

OFFICERS & EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President	Pete Marcoux	VP Faculty Development	David Vakil
Compton Educational Center	Saul Panski	VP Finance and Special Projects	Lance Widman
VP Curriculum Chair	Janet Young	VP Legislative Action	Chris Wells
VP Educational Policies	Evelyn Uyemura	Secretary	Claudia Striepe

Senate Mailing List

<u>Adjunct</u>				<u>Health Science & Athletics</u>			
Carolyn Almos			Theatre	Tory Orton (sharing)	6/07	32863	
Gary Robertson			Speech	Kim Baily (sharing)			Nursing
<u>Behavior & Social Sciences</u>				<u>Hum.</u>			English
Maria Brown	3756	BSS		Lyman Hong	6/07	6046	English
Emily Rader	3757	BSS		Peter Marcoux	6/08	6046	English
Lance Widman	8/09 3746	Pol. Sci.		Evelyn Uyemura	6/08	3172	ESL
Michael Wynne	7/08 3562	Psychology		<u>Industry & Technology</u>			
Janet Young	3613			Ed Hofmann	6/07	3292	Machine
<u>Business</u>				Douglas Marston		3621	Electronics
Sheperd Jacobson	3206	Business		George Rodriguez	6/07	3308	Welding
Jacque Thompson	6/07 3206	CIS		<u>LRC</u>			
<u>Compton Educational Center</u>				Susie Dever	6/09	3514	LRC
Saul Panski	2560	History		Claudia Striepe	6/08	6006	Library
Estina Pratt	2535	LRC		<u>Mathematical Sciences</u>			
Arthur Flemming	2563	Philosophy		Massoud Ghyam	6/08	3900	Math
August Hoffman	2434			Judy Kasabian	6/08	3310	Math
Darwin Smith	2562			Greg Scott	6/09		Math
<u>Counseling</u>				Susan Tummers	6/08	3226	Math
Kate Beley	6/07 3251	Counselor		Marc Glucksman	6/10	3216	Math
Ken Gaines	6/08 3690	Counselor		<u>Natural Sciences</u>			
Lisa Raufman	6/08 3435	Counselor		Chas Cowell	6/06	6152	Chemistry
<u>Fine Arts</u>				Kamran Golestaneh	6/09	3243	Chemistry
Ali Ahmadpour	6/09 3539	Art		Teresa Palos	6/08	3354	Biology
Jason Davidson	6/09 3725	Speech		David Vakil	6/08	3134	Astron & Physics
Chris Wells	6/09 3723	Speech					
Mark Crossman	3728	Speech					

Accreditation	Susie Dever & Arvid Spor	Dean, Humanities	Mr. Tom Lew
Academic Affairs	Quajuana Miller	Dean, I&T	Dr. Stephanie Rodriguez
Admissions & Records	Bill Mulrooney	Dean, LRC	Ms. Alice Grigsby
Associated Students Org.	Vivian Amezcua, Vincent Armstrong	Dean, Math	Dr. Don Goldberg
Board of Trustee, Area 1	Dr. Nathaniel Jackson, Secretary	Dean, Natural Sciences	Dr. Jean Shankweiler
Board of Trustee, Area 2	Mrs. Mary E. Combs, Vice President	Federation Office	Sean Donnell & Nina Velasquez
Board of Trustee, Area 3	Mr. William J. Beverly, President	Health Center	Debbie Conover
Board of Trustee, Area 4	Dr. Ray Gen	Human Resources	Barbara Perez
Board of Trustee, Area 5	Miss Maureen O'Donnell	President/Superintendent	Dr. Thomas Fallo
Board of Trustee, Student	Ms. Roxanna Seyedin	Public Information	Ann Garten
Campus Police		SLO Coordinators	Lars Kjeseth & Jenny Simon
Dean, BH&S	Dr. Gloria Miranda	The Union	Editor
Dean, Business	Dr. Virginia Rapp	VP Academic Affairs	Dr. Francisco Arce
Dean, Counseling	Dr. Regina Smith	VP Administrative Services	Dr. Jeff Marsee
Dean, Fine Arts	Dr. Jim Schwartz	VP Student Services	Dr. Jeanie Nishime
Dean, HS&A	Dr. Irwin Drew		

SENATE'S PURPOSE (from the Senate Constitution)

1. 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.”
2. To facilitate communication among faculty, administration, employee organizations, bargaining agents and the El Camino College Board of Trustees.

Education Code §87360 (b) requires that

Hiring criteria, policies and procedures for new faculty members shall be developed and agreed upon jointly by representatives of the governing board, and the academic senate, and approved by the governing board.¹

AGENDA & TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page #
I. CALL TO ORDER	
II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	1-7
III. REPORTS OF OFFICERS	
- President	8-16
- VP- Compton Center	17-20
- Chair- Curriculum	21-25
- VP- Educational Policies	26-36
- VP- Faculty Development	37-45
- VP- Finance	46-49
- VP- Legislative Action	
IV. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES	
- Accreditation	
- Calendar	
- Enrollment Management	
- SLOs	
- Technology	
V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	
- Title 5 Certificate Name Change	25
- BP & AP 4231 (2nd reading)	26-32
VI. NEW BUSINESS	
- BP 4045 (1st reading)	33-36
- BP & AP 2510: Discussion	50-51
- Sabbatical Leave	
VII. AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING	
VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT	
IX. ADJOURN	

Academic Senate Meeting Schedule – 2007-08

12:30pm-2pm, Alondra Room

Fall

- September 4
- September 18
- October 2,
- October 16
- November 6,
- November 20
- December 4

Spring

- February 19
- March 4
- March 18
- April 1
- April 15
- May 6
- May 20
- June 3

CEC Faculty Council Meeting Schedule 2007-2008

2:00-3:00, CEC Board Room

Fall

- Sept 6
- September 20
- October 4
- October 18
- November 15
- December 6
-
-

Spring

- February 21, 2008
- March 6, 2008
- March 20, 2008
- April 3, 2008
- April 17, 2008
- May 8, 2008
- May 21,2008
- June 5, 2008

Committees

Senate

<u>NAME</u>	<u>CHAIR</u>	<u>DAY</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>ROOM</u>
<u>ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY</u>	Jim Noyes, Virginia Rapp			
<u>COMPTON FACULTY COUNCIL</u>	Saul Panski	Thursdays	2:00-3:00	CEC Board
<u>CURRICULUM</u>	Janet Young	2 nd & 4 th Tues.		
<u>EDUCATION POLICIES</u>	Evelyn Uyemura	1 st & 3 rd Thur	12:45-1:45	MBBM 131
<u>LEGISLATIVE ACTION</u>	Chris Wells	1 st Thursday	12:45 – 1:30	

Campus

<u>ACCREDITATION</u>	Arvid Spor, Susie Dever			
<u>BOARD OF TRUSTEES</u>	William Beverly	Mondays	4:30	Board
<u>CALENDAR</u>	Jeanie Nishime, Francisco Arce			
<u>CAMPUS TECHNOLOGY</u>	John Wagstaff	Wednesdays		
<u>COLLEGE COUNCIL</u>	Tom Fallo	Mondays	1:00-2:00	Adm. 127
<u>DEAN'S COUNCIL</u>	Francisco Arce	Thursdays		
<u>ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT</u>				
<u>FACULTY DEVELOPMENT</u>	Dave Vakil	2 nd & 4 th Tues	12:45 – 2:00	ADM 127
<u>PLANNING & BUDGETING</u>	Arvid Spor, ???	1 st & 3 rd Thur	1:00 – 2:30	Alondra
<u>SLOs</u>	Jenny Simon, Lars Kjeseth			

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

September 18, 2007

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

Behavioral & Social Sciences

Brown, Maria X

Cannon, Elaine X

Gold, Christina

Widman, Lance X

Wynne, Michael X

Business

Halamka, Dagmar

Miller, Tim

Thompson, Jacquie

Shepard Jacobson X

Counseling

Beley, Kate X

Gaines, Ken X

Raufman, Lisa X

Fine Arts

Ahmadpour, Ali X

Berney, Dan

Davidson, Jason X

Georges, William

Wells, Chris X

Crossman, Mark

Health Sciences & Athletics

Van Lue, Nick / Hazell, Tom

Orton, Tory/Victoria (sharing) X

Sinopoli, Louis / Makaru, Roy

Stanbury, Corey

Kim Bailly (sharing)

Humanities

Hong, Lyman X

Marcoux, Pete X

Uyemura, Evelyn X

Industry & Technology

Cafarchia, Vic

Hofmann, Ed X

Marston, Doug X

Rodriguez, George

Learning Resources Unit

Dever, Susan X

Striepe, Claudia X

Mathematical Sciences

Ghyam, Massoud X

Scott, Greg

Tummers, Susan X

Marc Glucksman X

Natural Sciences

Cowell, Chas X

Golestaneh, Kamran

Palos, Teresa X

Vakil, David X

Adjunct Faculty

Almos, Carolyn

Robertson, Gary X

Ex Officio Attendees: Janet Young, Francisco Arce, Jeanie Nishime

Guests and/Other Officers:: Estina Pratt(CEC), Jenny Simon, Vincent Armstrong, Arthur Fleming(CEC), Darwin Smith (CEC), Susan Zareski, Arvid Spor

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

The second Academic Senate meeting of the Fall 2007 semester was called to order at 12:33pm.

Pete Marcoux apologized for the tone of the last meeting which he thought may have seemed overly aggressive toward VPAA Dr. Arce.

