

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES

21st February 2012

Adjunct Faculty

Sue Ellen Warren

Leah Pate

Behavioral & Social Sciences

Firestone, Randy X
Gold, Christina X
Moen, Michelle X
Widman, Lance EXC
Wynne, Michael EXC

Business

Siddiqui, Junaid X
Lau, Philip S X
VACANT

Counseling

Pajo, Christina X
Sabio, Sabra
Vaughn, Dexter X
Key, Ken

Fine Arts

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

Health Sciences & Athletics

Hazell, Tom X
Colunga, Mina X
Baily, Kim X
Holt, Kelly X
Hicks, Tom X

Humanities

Isaacs, Brent X
Marcoux, Pete X
McLaughlin, Kate X
Halonen, Briita X
Simon, Jenny X

Industry & Technology

Gebert, Pat
Hofmann, Ed X
MacPherson, Lee X

Winfree, Merriel X
Marston, Doug

Learning Resources Unit

Striepe, Claudia X
Ichinaga, Moon X

Mathematical Sciences

Bateman, Michael X
Hamza Hamza X
Sheynshteyn, Arkadiy
Taylor, Susan X
VACANT
Barajas, Eduardo X

Natural Sciences

Doucette, Pete X
Herzig, Chuck X
Jimenez, Miguel X
Palos Teresa X
VACANT

Academic Affairs & SCA

Arce, Francisco X
Nishime, Jeanie X
Lee, Claudia
Lam, Karen

ECC CEC Members

Evans, Jerome
Norton, Tom X
Panski, Saul X
Pratt, Estina X
Halligan, Chris
Odanaka, Michael X

Assoc. Students Org.

Asher, Rebekka
Valdez, Cindy

Ex- Officio Positions

Guests, Dean's Rep, Visitors:

Carolyn Pineda,

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

The first Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2012 semester was called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:36pm.

Approval of last Minutes:

[See pp.6-12 of packet]The minutes of the December 6th meeting were approved as written.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

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

- [See pg 14 of packet] CG reported on discussion at the **College Council meeting of December 12th**. CG noted that the minutes did not adequately reflect the content of the meeting, and that there had been some heated discussion pertaining to collegial consultation and the requested ASCCC/CCLC visit. President Fallo favors an informational visit, while CG favors a problem solving visit. Dr. Arce has since pit in for an informational visit via online channels. Please give Cg feedback via email as to who the intended audience for the visit should be – academic senate officers and administrators, college-wide audience, etc.
- [See pp 15-19 of packet] CG reported on the Council of Deans meeting of December 8th, 2011 and January 12th, 2012, noting that a lot of information had been conveyed at the meetings.

BP 4225 Course Repetition needs review and will be moving through the Ed. Policies Committee. Dr. Simon noted that Course Repetition should not be confused with Repeatability. Course Repetition allows for a course to be taken again (limit 3 times) due to a poor grade.etc.

The Field Trip Policy is also undergoing review. This is a complex issue due to the array of types of trips, and legal issues. CG noted that there was talk of trying to simplify things, but for now CG advised faculty thinking of arranging a field trip to talk to their Deans first. She noted it may be easiest to state that the class period will be held at an “alternative class site.”

VP Compton Education Center - Saul Panski (SP)

No report - requested to speak later in the agenda.

Curriculum Committee – Jenny Simon (JS)

No report, but a future report can be expected on BP 4260 Prerequisites. JS noted that the rules on setting prerequisites have loosened, but the Curriculum Committee feels there still needs to be some data driven guidelines.

VP Educational Policies Committee – Merriel Winfree (MW)

MW reported that the Committee is seeking new members. She noted that the Committee meets the 2nd and 4th Tuesday of every month from 12:30 - 2:0pm in Student Services 106. Currently there are only 5 members. Please email MW if interested in serving.

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

BH reported that the **Getting the Job Workshop Part 2** “The Interview Process” will be held February 24th 12:30 – 2:00pm. This is aimed primarily at adjunct faculty.

BH further reported that the Faculty Book Club would be running again, but the role of facilitator was still in flux.

MI noted that an email regarding the “California Reads” program would be forthcoming. Additional activities for this program have been planned, and it is not too late for faculty to participate. Excerpts from the titles for student readings can be organized via ERes..

Spring Flex day had featured a demonstration of the online reporting of Flex hours. If anyone has trouble with the system, please let BH or MI know, and they can pass the concerns along to Donna Manno.

