and then students may be allowed another attempt after a “lapse of time”. If, however, the

student fails on the last attempt, the “lapse of time” opportunity is forfeit. Ms. Taylor felt that this was not made clear, and that the phrase “lapse of time” was also not clearly defined. Mr. Mulrooney said that Sacramento needs and wants to define the exact period.

Dr. Nishime noted that according to the latest information it appeared to be more than 36 months. Ms. Taylor suggested rewording the section on pp.37-38 to make things clearer. Mr. Mulrooney replied that he would probably write guidelines to accompany this documentation. He noted that the Chancellor’s Office also seems to be producing guidelines to accompany their documents, and that people would rely on the guidelines for specific issues.

Ms. Taylor asked if pg. 39 Point 4.C. was mandated by the State? After discussion Dr. Nishime and Ms. Taylor suggested that Point 4.c.1 begin “No Notation will be assigned...” Mr. Mulrooney noted that this is a response to extraordinary circumstances and that no doubt there would be changes to this.

Ms. Gephart asked, with respect to Repeatable classes that they have a Cosmetics class that needs to go back to Curriculum, but what to do in the interim? Mr. Mulrooney asked if the class was part of mandatory training – and if so they were probably OK for now as those classes could be taken umpteen times as mandated by the State. Mr. Crossman asked if there were any changes as regards priority. Mr. Mulrooney said that priority registration is looked at. Dr. Nishime queried whether students would still have priority registration at the 3rd repeat, noting that this made sense as they had already had a “bite of the apple” and that issue should probably be addressed in the Policies and Procedures dealing with priority registration. Mr. Mulrooney said he would need to see data on the groups, and reminded all of the fact that an intervention is required after 2 attempts at a class. He noted that these interventions were working well. Mr. Norton asked whether this vote could not wait. Mr. Mulrooney replied that it was important that we act. This was passed by the Board of Governors last Fall and then campuses have 180 days in which to implement, and we start Summer registration in mid-May and we must be done by then. Mr. Marston made a motion to approve BP/AP4225, seconded by Mr. Ahmadapour. The vote was taken and showed the majority in favor, with 1 Abstention. The BP/AP 4225 passed.

NEW BUSINESS

AP 4231 Grade Change Procedure - Ed. Policies - First Reading. Merriel Winfree(MW)

[See pp.42-48 of packet]

The Senate had voted in June 2011, to approve revisions to the Grade Change Policy and procedure. Minor revisions had been made subsequently, and the BP was approved by the Board in Fall 2011. The Board felt that more extensive revisions were needed to the Procedure, and this was returned to the Education Policies Committee. This change in Procedures allows for grade changes to be initiated by the college in the event of fraud.

CG noted that the requested changes are underlined on pgs. 42-48 and that the Senate has not seen these changes before. The main change come on pg 45. Point D.2. Pre-hearing Communication. The dean will sit with the student and go over the appeal. This gives the Dean a chance to aid the student or deny the appeal. The change to Part II. A.1. was also noted, pointing out that credible evidence must be produced, and in II.A.3. that an alternate instructor will give the new grade after considering the student performance.

CG noted that this was a first reading and opened the floor to discussion and comment. Mr. Wells commented that in D.3. the word Review was better than Denial in the heading, but that that in the body of the paragraph it should be stated that the VPAA “may deny the evidence or request further documentation”, NOT “deny the appeal or request...” Ms. Taylor felt that was not clear, as VPAA COULD deny the appeal.

CG noted that the Ed. Policies Committee was concerned with the emphasis on denial and had thus changed the language to real review, and perhaps more changes in this regard needed to be made. CG said she would request Ed. Policies look at alternate language. Dr. Nishime noted that the Student Grievance side sees similar problems. There needs to be that authority to deny the appeal if not enough evidence otherwise the Committee’s time is wasted. Mr. Wells noted that perhaps the language in the Student grievance policy and this Grade Change policy should be parallel. Mr. Ahmadapour felt that the grade

change process at ECC is the hardest he has seen and, in his opinion, usually ends in hurting the students – especially as regards incompletes. He felt grade changes should be mainly in the hands of the teachers and be much simplified (except in cases of fraud) He noted that there was too much paperwork and the process should be revisited. CG had a question on the “informal requests” mentioned on pg 43 Pt.1.B., asking if this was how most requests occur. Mr. Mulrooney reported that the Chancellor’s Office had said we had no proper policy and so they were going to cut ECC off from apportionment. The language about the informal process was put in as it was hoped many cases could be quickly settled this way, but some students prefer the formal process. Mr. Mulrooney noted that we ARE a little more strict than other colleges where grades seem to be changed willy-nilly. Mr. Ahmadapour felt that all the bureaucracy at ECC was unnecessary and put all the work on the students and teachers.

INFORMATION ITEMS –DISCUSSION

Mr. Marston noted the tornadoes in the Fort Worth Dallas area, and asked that we spare a thought for the victims.

CG reminded all about the Information Meeting in the East Dining room at 4pm.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:53pm.

CS/ECC2012