Minutes

Approval of last Minutes

Corrections to the Minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of 4th Sept. 2007 were noted: Evelyn Uyemura noted that the minutes read as if the Educational Policies Committee were in agreement with, or behind, the decision have separate Student and Faculty sections within BP 2510. In fact, this is a decision made by Administration.

Lance Widman noted that the Planning and Budget Committee was called by differing acronyms, and that it should be the PBC.

With those corrections, a motion was passed to approve the minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of Sept. 4th, 2007.

President's report – Pete Marcoux (henceforth PM)

PM asked that members talk with colleagues in their respective Divisions. A decision re: the Facilities Master Plan will be made at the next Board meeting on October 21st. There will be an open meeting on Sept. 25th to discuss the master Plan and the options will also be explained. [pg.9 of packet] Susie Dever noted that the Facilities Committee had examined the plan, and that the Committee was recommending Option B. Option B would maximize State dollars and extend the life of our Bond. We were reminded that our concern should be focused on what would be best for student success and learning. A question was raised about when El Camino would find out about additional State funding. Dr. Arce replied that all identified projects were eligible for additional State funding, and that the sooner we made a decision on which option to go for, the sooner decisions at the State level could be made. Susie Tummers noted that it was unfair to find out about the open meeting a mere week in advance when many faculty were already overburdened with meetings. What was the rush to get the decisions to the Board? The reply was that construction costs are rising at the rate of one and a half percent per month. PM agreed that the timing issue was a concern, but that the other factors were mitigating factors. PM said that he was the Faculty representative to the Board, and Angela Simon was the Union representative. He is struggling with the issue of how to represent the faculty. He does not necessarily know how the faculty at large feels on the issues, and therefore how to vote on their behalf. PM asked if anyone else wished to serve as Faculty representative. It was noted that new information would be available on the Facilities web page.

PM wondered whether the Academic Senate was the proper forum for a discussion on BP2510. PM thought perhaps a Town Hall meeting for the general College body might be more appropriate. Chris Wells thought a meeting dedicated to this topic would be desirable.

Roster

PM said that Claudia Striepe was helping him with the Roster, and for members to note any changes, resignations, etc on the attendance sheet, or to tell CS in person.

Associated Student Organization report - Vincent Armstrong (VA), Susan Zareski (SZ).

VA asked whether the Senate would get to the question of BP 2510. Evelyn Uyemura noted that the Educational Policies Committee does not have a draft document at this time.

Compton Education Center report – Saul Panski (SP), Estina Pratt (EP)

EP noted that SP could not be present and she shared an email from SP which noted the following:

- The Compton Education Center (henceforth CEC) met about Basic Skills. There are supplemental funds of between \$60,000 and \$70,000 for Basic Skills to be split between the two campuses.
- Division Chairs met at a Retreat last Friday to discuss issues.
- Plans were being made for a summit.
- CEC is working diligently on their responses for FCMAT.
- There had been a campus meeting with the Provost – one issue had been discussion about the Basic Skills money.
- Special Trustee Landsbeger (spelling?) had proposed an amendment to the Faculty Hiring Policy. El Camino is in favour of this, but CEC faculty want the same rights as ECC faculty. If ECC has representatives on CEC hiring committees, then CEC wants to have CEC representatives on ECC hiring committees.

Curriculum Committee report – Janet Young (JY)

[pg. 21 of packet]

JY met with the Deans regarding Certificate changes and the Curriculum Review Timeline. At the first Curriculum Committee meeting the committee reviewed the Timeline for Fall submission, reviewed Title V Certificate changes, a data entry staff position was approved, there was an overview of the Curriculum Handbook, and reviewed and approved Fine Arts non- credit courses.

JY, Dr. Rapp and Quajuana Chapman participated in the Stand Alone Course Approval Certificate Training. This allows CCC's to locally approve stand alone courses instead of submitting them to the State office for approval. Colleges must be recertified each year and the process will be reevaluated in 2010.

Credit Certificates of more than 18 units must be approved by the system Office and are to be renamed Certificates of Achievement. ECC currently offers 57 Certificates of Competence and 74 Certificates of Completion. JY shared this chart of Certificates completed by 10 or more students:

<p>Competence (3.0 GPA): Fire Academy – 38 Paramedical Technician – 30 Paralegal Studies – 10 Sign Lang Inter Training – 20 (98)</p>	<p>Completion (2.0 GPA): Administration of Justice – 17 Air Cond & Refrigeration – 10 Accounting – 11 Cosmetology – 42 Paramedical Technician – 18 Radiologic Technician – 14 Respiratory Care – 14 (126)</p>
--	--

Educational Policies Report – Evelyn Uyemura (EU)

[See pg. 26 of the package + handout]

EU noted that this will be the first reading of BP 4231. This Policy passed last Spring, but the Committee was requested to add a phrase and change some wording. When approved, it was on an emergency basis and just the Policy went through. EU felt that the Policy and Procedures should be approved as a Unit, as there was so much pertinent information in the Procedures. BP 4231 covers the needs of students wishing to obtain a grade change. There must be a compelling reason for a grade change to be made, documentation must be present, and a faculty member would make the final decision. Please look at this version and we will vote at the next meeting. EU next spoke on BP 2510 aka Participation in Local Decision Making, aka Shared Governance. This policy spells out how all stakeholders on campus have a voice. The College Council had asked that the policy be revised to include a student voice. On looking at the policy the Committee realized that the language pertaining to the Faculty was also vague. The Committee decided to clarify both faculty and student areas. The faculty and students have many areas of common concern, but faculty have primacy over students, and this must be clearly stated. President Fallo suggested that it might be better to keep the language intentionally vague, but the Educational Policies Committee does not agree. The Committee is not against including the student voice, but feels the primacy of the faculty voice must be stated. It appears that the Educational Policies Committee and the Academic Senate are holding up the process, but this is not the case as versions of this Policy have been sent on to College Council and the Board and nothing has happened or they have been rejected.

The Associated Student representatives asked whether the Education Policies committee could treat it as two separate issues? Discussion followed. The Educational Policies committee would not want to recommend a policy that would not cover and protect faculty needs while still recognizing the rights of students. Both students and faculty want a clear voice in decision making. Lance Widman noted that we might need a Federation of Teacher representative at the meetings. EU said that there had been a representative for the meetings concerning the draft that was rejected. Chris Wells asked whether the process and language was in compliance with the law. Doug Marston noted that some language definitely got changed over time. It was repeated that a campus- wide meeting might be desirable.

Faculty Development Committee report– David Vakil (DV)

DV reported that the committee met last week and discussed the following items:

- Focusing on developing the skills and abilities of part- time faculty.
- Videotaping faculty development activities so that other staff can participate vicariously later. For instance, the recent TEP program was videotaped.
- Starting a “Teaching Book of the Semester” book club.
- Pushing Basic Skills development.
- Improving morale

DV used Clickers to poll the Academic Senate opinion on some Staff Development and morale building ideas. The results showed that as concerns faculty development, the Academic Senate members were in favor of implementing teacher mentoring and training on campus. As far as improving morale on campus the academic Senate members were in favor of mixers (not alcoholic beverages) for all employees.

Dave will take these results back to the committee for discussion.

Upcoming meeting ideas include:

- Arranging a reunion of past Great Teachers Seminars attendees.
- Resurrecting the faculty eating area.

- Developing faculty liaisons for each Department.
- Continue discussion of the Faculty Development budget with the Staff Development Office.

The committee meets in Admin 127 on the 2nd and 4th Tuesdays of the month.

Finance and Special Projects/ PBC (Planning and Budgeting Committee) – Lance Widman (LW)
[pg. 35 – of the packet]

LW reported that the PBC had been going through and that the PBC had recommended the Board approve the budget as proposed.

Council of Deans Meetings report – Lance Widman (LW)
[pg.39 & p.41 of packet]

LW reported that Accreditation was the primary topic of the meeting of August 16, 2007. The topic of discussion for the September 6th meeting was the Enrollment Management Plan. LW again drew attention to the Community College Initiative as this issue will be important to Community Colleges as regards fees and funding. LW urged faculty to remind students to register to vote soon.

Legislative Action report – Chris Wells (CW)

CW reported further on the Community College Initiative. The CTA will remain neutral on this issue, while the CCA will support the issue. Three Bills are under discussion: AB 906 – Compliance with the 50% Law (Salaries), AB 1305 – Compliance with the 75% Law (Hours of Credit Instruction), and AB 1423 – Uniform Application of Salary Schedule.

Student Learning Outcomes – Lars Kjeseth (LK) & Jenny Simon (JS)

JS highlighted progress made. The End of Semester report is on p.58 of the packet. At the end of last semester there was a big push to get SLO proposals, and currently there are over 90 SLO's and Assessment plans on campus, with 10 SLO's assessed last semester. Linda Gallucci (formerly Arroyo) from Student Services has been appointed a new SLO coordinator. Future goals include attending the Strengthening Student Success Conference, in San Jose. A team of 12 to 14 are going. This team will then pass the information on to the faculty at a series of Assessment Weeks. The first Assessment Week is set for October 22 – 26th. Another goal is to find an "electronic home" for SLO's. Currently there is a binder in each Division office. Finally JS and LK wish to keep the process moving by integrating SLO's into other campus processes like Program Review.