VP Finance – Lance Widman (LW)

No report.

VP Academic Technology Committee – Pete Marcoux (PM)

PM noted that many faculty webpages are out of date and asked the Senators to remind their Divisions to update the pages or remove them. This is important for accreditation.

PM reported that the Campus Technology Committee would be meeting today at 2pm, and the Academic Technology Committee has still to set dates for meetings.

VP Instructional Effectiveness – Kelly Holt (KH)

KH noted that the Accreditation report will highlight the import of SLO work. SLO work can all be done via CurricUNET now, and while CurricUNET is not as user friendly as one could hope, one does get used to the quirks. CurricUNET/SLO training will be held this week in the Staff Development Lab on Friday and Program Review on CurricUNET on Thursday.

KH noted that one can sign up for these sessions online via FlexReporter. Mr. Norton asked if the training sessions could be repeated and KH said she would arrange this, but noted that Compton is not using CurricUNET for Program Review, only for SLO work, as programs at Compton do not mirror ECC programs.

CG made a request to reorder the agenda to present a **Resolution of Appreciation to Professor Jason Suarez** who had to leave shortly to teach a class.

Dean Miranda spoke briefly about Prof. Suarez’s work at ECC beginning in 2001. He has been a dedicated historian, teaching world history to students in such a way as to engage many learning styles, and spends much time and energy helping students learn. Prof. Suarez has been a State-wide Basic Skills Committee member, and works with other committees on and off-campus.

CG read the Resolution of Appreciation and presented it to Prof. Suarez, and noted that the Academic Senate would nominate Prof. Suarez for the State-wide Straub Diversity Award.

Prof. Suarez offered his thanks.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Calendar Committee Report:

The Board of Trustees was presented with two calendars.

A 2012 – 2013 calendar with a Winter session, which was approved, and a 2013-2014 calendar without a Winter session, which the Board did not approve, saying it needed more information. To this end, Dr.

Nishime has convened three subcommittees to gather information in the areas of Efficiency, Economy, and Academics. Information compiled by the committees will be presented at the March Board meeting.

Mr. Wells requested that the compiled information also be brought to the Senate. Dr. Nishime agreed there would be an opportunity to do so as the Senate March meeting was the Tuesday before the Board meeting.

ECCFT Report:

Dr. Shadish was not present to provide a report.

Accreditation Report – Dr. J. Nishime:

[See extra handout provided – letter dated February 1, 2012]

ECC presented a mid-term report in October of 2011. The Commission met in January and later sent the letter as their response to the mid-term report. ECC is being asked to respond to 5 recommendations:

1. Planning and Budgeting
2. SLOs
3. Online Courses and appropriate rigor of same.
4. SLO assessments present in faculty evaluations – currently the campus provides this information in the self-assessment portion of the evaluation packet.
5. Fiscal management planning. This portion states that conditions at Compton could negatively affect ECC. Dr. Nishime has requested more clarification on this statement.

Dr. Nishime noted that once recommendations have been made, a campus has 2 years to correct the “problem”. ECC has been removed from warning, but this letter states that ECC and the CEC must meet the standards mentioned above. While it is recognized that we do have some issues, Dr. Nishime felt it not certain that we could meet the October deadline.

Dr. Nishime noted that re: Planning, she is not sure that we are at a sustainable level, noting that activity in this area needs to be ratcheted up. Thus more training sessions will be held at ECc and the CEC. These sessions will mainly be intended for managers.

Dr. Arce noted re: SLO’s, that with the transition to CurricUNET we have seen a drop in activity. He noted that much SLO work is incomplete and more of an effort must be made to update the work, and show how we are using SLO assessment to make changes. The campus should make the SLOs a more authentic activity, rather than just a compliance process.

Re: SLO Assessment and faculty evaluations, Dr. Arce noted that on the last site visit the Accreditation team had sampled faculty self-evaluations. There were some outstanding examples, but others are not, and faculty must work to make them more meaningful. Dr. Arce emphasized that Accreditation teams do read the SLO portions of the self-evaluations, as they are felt to be very important in making a better teaching/learning institution.

Dr. Nishime acknowledged that the Fiscal management issue will be difficult, noting that there has been a lot of turnover at the CEC, and that there had been a period with a Special Trustee that had not been beneficial to the college. However, she noted that it was fortunate that Mr. Henry had returned and he had good relationships with many parties.