Calendar Committee – Lyman Hong (LH)

LH reported that the Summer hours for 2008 had been approved. The first 6 weeks will run from 6/16 through 7/24, the second six weeks will run from 6/23 through 7/31, and the eight week sessions will run from 6/23 through 8/14. Still under consideration is whether to eliminate the Winter session and instead implement two back-to-back six week Summer sessions. If you wish to comment on this please email lhong@elcamino.edu

VPAA Dr. Arce noted that Winter session had grown at the expense of Spring semester enrollment in the last two years. Dr Arce said that there was talk of building a stronger 8 week

foundation in the Spring and Fall semesters. Emily Rader proposed continuing the discussion at the next meeting as there was quite a bit of useful material that could be shared with the Senate members. Lisa Raufman asked about the process the Calendar committee follows and said that their minutes should be available. PM requested that the committee get the minutes to him early for inclusion in the packet.

Academic Technology Committee – Pete Marcoux, Michael Wynne

There will be a meeting of this committee on September 27th in Library 202..

Accreditation – Arvid Spor (AS) & Susan Dever (SD)

No report.

Enrollment Management – Francisco Arce & Jeanie Nishime

Dr Arce asked that the Senate look at the list of the seven subcommittees working on the Enrollment Management Plan. [p.55+ of packet] These committees were established as a result of the three retreats that were held in the late Spring and have not yet had much chance to enroll faculty. Please contact the committees if you wish to join.

Unfinished Business

New Business

Janet Young reported on a memo sent to all Deans and Directors [p. 21 of packet] concerning TitleV revisions for Certificates. Certificates of Competence and Certificates of Completion must hence forth be known as Certificates of Achievement. Currently we have Certificates of Competence for which students must have a GPA of 3.0, and Certificates of Completion for which students must have a GPA of 2.0. We awarded 155 Certif. of Competence and 190 Certif. of Completion last year. Some discussion followed. The graduation requirement for the Certificates is 2.0 GPA. If we rename the certificates we would need to decide on one GPA. Dr. Nishime said that the minimum threshold is a local decision and we could peg any GPA we liked. If we made it lower than 3.0 some Certificates would need to be excluded (for instance the Paralegal Certificate) as the outside agencies insist on a 3.0 GPA. Think about these issues and the discussion will be continued at the next Senate meeting

Administrative Procedure 4231 – Grade Change [p.27 of packet] had its first reading at the Academic Senate. The next packet will have a fuller version. This is a procedure for students to follow. Only faculty members can change grades. Administration would not be involved. We will vote on this issue at the next meeting.

Announcements

PM requested that everyone share the activities and concerns of the Academic Senate with their Division colleagues.

Susie Dever thanked part time faculty Senate members Gary Robertson and Carolyn Almos for their participation.

Agenda Items for Next Meeting

The Calendar issue.

Sabbatical Leave Policy.

The election of adjunct members – call for names.

PM announced that CS would be helping with the Roster. Please forward changes and corrections to the roster to Claudia at cstriepe@elcamino.edu

Meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm.

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Office of the President
Minutes of the College Council Meeting September 17, 2007

Present: Ms. Amezcua, Dr. Arce, Dr. Dever, Mr. Donnell, Dr. Fallo, Mr. Marcoux, Dr. Marsee, Mr. Middleton, Dr. Nishime, Ms. Pickens, Mr. Robertson, Ms. Smith, and Dr. Spor.

1. President Fallo met with Evelyn Uyemura regarding Board Policy 2510 – Collegial Consultation. This will also be discussed in the Academic Senate meeting tomorrow. President Fallo reports that he will bring the student portion to the Board as 2510.1.
2. Responsibilities for Administering Functions and Operations at the El Camino College Compton Community Educational Center – Working Draft dated June 6, 2007 – was distributed last week. We have an outdated contract with Compton Community College District (CCCD) and the Chancellor’s Office. The parts of the contract that are out of date deal primarily with the fiscal side.
3. There was a question about having a Compton Center representative sit on College Council. It might be appropriate for a Compton Center student to participate. College Council can discuss this further.
4. The College Council Evaluation results will be sent out via e-mail this week for discussion at the next meeting.
5. The \$3 million Special Project Funding 2007-08 was distributed. There is concern that we are getting used to depending on this money.
6. The 2008-2009 Calendar Committee Proposal was distributed. This proposal will be taken to the Board in October.
7. The Portal Committee listing was reviewed. The Vice Presidents will report back on status of Division Councils in their area.
8. Mr. Middleton – There were 70 Compton faculty in attendance at the Compton Flex presentation of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace. The California Community College Registry job fair will be at the LAX Hilton on January 26, 2008 and will be at the San Francisco Marriott on February 2, 2008. The Del Fox Annual Humanitarian Scholarship event is April 3, 2008.
9. Ms. Amezcua – ASO had a welcome back barbeque – which increased ASB sticker sales. There will be a meet and greet this Wednesday at the ASO office to give students an opportunity to meet their student leaders.
10. Mr. Marcoux – the Academic Senate agenda includes Title V changes, Policy 4231 - Grade Change, and Procedure 2510 – Collegial Consultation.
11. Mr. Donnell – the CFT (California Federation of Teachers) is pushing the Community College Initiative. The ECCFT has given a donation – but they are asking that El Camino College donate \$40,000.
12. Ms. Smith – there was a unity activity – Dodger Game with representatives from all groups. Next event is the October 20th picnic and hike.

Agenda for the September 24, 2007 Meeting:

1. Minutes of September 17, 2007
2. Board Policy 2510.1 - Student Participation in Local Decision Making
3. 2006-2007 College Council Evaluation
4. 2006-2007 Goal Review
5. 2007-2008 Goals

**El Camino College – Office of the President
Facilities Steering Committee
September 17, 2007**

Present: Francisco Arce, Rocky Bonura, Tom Brown, Susie Dever, Thomas Fallo, Bob Gann, Bruce Hoerning, Tom Lew, Pete Marcoux, Jeff Marsee, Leo Middleton, Jeanie Nishime, Barbara Perez, Susan Pickens, Gary Robertson, Angela Simon, Luukia Smith, and Arvid Spor.

Also present: Jim Rogers – Maas Companies
Deborah Shepley – tBP Architecture

- I. Minutes of July 24, 2007 were approved with one correction.
- II. Facilities Master Plan Options – Bob Gann & Debra Shepley – the options presented at the last meeting were reviewed again. Bob Gann provided the following information, along with projected costs for each proposed plan.

A. Planning Assumptions

El Camino College has the ability to move funding between categories for work that was included in the 2002 Plan. This was verbally confirmed by our attorney and will be received in writing.

The Facilities Master Plan's (FMP) income and expenditures will be balanced based upon Measure E and State funding solely. This will be accomplished by the following measures:

1. Allocating contingencies,
2. Allocating unbudgeted income (interest & refunding)
3. Reallocating surplus from projects being completed under budget,
4. Deleting undefined scope projects,
5. Reducing the scope of some projects to what can be accomplished by the current budget amount.

The discretionary funding available from measures one through four is \$89 million.

\$52 million of this funding will be allocated first to those projects which are either high District priorities or necessary to complete an entire sector of the campus. The following projects meet the above criteria.

1. Parking Structure
2. Infrastructure

3. Bookstore Cafeteria Conversion
4. Business Building Replacement
5. Administration Renovation

The remaining funding will be used to support the chosen option for modification of the FMP. When realized, funding from additional sources will be used to augment Measure E funding or increase the scope of related projects.

B. Clarification

- a. Priority Projects – there was a question as to why items 3, 4, and 5 are listed as priorities when they were not identified previously. It was reported that Business has always been in the A-1 category. The bookstore/cafe conversion is needed to finish the humanities mall portion of project. The administration renovation is needed for the demolition portion of project.
- b. State Funding – The System Office will inform us in December which projects they view as likely candidates for funding and give direction to go ahead with proposals.

- III. Flex Day Comments – A lot of Math people were at the presentation. It was decided to have another facilities presentation for the campus to answer any questions people might have. The presentation will be Tuesday, September 25th from 1-2:00 p.m. in the Campus Theatre. A memo will be sent out to the campus community with a link providing all documents distributed at this meeting, and the last two sets of minutes. The memo will indicate that the committee is strongly leaning towards option B. Deborah Shepley and Bob Gann will facilitate this meeting.
- IV. The next Facilities Steering Committee Meeting: Monday, October 1st at 2:15 p.m. in the Board Room.

Facilities Master Plan Forum, September 25, 2007

Forum Questions

Q. The slide before also shows state project funding. What is the difference between top and bottom numbers --is that Measure E and local funding?

A. The top set of numbers is the total plan cost with combination of local and state funding to build option. The lower set of numbers is local cost compared to available funding from Measure E.

Q. The local project funding – is that a controlled amount of money?

A. It is the total amount of funding available from Measure E. There is approximately \$80 million spent to this point.

Q. Looking at options – Health Sciences & Athletics isn't in any one of those options - does that mean that some projects have been eliminated?

A. No we have not eliminated other projects and those are still within project plans.

That is the total amount of Measure E funding and the other is total cost per option including other options previously on the list.

Q. What are dynamics of state funding?

A. We are fairly confident on Option B that there is an 80% chance that we will receive funding for one project - and a 50% chance that we will receive funding for two projects. State funding itself is an open question.

Q. On Option B - the phrase was used “Student Service Center remains the same” does that mean – renovate inside only? What does not need to be redesigned?

A. Under this option the replacement of Student Service Center and Student Activity Center is still possible.

Q. Student Activity Center - would that mean that counseling offices be redesigned?

- A. It is not relevant to either option. If it is a replacement building we largely have substantial planning and construction documents completed on that project.
- Q. For any of these new buildings has the architecture been designed? For example is there an option for five stories instead of three?
- A. Right now buildings are just conceptual.
- Q. Can you summarize which options would result in more parking space?
- A. Yes, Option B adds a large parking area on the north side. Options B-1 and C also have more parking on the north side.
- Q. For all these options -- are these buildings or just boxes?
- A. Other than the Student Service Center, there has been no work done on architecture and the buildings are just boxes right now. The Business/Math “box” represents a three story building. But that is as far as the planning has gone at this time.
- No matter where the Student Service Center goes the design is set. The architecture design would depend upon location but there will be no change in space.
- Q. When did we get to the too much building phase where it would impact our cap/load ratio? What happens when you eliminate a building?
- A. With Option B there is a reduction in square footage – there is nothing in the project that increases square footage again. This is viewed as a positive from the State’s perspective.
- Q. What about the location for Info-tech and Math & Computer Sciences throughout these moves?
- A. Related to the component in Communications-- will be relocated adjacent to other computer functions in Math & Computer Science building in mass space from move out from math functions. The exact location is not known.

Q. With all the construction increases how much of an increase has been factored into these options?

A. There is an inflation increase of 10% factored in per year until acquisition.

Q. What does Technology mean?

A. The consolidation of a number of computer labs – primarily that is the technology component.

Q. You said that with Plan B there is an 80% chance that we would receive state funding for two projects. Are you prepared for increases if we don't get the funding?

A. Option B leaves stopping points along the way if state funding is not received. The College is actively pursuing state funding at this time.

Q. Option B technology consolidation – Option B would not have any technology component?

A. Computer labs that support math would be located in Business/Math building – but we would not consolidate any other labs in that building.

Comment: There is a concern that in the Business/Math building the lab space is going to be tight because new construction is smaller in size than existing buildings. Sufficient numbers of labs and open access facilities is a concern. Many labs in Business and Math are very heavily used --not all but many.

Response: We would agree that is a negative association with Option C. One of the detriments of state funding is that you follow state guidelines for building.

Q. With Option A or B – has there been any discussion of combining administration building Student Service Center and opening the administration building for parking?

- A. Yes, that had been discussed, but that would make the building more expensive. We are also trying to keep parking off that end of campus so you see the edge of campus rather than parking.

Comment: We get a lot of visitors – that ask where is the administration building – and they say they want to enroll. I am under the impression that we may be one of the only campuses that does not enroll in the administration building.

Response: For other campuses – the majority of student service centers are separate from administration. The first time student on campus is typically looking for admissions or student service center as opposed to administration.

Q. What happens next?

- A. The Facilities Steering Committee will be making a recommendation to the President – who would then make a recommendation to the Board.

Comment: We are trying to get as much input from faculty – that is the purpose of this forum. The Facilities Steering Committee is in favor of Option B. The committee wants some input so they can make recommendation to the President. Everyone has a representative on this committee – and has tried to get input. This is how the Collegial Consultation process has been working.

Q. If Math building moves out to a combined Math/Business building will the old Math building be renovated extensively?

- A. It would be renovated extensively similar to Natural Sciences.

Q. There is a concern about shops being consolidated into parking lot – that footprint would fit into current outside shop area – would this hold four programs plus tool and technology into one building?

- A. Machine and tool technology would remain in Math building. Option B1 would be smaller. Deborah has identified non usable space – the existing shops have the most unusable space. The new plan has more usable space. A study area could be designed in new building if needed.

Q. What is the date of completion for Option B?

A. 2014.

Comment/Question to audience: Are there any student success/learning issues that anyone has here for Option B?

Q. Traffic flow pattern was one concern that came up on flex day with the three story Business/Math building. This would be a very used building in corner. Did the Committee talk about those concerns?

A. Yes, Business/Math would be a high use building that would accommodate a large amount of students. Most of the parking is located on that side of the campus. We are also constructing a parking structure on that area of campus. The distance is shorter to the new building than to current math building—so we will be shortening the walk for some.

Q. Right now there is a problem with the Student Service Center elevators. Is there a back up elevator plan for new buildings?

A. Yes that is one of the key components for new buildings.

requires students to participate in political campaigns of candidates of their choice does not constitute participation in a political campaign by the institution.¹

Similarly, providing office space, financial support, and a faculty advisor for a campus newspaper that publishes students' editorial opinions on political matters does not constitute an attempt by the university to participate in political campaigns on behalf of candidates for public office.² Instead, the Internal Revenue Service has viewed these types of activities as serving the university's tax-exempt educational purposes.

As part of their educational mission, colleges and universities provide a forum for a wide variety of speakers. There can be no more appropriate site for the discussion of controversial ideas and issues than a college or university campus. Candidates for public office may speak on campus, as may their supporters or opponents, so long as the institution does not administer its speakers program in a manner that constitutes intervention in a campaign. Invitations made to outside speakers by students or faculty do not imply approval or endorsement by the institution of the views expressed by the speaker. Consistent with the prohibition on political activities, colleges and universities can specify that no member of the academic community may speak for or act on behalf of the college or university in a political campaign. Institutions may also clearly affirm that sponsorship of a speaker or a forum does not constitute endorsement of the views expressed.

Robert C. Post (Law), Yale University
Mary L. Heen (Law), University of Richmond
Subcommittee

Endnotes

1. Revenue Ruling 72-512, 1972-2 Cumulative Bulletin 246. [Back to text](#)
 2. Revenue Ruling 72-513, 1972-2 Cumulative Bulletin 246. [Back to text](#)
- [Printer-Friendly Page](#)

**ACADEMIC SENATE
COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

AGENDA

Academic Senate Meeting
Thursday, September 20, 2007, 1:00 pm, Board

Room

Every effort will be made to start promptly. and adjourn at 2:00 p.m. All items not covered will be carried over to the next agenda.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

IV. REPORTS

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| A. President's Report | Saul Panski |
| B. Faculty Rep Report | Dr. Art Flemming |
| C. Shared Governance Comm. Rep | Darwin Smith |
| D. Student Rep | Fredwill Hernandez |

V, DISCUSSION ITEMS

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| A. District Plan for FCMAT Compliance | Rachelle Sasser |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|

VI. ACTION ITEMS

VII. ADJOURNMENT

**MINUTES
OF THE
EL CAMINO COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE
COMPTON CENTER FACULTY COUNCIL**

**HELD IN THE BOARD ROOM
September 6, 2007**

MEMBERS PRESENT: **18 members present:**
Saul Panski, Dr. August Hoffman, Estina Pratt, Dr. Arthur
Flemming, Darwin Smith, Susie Dever, Jerome
Evans, Shemiran Lazar, Manzoor Ahmad, Marjeritta
Philips, Shirley Thomas, Pamella West, Leonard Clark,
Chris Halligan, Fredwill Hernandez, Jose Bernaudo,
Thomas Norton, Mike Odanaka

MEMBERS ABSENT: **4 members absent:**
Annaruth Garcia, Walter Bently, Tom Rydalch,
Mohammed Bouroudjerdi

ADMINISTRATORS PRESENT: **6 administrators present:**
Dr. Doris Givens, Rachelle Sasser, Wanda Morris, Fred
Sturner, Ricky Shabazz, Keith Curry

VISITORS PRESENT: **5 visitors present:**
Rodney Murray, Dr. Silvia Arroyo, Aurora Cortez-Perez,
Axa Maradiaga, Nehasi Lee

29 IN ATTENDANCE

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Saul Panski at 2:00 p.m. Fred Sturner was asked to answer questions about getting enough chairs for the classrooms that were in need of them. A discussion about the need ensued and Fred Sturner assured the Council that chair needs will be met.

Estina Pratt alerted Saul Panski that the meeting was out of order as rules were not being followed. August Hoffman asked that an item about Load Balancing be added to the agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Darwin Smith/Tom Norton moved/seconded that the agenda be approved. The agenda was approved.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no Council minutes to approve.

IV. REPORTS

ECC Academic Senate

Susie Dever from ECC reported that at their last Senate meeting Dr. Art Flemming was forceful and very impressive in his participation at the El Camino Budget Commission. She impressed upon the Council that we are to set goals for the year, and that we should increase the liason between the two campuses. She stated that she will report to the Council on Committees she serves on. Student Nahasi Lee asked how students at CEC can serve on Shared Governance Councils. Susie replied that if the opportunity arises, students will serve, and noted that most meetings are open meetings. She also mentioned that the two ASBs can get together and articulate this.

Saul Panski introduced Ricky Shabazz, Director of Outreach at CEC. We were given an update on the latest recruitment efforts being done at Compton especially this past Summer. Some of these included bus and radio ads, meetings with high school counselors, meetings with Church and civic leaders, a page on My Space, etc. Ricky passed out some recruitment materials that his office has been circulating in the communities we serve.

Keith Curry thanked everyone for their involvement with recruitment. He noted that those efforts have paid off resulting in a 146.1% increase in enrollment figures. Mr. Curry mentioned that at the last community meeting, the citizens were very receptive. He wanted the campus to know that Mr. Shabazz has been out there. Mr. Shabazz pointed out that he has been going after students aggressively, correcting negative images of Compton with his Outreach Teams. He said progress is being made. Currently he is going out to the schools so that those students can take advantage of the different programs that we have to offer. He asks for the Senate's support. A discussion followed and Darwin Smith thanked Ricky Shabazz for all the hard work. A question and answer period followed.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Dr. Hoffman informed the Senate that the football field is not being used by the team for games as the field is full of holes. He noted that the Homecoming Game is not going to be on the campus because of this. Homecoming Game should be held on campus. He also noted that we have new gym equipment but cannot be installed as \$25,000 worth of modifications has to be made to the equipment room.