Dr. Nishime reported that we must respond to this letter, and she has a timeline that she will take to the Board, and she is currently looking for a Compton co-chair to prepare a response that she hopes will be ready by June.

Mr. Panski reported that the CEC is in active discussion on the issues, he noted that the CEC had gotten an unqualified audit, which is good news, but will need to hire a Special Financial Officer., and the CEC CEO is developing a plan to revamp the financial area. Mr. Panski noted that the Special Trustee has been very active, and the CEC believes they can meet the recommendations. As regards SLO assessment and Program Review at the CEC, Mr. Panski feels that progress has been made in this area, but one problem is that there are many disciplines where programs are taught only be adjuncts. Incentives are being offered in these areas to get the SLO work done. Mr. Panski reported that, realizing there is a lot of work to do, meetings are being called for the faculty re: SLO work.

Mr. Marcoux asked Dr. Arce to provide examples for the faculty of the outstanding self-evaluations re: SLO work, and Dr. Arce agreed, saying it is important to have models. Ms. Halonen agreed with the request, noting that there has been little guidance in this area.

Mr. Crossman said that it was his recollection that when the ECC/Compton partnership had been proposed many had had concerns, but we had been told that ECC would be held harmless, and was this correct? Dr. Arce replied that in essence it is correct, it is in the Memorandum of Understanding that ECC could terminate the partnership, but things were not as simple as that.. Dr. Arce noted that ECC could still be put on sanction, and we would still have to undergo a process to extricate ECC from the partnership. Mr. Crossman asked why did ECC then agree to this. Dr. Arce noted that in the

interim guidelines have changed and become stricter. Earlier we were not held to the 2-year requirement, and this has changed. Mr. Crossman asked whether ECC has anything in writing to hold us harmless. Dr. Arce answered No, only the Memorandum of Understanding, and our only option would be to withdraw.

Mr. Wells asked if the ACCJC thus trumps the Memorandum of Understanding? Mr. Crossman asked if anyone had ever discussed this possibility.

Dr. Nishime noted that if we withdraw ECC is not obligated to find another partner for the CEC. Dr. Arce noted though that if ECC terminated the contract, ECC would have to make some arrangements, and be intermediaries while the termination process was worked through.

Mr. Panski noted that the CEC was working through its problems and that ECC should concentrate on its own shortcomings.

It was noted, in reply to a question from Mr. Ahmadapour, that colleges often get recommendations, and it is not an unusual situation. What is unusual is our unique relationship with the CEC..

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

CG asked to postpone the items

BP/AP 4025 Philosophy for Associate Degree & General Education (second reading) and Nominations for Adjunct Senators. Senate President, and Co-VP Faculty Development and move to a discussion of the Resolution of No Confidence.

Resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of the Collegial Consultation Process at El Camino College.

[See packet pp 43 = 45]

CG reported that a Taskforce had met twice during Winter session and had discussion large issues re: the resolution. The Taskforce had also spoken to the State-wide representative for our area from Santa Monica College. It had been decided to make the Implementation of the process of collegial consultation the focus of the Resolution as this cast a wider net and pinpointed more exactly the problem we felt we are faced with.

CG emphasized that the Resolution must be supported by evidence and that the taskforce is in the process of collecting said evidence.

CG noted that if we choose to take a faculty-wide vote, it would be prudent to make sure that the majority of the faculty support the Resolution., therefore a need was felt for a Plenary session to discuss the Resolution on a campus level and get feedback. CG noted she has already received feedback that generally seems to indicate support. The feedback, though, has varied, with some feedback has calling to name President Fallo directly, while other feedback has indicated that some think the Resolution is not a good idea at all. Some Divisions have taken polls to assess feelings on the matter.

The concerns are the long-term frustration with the collegial consultation process, and concerns re: the outcome of such a move – would it make the situation worse/would there be retribution/would names be named?

The taskforce has written a draft Resolution [see Packet] and a factsheet with supporting evidence will accompany the final document.

Mr. Wells asked if this was a first reading?

Mr. Ahmadapour suggested getting people's comments on tape, so as to have a written and audio record.

Mr. Marcoux suggested we need a plan of action. CG agreed. Mr. Wells asked if the Senate needed a motion before moving to discussion and Ms. Taylor felt things should be kept more informal at this stage.