Dr. Pieter Van Niel, reported on the Little Theater proposed renovation. He said that the Little Theater Program has a strong record of success, but since 1999, there have been no real theater programs as the program is awaiting remodeling. He displayed the proposed modifications to the building with a model display.

Mr. Fred Sturner, commented that remodeling would have a band-aid effect, and that we should look at the big picture. We should put a budget together and then set priorities for what must be done.

Dr. Callahan commented that the campus is now a different place, and that we should start planning a new Master Plan. We cannot be thinking in the past. A resolution to support the remodeling of the Little Theater was introduced and handed out for a vote. There were 6 ayes and 3 absentiasThe resolution for support passed the Senate.

Saul Panski informed Dr. Givens about the passing of the resolution, and that the Senate would be expecting a response. This item would be brought up in two weeks for further discussion. Mr. Panski also apologized to Dr. Van Niel for lack of time and thanked him for his continued passion.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn moved/seconded (Mansoor Ahmad/Dr. Art Flemming) to adjourn at 3:07 p.m.

Faithfully Submitted by Estina Pratt



October 2, 2007

Date: September 12, 2007
To: Academic Senate, Deans, and Directors
From: Janet Young, College Curriculum Committee Chair
Regarding: Discussion Regarding Title 5 Revisions for Certificates

Revisions to Title 5 became effective in August 2007. One of the revisions requires that we cease using the term Certificate of Competence and Certificate of Completion for credit certificates. An approved certificate must now be referred to as a Certificate of Achievement only. The changes must be reflected in the 2008-2009 Catalog, therefore, they must be brought to the Curriculum Committee this semester. In order to move them forward we need to decide on the criteria for this certificate. These changes will be discussed at the Senate meeting on Tuesday, September 18, 2007. I encourage you to inform your faculty so that they can be part of the decision-making process.

I have included a grid showing all of certificates that we offer, whether it is a certificate of competence or completion, if the requirements are the same for the certificates, and if it as low unit certificate (which will require a name change to Certificate of Recognition) in the near future. For the purpose of expediency, the Curriculum Committee will be entertaining the credit certificates first.

Current Wording in the 2007-2008 Catalog, page 37.

The Certificate of Competence or the Certificate of Completion will be evaluated according to the following conditions:

1. Catalog requirement - Certificate requirements are derived from the catalog in effect at the time the student entered El Camino College or from the current catalog, following the Catalog Rights guidelines. (Please refer to the Associate Degree section of this catalog). Each catalog is in effect during the academic year for which it is published (falls semester through the summer session). **Note: This can remain the same.**
2. Residency requirement - Individual certificates specifically state the required number of units that must be completed at El Camino College. **Note: This can remain the same.**
3. A Certificate of Competence is awarded to students who complete the prescribed program with a B average.
4. A Certificate of Completion is awarded to students who complete the prescribed program with a C average

Numbers 3 and 4 will need to be combined into one statement. According to Title 5, this is a local decision.

Here are three options to facilitate the discussion:

Option 1: A Certificate of Achievement is awarded to students who complete the prescribed program with a B average.

Option 2: A Certificate of Achievement is awarded to students who complete the prescribed program with a C average.

Option 3: A Certificate of Achievement is awarded to students who complete the prescribed program with a grade of C in each course.

Note: In some cases, such as with Paralegal Studies, a B average is required. If it is decided that only certain Certificates of Achievement (that have mandates from outside agencies) will require a B average, we will need to add a statement to that effect.

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE**

1102 Q STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95811-6549
(916) 445-8752
[HTTP://WWW.CCCCO.EDU](http://www.cccco.edu)



September 19, 2007

TO: Chief Executive Officers

FROM: Steven Bruckman
Executive Vice Chancellor and General Counsel

SUBJECT: **Significant Changes to Curriculum Regulations**

As you know, at its July 2007 meeting, the Board of Governors made a number of changes to its curriculum regulations affecting such topics as course and program approval, curriculum standards, standards of scholarship, and requirements for the associate degree. In many instances, the changes were nonsubstantive, including renumbering regulations for a more logical and accessible sequencing.

However, a number of substantive changes were also made. Two important areas of regulatory change affect stand-alone course approval at the local level and enhanced funding for certain noncredit courses. A full description of all changes was provided with the Board's July agenda item, including comments that describe the changes that were made and their significance.

The regulations took effect on August 16, 2007, so they are now binding on the districts. We have just received the updates to Barclays Official California Code of Regulations that reflect the new regulations. If you have a subscription to this service and have not yet received the updates, they should be arriving very soon.

Chancellor Woodruff wants to make your transition to the new regulations as easy as possible, so she has asked us to again summarize the more significant changes. This is not intended to be a comprehensive listing of changes; please consult the July 2007 Board agenda for a complete review.

Section 55000.5. Handbook; Monitoring and Review of Approved Courses and Programs.

This section incorporates the California Community Colleges Program and Course Approval Handbook as a Board regulation. While we expect that districts have always adhered to provisions in the Handbook, we want to point out that they now have the effect of regulation. Our Academic Affairs Unit is developing a revised Handbook, and we hope it will be ready for distribution in early 2008. That revised Handbook will provide detailed guidance on implementation of many of the regulations discussed below.

Section 55002.5. Credit Hour. The definition of a unit of college credit was amended to avoid reference to specific term lengths. The definition now more precisely describes the relationship of hours to units. A one-unit course requires a minimum of 48 hours of lecture, study, or laboratory work (on a semester system); a two-unit course requires a minimum 96 hours, etc.

Districts may need to confirm that the number of credit units assigned to various courses reflects this standard. A one-unit course that requires only 20 hours or that requires 98 hours would be problematic and should be reviewed.

Section 55007. Multiple and Overlapping Enrollments. This new provision prohibits the practice of students enrolling in two or more sections of the same credit course at the same time. It also outlines conditions for students who enroll in overlapping credit or noncredit courses, and verifies that there must be documentation confirming that overlapping time was made up. If districts allow students to enroll in overlapping courses, they will need to ensure that their Board-adopted attendance accounting procedures (required by title 5, section 58030) include the mechanism described in section 55007.

Section 55022. Pass-No Pass Options. The phrase “credit-no credit” has caused confusion with “noncredit,” so it was eliminated in favor of the phrase “pass-no pass.” To allow time to implement the new “P” and “NP” symbols, use of the “credit-no credit” terminology and symbols can continue until the Fall 2009 term. However, it is advisable for districts to start making the necessary changes to databases, catalogs, and other references as soon as possible.

Section 55024. Withdrawal. We clarified that a “W” is not appropriate if a student withdrew from a course because of discriminatory treatment or because he/she was subjected to retaliatory treatment for alleging discriminatory treatment. Because a “W” can negatively affect a student who merely withdrew to avoid exposure to the improper conduct, district nondiscrimination complaint processes should be coordinated with this section.

Section 55025. Grade Changes. New language addresses procedural problems which have arisen in past cases. In some instances, a student cannot initially request a grade change from an instructor because that person is unavailable or that person is alleged to have acted improperly towards the student (e.g., discriminated against the student). In such cases, a mechanism for an alternative and objective review must be provided.

Section 55040. District Policy for Course Repetition. The major change here is that a student is now allowed two repetitions, instead of one, to alleviate substandard grades.

Section 55041. Course Repetition Absent Substandard Academic Work. Language was added to clarify that a district can require a student to repeat a prerequisite course the student previously completed with a passing grade if there is a “recency” requirement for that prerequisite.

Section 55042. Course Repetition in Activity Courses. This section defines “activity courses” and codifies our previous administrative interpretation of repetition limitations. In particular, if several levels of courses consist of similar educational activities, the course repetition limitation applies to all levels of those courses. We also confirm that ESL courses and nondegree-applicable basic skills courses are not considered “activity courses,” so they are subject to the course repetition limits which apply to courses other than “activity” courses.

Section 55062. Types of Courses Appropriate to the Associate Degree. We removed ESL courses that teach composition skills from the definition of English courses. So long as ESL courses are accepted as transfer courses, they can be counted for the degree.

Section 55063. Minimum Requirements for the Associate Degree. The term “English 1A” has been replaced with the term “Freshman Composition,” and the regulation now allows an “area of emphasis” as an alternative to a “major” in a single discipline or related disciplines. The area of emphasis is intended to facilitate transfer by including lower division coursework preparing students for a field of study or major at UC or CSU. Effective Fall 2009, students must receive a C or better in each course counted toward their major or area of emphasis.

Section 55070. Credit Certificates. This section describes credit certificates and the approval required to authorize them. The term “certificate of achievement” must be used and reserved for the college-awarded document confirming that a student has completed a program consisting of 18 or more semester units or 27 or more quarter units of degree-applicable credit coursework. Colleges cannot use the term “certificate of achievement” for any other type of award they issue.

Section 55080. Adoption and Content of Plan. The requirement for annual updating of educational plans was removed. They must now be updated periodically or as deemed necessary by the governing board.

Section 55100. Course Approval. This section describes the circumstances under which districts may, until December 31, 2012, establish stand-alone courses without the approval of the Chancellor’s Office. It also implements the AB 1943 requirement that districts cannot use approval of stand-alone courses to establish new programs without obtaining approval from the Chancellor’s Office.

Section 55130. Approval of Credit Programs. The section spells out the kind of information that must be provided to the Chancellor’s Office in order to secure approval of credit programs.

Section 55151. Career Development and College Preparation. This section spells out the approval process for noncredit programs and course sequences for enhanced funding. The terms “certificate of completion” and “certificate of competency” are defined. Please note subdivision (h) which was specifically requested by the Department of Finance and which requires that a certificate of completion must identify the goals for the program or sequence of courses. Also note that this section sunsets on June 30, 2008, to allow for the possibility that future legislation may eliminate the requirement that all programs or sequences of courses eligible for enhanced funding must lead to a certificate.

Section 55152. Short-term Vocational Programs Providing 288 Hours or More of Instruction. This section describes the approval process for short-term vocational programs involving 288 hours or more of instruction.

Section 55153. Other Noncredit Programs Providing 288 Hours or More of Instruction. This section describes the approval process for noncredit programs in areas not eligible for enhanced funding where the program provides more than 288 hours of instruction.

Section 55154. Adult High School Diploma Programs. This section defines “high school diploma program,” describes the approval process for such programs, and confirms that they are eligible for enhanced funding if they satisfy the requirements of section 55151. There is no requirement that colleges use the CAHSEE.

Section 55155. Noncredit Certificates. This section provides that the terms “certificate of completion” and “certificate of competency” cannot be used for noncredit certificates that do not satisfy section 55151. The name changes take effect for the Fall 2008 term, but districts should begin now to rename existing certificates that do not meet those standards.

Section 55220. Excursions and Field Trips. Several revisions were made to the funding of excursions or field trips. Colleges can now use grant or categorical program funds or funds of an auxiliary organization to pay for student expenses if allowed by the funding source. The restriction on field trips or excursions where a student cannot afford to participate were removed for study abroad programs and those restrictions now relate only to field trips or excursions which are integral to completion of a course.

Section 55521. Prohibited Practices. This section lists prohibited assessment practices. It now allows use of specialized assessment instruments for nursing programs as authorized by Education Code section 78261.

Section 58161. Apportionment for Course Repetition. Attendance of students repeating a course to alleviate substandard academic work may now be claimed for apportionment three times--the original enrollment plus two repetitions. This same limit applies where a student is permitted to repeat a course by petition where substandard work was not recorded.

Section 58161.5. Apportionment for Re-enrollment after Withdrawal. Districts cannot claim apportionment for students who have previously received a “W” in the same course 4 or more times.

cc: Cabinet

September 14, 2007

To: Evelyn Uyemura, for Academic Senate

From: Don Goldberg, Dean

Re: Changes to Grade Change Procedure

A newly revised Title 5 §55025 requires three changes to the proposed procedure. I have attached the new language.

Section C.4. has been revised and broadened to comply with Title 5 §55025(c). In earlier drafts, we included provision for an alternate instructor when the instructor was unavailable. The Title 5 changes require the same provision in cases of possible discrimination and gross misconduct.

The original Section E. can be eliminated because the changed Title 5 §55025(c) allows “an alternative mechanism” to Ed Code section 76232, which the appeal process in our new procedure describes.

A new Section E explicitly provides for expunging of an incorrect grade. This is included in the procedure to comply with Title 5 §55025(d).

New Title 5 regulation on grade change

§ 55025. Grade Changes.

(a) In any course of instruction in a community college district for which grades are awarded, the instructor of the course shall determine the grade to be awarded each student in accordance with this article. The determination of the student's grade by the instructor shall be final in the absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency.

(b) For purposes of this section, "mistake" may include, but is not limited to, clerical errors and errors made by an instructor in calculating a student's grade.

(c) Procedures for the correction of grades shall be consistent with Education Code section 76232 or provide an alternative mechanism which will ensure that students receive a reasonable and objective review of the requested grade change. If the procedure requires the student to first request a grade change from the instructor, provisions shall be made for another faculty member to substitute for the instructor if the instructor is not available, the student has filed a discrimination complaint or the district determines that it is possible there has been gross misconduct by the original instructor.

(d) Procedures shall also include expunging the incorrect grade from the record.

(e) When grade changes are made as a result of course repetition in accordance with article 4 of this subchapter, appropriate annotations of any courses repeated shall be entered on the student's permanent academic record in such a manner that all work remains legible, insuring a true and complete academic history.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66700 and 70901, Education Code.

Reference: Sections 70901 and 76224, Education Code.

Board Policy 4231**Grade Change**

When grades are given for any course of instruction taught in the El Camino Community College District, the grade given to each student shall be the grade determined by the instructor of the course, and the determination of the student's grade by the instructor, in the absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency, shall be final.

A student who alleges that a grade in a course was given as a result of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency may appeal the grade within 18 months of the last day of the term in which the grade was given.

Procedures for appeal have been developed by the President/Superintendent or his designees in collegial consultation with the Academic Senate.

This policy supersedes the section of BP 4220 that deals with grade change procedures.

Citation: Education Code Sections 76224(a) and 76232; Title 5 Section 55760(a)

Ed. Policies 5/17/07

Academic Senate first reading 5/1/07

Academic Senate second reading 5/29/07

Revised 6/7/07

Needs to be re-presented to Senate

Administrative Procedures 4231**Grade Change**

Grades are determined by the instructor of a course. Both state law and college policy state that the determination of a grade by the instructor is final, in the absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency.

A. Grounds for requesting or appealing for a grade change.

A student can request or appeal for a grade change only if the grade is incorrect due to mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency.

B. Informal grade change request

If a student believes that a mistake was made in computing or recording a grade, he or she may contact the instructor directly to ask the instructor to review the grade records and make the correction. A mistake in a grade can be corrected by the instructor.

Occasionally, the student may prefer to ask the instructor's Dean rather than asking the instructor. However, the Dean may not change the grade in response to an informal request; only the instructor can order the grade change in response to an informal request and only if the request is made within the time limits set by this procedure.

B.1. Making the request

A student who believes that a grade is incorrect because of a mistake may inform the instructor of the course or the Dean who supervises the instructor. If the Dean is informed, he/she may discuss the request with the student and instructor, separately or together. The student may decline to meet with the instructor.

B.2. Time limit

An informal request for a grade change must be received in the Division Office no later than eighteen months after the last day of the term for which the grade was given.

B.3. Response to request

If the instructor agrees to change the grade, he/she may file a Grade Change Order with the Admissions and Records Office, explaining the change. The Grade Change Order requires the Dean to verify that the change is permitted by college policy. The Admissions and Records Office shall change the student's grade record and preserve a copy of the Grade Change Order. If the instructor decides not to change the grade, he/she should inform the student directly.

C. Grade Change Petition

A student may file a Grade Change Petition whether or not he/she has pursued an informal grade change request. Making an informal grade change request does not affect the time limit for filing a Grade Change Petition.

C.1. Filing a Grade Change Petition

A student who alleges that a grade in a course was given as a result of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency may file a Grade Change Petition with the Dean who supervises the instructor of the course, using the Grade Change Petition form. The student must state the grounds for the petition and include supporting documentation. The Grade Change Petition form is available at the offices of the instructional Deans and at the Admissions and Records office.

C.2. Time limit

A Grade Change Petition must be received by the appropriate instructional Dean no later than eighteen months after the last day of the term for which the grade was given.

C.3. Response to filing

Upon receipt of the Grade Change Petition, the Dean may discuss the request with the student and instructor, separately or together. The student may decline to meet with the instructor and/or the Dean. The Dean shall forward the Grade Change Petition to the instructor and direct the instructor to act on the petition.

The instructor shall review the Petition within the next regular semester, decide whether or not to change the grade, and provide an explanation for the action. The Dean will verify that the action is permitted by college policy and shall provide a copy of the action to the student. The Admissions and Records Office shall preserve a copy of the Grade Change Petition.

~~C.4. Special procedure when instructor is unavailable~~

~~If the instructor is unavailable to respond to the Grade Change Petition within the time limit, the Dean, in consultation with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, shall appoint an alternate instructor to review and act upon the Petition. The alternate shall be in the discipline of the course or in a related discipline. In the event that no qualified instructor is on the faculty, the Dean, in consultation with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, shall arrange for a qualified consultant.~~

C.4. Special circumstances

The procedure described here shall be used in the following circumstances:

- (a) If the instructor is unavailable to respond to the Grade Change Petition within the time limit; or
- (b) If, at the time the Grade Change Petition is filed, the student has filed, in accordance with District procedures, a discrimination complaint against the instructor; or
- (c) If, at the time the Grade Change Petition is filed, the Dean determines that it is possible there has been gross misconduct by the instructor.

In such circumstances, the Dean, in consultation with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, shall appoint an alternate instructor to review and act upon the Petition. The alternate shall be in the discipline of the course or in a related discipline. In the event that no qualified instructor is on the faculty, the Dean, in consultation with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, shall arrange for a qualified consultant.

D. Grade Appeal

If the instructor's response to the Grade Change Petition is not acceptable to the student, the student may file a Grade Appeal to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Before filing a grade appeal, the student must have submitted a formal Grade Change Petition to the appropriate Dean. The Grade Appeal shall consist of (a) the Grade Appeal Form stating the grounds for the appeal, (b) allegation of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency, (c) a copy of the Grade Change Petition showing the instructor's decision, and (d) supporting documentation. The Grade Appeal Form is available at the office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

D.1. Time limit

The Grade Appeal must be filed with the Vice President of Academic Affairs no later than fourteen calendar days following the receipt of the instructor's response to the formal Grade Change Petition.