Mr. Crossman said that the body should schedule a vote, so as not to be in violation of the Brown Act.

CG noted that we could vote here, then move ahead with a campus- wide vote after a Planary session. Ms.

Taylor agreed. Mr. Wells noted that document might be altered after hearing the discussion engendered

by the Plenary. CG said we could discuss the issue here, make amendments as necessary, then send it on

to faculty. Mr. Wells asked when the Plenary would be scheduled? CG said we should first ensure that we were all comfortable with the Resolution. Mr. Wells suggested making the next Academic Senate meeting

session the Plenary Session. CG asked for the formal motion to be made and Mr. Marcoux made the motion that the next Academic Senate meeting would be a Plenary Session to discuss the Resolution with the faculty, seconded by Ms. Taylor. The vote was taken, all ayes, no nays, one abstention by Mr. Panski. The motion passed.

Dr. Baily asked what of those who could not attend the session due to teaching commitments. CG said she could schedule one alternative time, and Ms. Taylor suggested also emailing a summary of the plenary discussion minutes to those faculty.

CG called for discussion of the draft document and Ms. Taylor asked for a few minutes to be given for all to read the document. This was granted.

CG gave a brief overview, noting that the reasons for the Resolution were given in the first three Whereases from the National, State, through local levels. The second Resolve indicates a willingness and determination to move forward. Mr. Firestone suggested splitting the second resolve into two parts, and Mr. Crossman agreed, saying it would give the point re: the Board of Trustees more emphasis.

Ms. Halonen remarked that if the Senate alone voted we would need to remove mention of the faculty from the first Resolve, and CG agreed that this could be done if the Senate alone voted.

Dr. Baily asked whether this document is supported by evidence, as concrete proof was needed, and it was hard to support the serious step this Resolution meant without seeing evidence. CG noted that evidence is being collected and would be included in the aforementioned factsheet. Ms. Taylor agreed that no-one could be expected to vote without first seeing evidence.

CG noted that the type of evidence being collected involved examples of arbitrary decision making, decisions contrary to committee wishes, lack of written responses to explain decisions, lack of transparency in decision making, and other problems with communication.

Mr. Crossman stated that we had seen an example today with the comments re: Compton. Ms. Halonen noted that a list of the evidence is being drafted. CG asked if the Senate should see the list of evidence the meeting before the Plenary. Dr. Baily noted that the campus should see the list before the Plenary. CG noted that the Taskforce had discussed putting the evidence in the whereases, but felt it would make the document too long, and that it was better to provide a separate factsheet. Mr. Ahmadapour suggested pushing the meeting back to get groups of faculty to outline documentary evidence. CG noted that Santa Monica College had gathered plenty of evidence at the Plenary session. When asked what solution we hoped to achieve, CG noted that these had not been formally listed, but would be outlined: written responses to follow decisions, votes for college consultation committees, cleared lines of communication with the Board.

Mr. Panski urged moving forward with caution at this time, as such issues raised red flags for Accreditation Commissions, and that ECC could find itself on sanction. He recommended making a strategic decision to wait until after accreditation. Mr. Ahmadapour disagreed with this suggestion. Mr. Crossman felt that any document that suggested that we HAVE shared governance at ECC is fraudulent, and we should deal with the elephant in the room. Shared governance is required by law and via the Ed. Code, and we have to sign off on these documents, and this issue has been a problem at ECC for years. Ms. Colunga asked whether we had 2 years to resolve this problem. CG noted that the Senate Does have to sign off on the Accreditation report, but can also submit a minority report. The Senate can also request to meet with the Accreditation team to discuss issues.

Ms. Colunga asked how we can get the Board of Trustees to see our problems. She noted it is the job of the Board to see that we get Accreditation. Ms. Halonen asked if there was a precedent at another campus who did something similar while under Accreditation recommendation status. Mr. Panski thought the college of Redwoods. Mr. Panski repeated the danger of being put on sanction. Mr. Crossman asked if a College could be put on sanction and not be given time to resolve the issues. Mr. Panski answered yes. Mr. Wells noted ECC had never had a totally clear Accreditation report.

CG summed up that the Taskforce would meet for an editing session based on this discussion, noting that the second Resolve would be changed, we would add the factsheet, and a special Plenary session would be held in 2 weeks.

INFORMATION ITEMS –DISCUSSION

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 2:01pm.

CS/ECC2012