D.2. Grade Appeal Panel: Composition

When a Grade Appeal is filed with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, a Grade Appeal Panel shall be appointed within thirty calendar days. The Panel shall consist of (a) an instructional Dean other than the Dean of the Division in which the disputed grade was given; (b) two faculty members, chosen by the President of the Academic Senate, who shall be from the discipline of the course in which the disputed grade was given, or a related discipline; and (c) two students chosen by the President of the

Associated Students Organization. The Panel shall be chaired by the Vice President of Academic Affairs or a designee; the chair shall be a non-voting member of the Panel.

All matters considered by the Grade Appeal Panel shall be treated as confidential by members of the Panel.

D.3. Grade Appeal Panel: Hearing

Within 30 calendar days of empanelment, the Grades Appeal Panel shall review the Grade Appeal, including all documents submitted by the student and other documentation it considers relevant.

The Grade Appeal Panel shall conduct a hearing prior to making a determination on the outcome of the grade appeal. Both the student and the instructor shall be notified of the day and time of the hearing and invited to attend. Both the student and the instructor will be provided an opportunity to make a statement and to be asked questions.

The student may be accompanied by an advisor. The advisor may be a faculty member or a student. The advisor may be present to advise the student, but may not ask or answer questions.

The instructor may be accompanied by an advisor. The advisor may be a faculty member or a representative of the faculty union. The advisor may be present to advise the instructor, but may not ask or answer questions.

The Grade Appeal Panel may make a recording of the hearing, which may be consulted during the Panel's deliberation.

D.4. Grade Appeal Panel: Decision

Following its hearing, the Panel shall deliberate and make findings by majority vote. The Panel may sustain or deny all, some, or none of the allegations in the Grade Appeal. The Panel may find that the disputed grade is incorrect because of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency; in such case, the Panel may determine the new grade to be assigned. The Appeal Panel shall issue its findings and recommendation to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, who shall inform the appealing student, the instructor, and the appropriate Dean.

The decision of the Grade Appeal Panel is final.

The Vice President of Academic Affairs will notify the instructor of the Grade Appeal Panel's recommendation. If the Panel recommends a grade change, the Vice President of Academic Affairs will direct the instructor to submit a grade change to the Admissions and Records Office. In the event that the instructor of record is unable

or unwilling to process the grade change within a reasonable time, the Vice President of Academic Affairs shall form a group of faculty to issue a grade change.

~~E. Appeal~~

~~A student may make an appeal as provided in California Code Section 76232. If a student initiates such an appeal, the student waives all rights and opportunities to file a petition or appeal or to receive a response to same as provided by this Grade Change Procedure.~~

E. Expunging of changed grade

When a grade is changed in accordance with this procedure, the original incorrect grade shall be expunged from the student's record.

Appendices

Form 1. Grade Change Order

Form 2. Grade Change Petition

Form 3. Grade Appeal

California Education Code Section 76224(a)

California Education Code Section 76232

California Code of Regulations. Title 5, Section 55760(a)

BOARD POLICY 4045**Textbooks****I. Introduction**

- A. The purpose of this policy is to define responsibilities for the adoption of textbooks and other classroom materials.
- B. The official course outline of record sets forth the goals and objectives of each individual course of study. All texts, films and other printed or electronic materials utilized in the learning process shall be compatible with and evaluated in light of the course outline of record.

All texts shall fully meet the requirements of the California Education Code (78900 et. Seq.).

- C. For the purpose of this policy, the following terms will be used:
 1. Textbooks/Texts—These include laboratory manuals, syllabi, workbooks, student supplements, or other printed or electronic material.
 2. Required Texts—These include textbooks or other printed or electronic material required of all students enrolled in a particular section of a course.
 3. Recommended Texts—These include textbooks or other printed or electronic material recommended to all students enrolled in a particular section of a course. Student use is optional.

II. Selection or Change of Texts

- A. The primary responsibility for the selection of text(s) rests with the faculty teaching the subject.
- B. A selection or change in text(s) may be proposed by any faculty member teaching the subject or by the appropriate administrator. The individual recommending the text shall discuss the proposal for selection or change with the faculty in the discipline.
- C. The faculty of a discipline may select a majority adopted text for the purposes of continuity in a multisection course or course sequence. However, if a faculty member feels another text is more appropriate for his/her methodology or philosophy, the faculty member may propose and select another text.
- D. The faculty's authority to select appropriate textbooks shall not be preempted by an administrator without reasonable cause and advance written notification.
- E. The period of adoption for texts is to be for not less than one academic year. Special consideration for earlier change may be given under extenuating circumstances.
- F. If an instructor, after discussion with faculty in the discipline and the appropriate administrator, believes that a particular class section can best be conducted without a required text, it is not necessary to require a text for that section. However, to facilitate articulation and transferability, textbooks are strongly advised for all credit courses.
- E. Textbooks should reflect professional standards in terms of content and design as well as reasonable cost to students.

Previous Board Policy Number: 6133

El Camino College
 Adopted: 3/14/66
 Amended: 4/28/80, 4/12/99
 Renumbered: 4/18/05

BOARD POLICY 4045**Textbooks and Instructional Materials**

The primary responsibility for the selection of textbooks rests with the faculty teaching the subject.

For the purpose of this policy, the term textbook includes required or recommended learning materials, including books, laboratory manuals, workbooks, student supplements, or other printed, multi-media, or electronic material.

The official course outline of record sets forth the goals and objectives of each individual course of study. All texts and other materials utilized in the learning process shall be compatible with and evaluated in light of the course outline of record.

Textbooks should reflect professional standards in content and design as well as reasonable cost to students. Instructors are encouraged to select instructional materials that are available in alternate format in accordance with California Education Code sections 66250 and 72010 and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

In order to minimize cost to students, the usual period of adoption for texts will be two academic years. Special consideration for earlier change may be given under extenuating circumstances.

All texts shall fully meet the requirements of the California Education Code (78900 et. Seq.).

Procedures for implementing the policy will be developed in collegial consultation with the Academic Senate, as defined in CCR § 53200.

Previous Board Policy Number: 6133

Administrative Procedures 4045**Textbooks and Instructional Materials**

1. The faculty of a discipline may select a majority-adopted text for the purposes of continuity in a multi-section course or course sequence. However, if a faculty member feels another text is more appropriate for his/her methodology or philosophy, the faculty member may select another text.
2. To facilitate articulation and transferability, textbooks are strongly advised for all credit courses.

FYI

Pay or Inducements

78900. (a) No publisher or manufacturer of instructional materials, nor any of his or her representatives, shall offer or give any emolument, money, or other valuable thing, or any inducement, to any community college official to directly or indirectly introduce, recommend, vote for, or otherwise influence the adoption or purchase of any instructional material.

(b) No community college official shall accept any emolument, money, or other valuable thing, or any inducement to directly or indirectly introduce, recommend, vote for, or otherwise influence the adoption or purchase of any instructional material.

(c) Any publisher or manufacturer of instructional materials or his or her representative, or any community college official who violates any of the provisions of this article is guilty of a misdemeanor. Any community college official who violates this article shall, in addition to any other penalty, be removed from his or her official position.

(d) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prevent any publisher, manufacturer, or agent from supplying for purposes of examination necessary sample copies of instructional materials to any community college official.

El Camino College
Adopted: 3/14/66
Amended: 4/28/80, 4/12/99
Renumbered: 4/18/05

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

October 2, 2007

September 11, 2007

Attendance

1. Attendees: David Vakil, Donna Manno, Lisa Raufman, Inna Newbury, Moon Ichinaga, Kamran Golestaneh.
2. Unable to attend this meeting but able in the future: Matt Kline, Mercedes Thompson.
3. Upcoming attendance issues: Inna Newbury can only come on the 2nd Tuesdays and Rose Ann Cerofeci can't make the meetings at all unless the time changes (teaching).

Action items (Person responsible for following up)

1. *Donna Manno*. Develop skeleton survey to distribute to deans to assess generic needs of part-time instructors (technology, pedagogy, etc.)
2. *Anita Martinez and Donna Manno*. Call members to remind of upcoming meetings (day of or 1 day before).
3. *Kamran Golestaneh and Inna Newbury*. Obtain digital footage of Dwayne Hayden's videotape of Friday's "Creating a Classroom Climate to Support Student Learning." Put on a chapter-segmented DVD and on internet.
4. *David Vakil*. Follow up with past members who weren't present and didn't contact David Vakil. (Lijun Wang, Elaine Cannon, Margaret Steinberg.)
5. *David Vakil*. Post minutes of this committee (past and future) to the portal.
6. *David Vakil*. Distribute ARCC report to Faculty Development Committee.
7. *David Vakil*. Begin developing "Teaching book of the semester" club for ECC. Suggested first book: McKeachie's Teaching Tips. Suggested time: lunch hour, perhaps as a brown bag. Staff development may have funds to purchase the books for club members.

Future (near-term) agenda items – [next] = for next meeting. Others for future meeting

1. [next] Budget for Staff Development – overview and impact on Faculty Development.
2. [next] Rough draft for Staff Development's Program Review & 2007-2008 plans.
3. [next] Continue discussing "Faculty Development; Improving Morale" list.
4. Developing faculty development liaisons for each academic division and/or department.
5. Revisit "Teaching tips" coordinated by Arvid Spor, Stephanie Rodriguez, and Lisa Raufman in the past.
6. Consider developing a brochure that outlines the upcoming teaching-improvement programs (e.g. On Course, TEP, Faculty Development).
7. Resurrecting a faculty eating area.
8. Reunion of past attendees of ECC's attendees to the Great Teachers Seminars.

Longer-term agenda items:

1. Center for Teaching & Learning.
2. Crisis Management & Emergency Preparedness – Faculty Development will follow up when campuswide effort, coordinated through the Office of Safety & Health (Rocky Bonura) has made more progress. The goal is to have faculty (including counselors and librarians) know how to handle in-class emergencies, such as responding to situations similar to the tragedy at Virginia Tech.

Turning Participant Results

Session Name: senate 2007-09-18 faculty development priorities

Created: 9/19/2007 9:00 AM

1) Pick your top 3 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT choices. Top choice = first.

rank	score		top choice	2nd choice	3rd choice
	123	1. Great ECC teachers seminar	4	3	7
	107	2. Teaching book of the semester	3	5	4
top	251	3. Teacher mentor & training	19	5	2
	55	4. Video-taping classes & discussions	2	3	1
2nd	153	5. Ask the veteran panels	3	11	3
3rd	145	6. Teach mini-lessons & feedback	2	5	10
<hr/>					
		totals	33	32	27

2) Pick your top 3 MORALE IMPROVEMENT choices. Top choice = first.

rank	score		top choice	2nd choice	3rd choice
4th	137	1. Distinguished Part-Time faculty	6	5	4
	87	2. Distinguished Administrator	1	5	4
2nd	172	3. Extra/frequent award for good work	6	8	5
3rd	158	4. Employee appreciation events	3	8	7
top	201	5. Mixers for all employees	14	5	2
	38	6. Intramural competitions	3	0	1
	25	7. Scavenge hunt mixer	0	1	2
<hr/>					
		totals	33	32	25

Academic Freedom and Outside Speakers

Incidents in which colleges and universities have rescinded invitations issued to outside speakers have multiplied in recent years. Because academic freedom requires the liberty to learn as well as to teach, colleges and universities should respect the prerogatives of campus organizations to select outside speakers whom they wish to hear. The AAUP articulated this principle in 1967 in its Fifty-third Annual Meeting, when it affirmed “its belief that the freedom to hear is an essential condition of a university community and an inseparable part of academic freedom,” and that “the right to examine issues and seek truth is prejudiced to the extent that the university is open to some but not to others whom members of the university also judge desirable to hear.”

This principle has come under growing pressure. Citing an inability to guarantee the safety of outside speakers, or the lack of balance represented by the invitation of a college or university group, or the danger that a group’s invitation might violate Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, college and university administrators have displayed an increasing tendency to cancel or to withdraw funding for otherwise legitimate invitations to non-campus speakers. Committee A notes with concern that these reasons for canceling outside speakers are subject to serious abuse, and that their proper application should be limited to very narrow circumstances that only rarely obtain. Applied promiscuously, these reasons undermine the right of campus groups to hear outside speakers and thus contradict the basic educational mission of colleges and universities.

It is of course the responsibility of a college or university to guarantee the safety of invited speakers, and administrators ought to make every effort to ensure conditions of security in which outside speakers have an opportunity to express their views. The university is no place for a heckler’s veto. In 1983, when unruly individuals on various campuses prevented United States Ambassador to the United Nations Jeane Kirkpatrick from addressing university audiences, Committee A reaffirmed “its expectation that all members of the academic community will respect the right of others to listen to those who have been invited to speak on campus and will indicate disagreement not by disruptive action designed to silence the speaker but by reasoned debate and discussion as befits academic freedom in a community of higher learning.” We have always been clear that colleges and universities bear the obligation to ensure conditions of peaceful discussion, which at times can be quite onerous. Only in the most extraordinary circumstances can strong evidence of imminent danger justify rescinding an invitation to an outside speaker.

Colleges and universities have also withdrawn invitations to outside speakers on the ground that such invitations reflect a lack of balance. This objection misunderstands the meaning of balance within a university setting. In the context of teaching, balance refers to the obligation of instructors

to convey to students the state of knowledge, as warranted by a professional community of inquirers, in the field of learning to which a given course is devoted. There is no obligation to present ideas about “intelligent design” in a biology course, for example, because those ideas have no standing in the professional community of biologists. If invitations to outside speakers are extended within the context of teaching, they should be consistent with the obligations of professionalism. They should not be subject to an additional standard of balance that does not reflect professional standards.

Most invitations to outside speakers do not concern professional pedagogy of this kind, but reflect instead the interests of specific campus groups that are authorized by colleges and universities to learn by pursuing their own particular extracurricular activities. Invitations of this kind may raise a question about the overall contours of a university’s extracurricular programming, but they ought not to be evaluated on an invitation-by-invitation basis. The spectrum of extracurricular activities sponsored by a college or university should be evaluated on the basis of its educational justifiability, rather than on the basis of a mechanical standard of balance that does not reflect educational objectives. So long as the range of a university’s extracurricular programming is educationally justifiable, the specific invitations of particular groups should not be vetoed by university administrators because these invitations are said to lack balance. Campus groups should not be prevented from pursuing the very interests that they have been created to explore.

University administrators have also rescinded invitations to outside speakers who are politically controversial on the ground that during an election such invitations would violate the prohibition of section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides that a charitable organization will qualify for a tax exemption only if it “does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office.” Before the 2004 presidential election, some institutions withdrew or objected to invitations to speakers identified with partisan political positions, including Michael Moore, a filmmaker critical of the Bush administration. In some cases, the initial invitations were issued by student organizations; in other cases, they were by members of a faculty body or as part of an invited speaker series.

Committee A is concerned that overly restrictive interpretations of Section 501(c)(3) have become an excuse for preventing campus groups from inviting politically controversial speakers. As was stated by the AAUP’s Fifty-second Annual Meeting, “the right to access to speakers on campus does not in its exercise imply in advance either agreement or disagreement with what may be said, or approval or disapproval of the speakers as individuals.” The idea that a university “participates” or “intervenes” in a political campaign by providing a forum to hear speakers who have something to communicate about issues of relevance to the campaign is thus fundamentally misplaced. The idea misconceives the role and responsibility of a university, which is not to endorse candidates but to discuss issues of relevance to society.

The essentially educational role of a university has been recognized by the Internal Revenue Service, which has held that activities which might otherwise constitute prohibited political activities are to be understood, in the context of a college or university, as furthering the institution’s educational mission. For this reason, a course in political campaign methods that

AN OPEN LETTER ON OUTSIDE SPEAKERS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM FROM THE AAUP PRESIDENT, CARY NELSON

In 2005--after several colleges and universities withdrew valid invitations to speakers during the 2004 election cycle--the American Association of University Professors published a statement on "Academic Freedom and Outside Speakers." Now that another election cycle is upon us, it is important to reiterate our policy's key points:

1. Many colleges and universities permit student and faculty groups to issue their own invitations to outside speakers. That practice is an important part of academic freedom and institutions should respect it.
2. When an authorized faculty or student group invites an outside speaker, this does not mean the institution approves or disapproves of the speaker or what the speaker says, has said or will say.
3. Colleges are free to announce that they do not officially endorse a speaker or the views a speaker expresses, but they should not cancel a speech because people on campus or in the community either disagree with its content or disapprove of the speaker.
4. Institutions should ensure that all legitimately invited speakers can express their views and that open discussion can take place.
5. Only in extreme and extraordinary cases may invitations be canceled out of concern for safety.

We believe education is best served by the free pursuit of all ideas, including controversial ones. Yet this commitment to academic freedom can be severely tested when campus or community members are offended by the views an invited speaker is expected to express. How should we respond when some claim an invitation amounts to an endorsement of a politician, a religion, or even an outlandish conspiracy theory? Should a university president, a board of trustees, or a group of concerned citizens or donors have the right to demand that an invitation to a speaker be withdrawn?

If the College Republicans invite Dick Cheney to speak about the "war on terror" the talk may be controversial, but if the College Republicans is a valid student organization, neither the Board of Trustees nor the administration should cancel the talk. Although administrators have sometimes cited fear of violating section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code as a reason for canceling invitations to politically controversial speakers, such invitations do not constitute the type of prohibited political campaign intervention or participation that would endanger the university's tax exempt status. The university does not endorse a particular speaker's views any more than it endorses the content of a particular book in its library.

Nor should the university compel a student group to invite an opposing speaker to ensure "balance" or create a debate format. It would be improper for a university administration to require the College Republicans to invite Barak Obama in order to "balance" Dick Cheney. Campus groups should not be compelled to invite someone they do not want to hear as a condition for inviting someone they do want to hear. A different student group can invite Obama, or the university can create its own event and add it to the campus schedule.

What happens if taxpaying citizens, state politicians, or important donors demand that the president cancel a planned speech? University presidents, who have many constituencies to please, may find this a difficult situation. Matters can become very complicated if different groups make contradictory demands. Satisfying one group may offend another. That difficulty can be avoided if a president does the right thing by defending academic freedom and the university's unique role as a place for ideas to flourish and to be exchanged. A president is not responsible for defending a speaker who has been properly invited by an authorized student, faculty, or employee group. Authorizing these groups to invite outside speakers that are of interest to them is an important way to sustain a vibrant campus intellectual life. Such a practice can be supported by all campus constituencies.

This reasoning holds true even when virtually everyone disagrees with an invited speaker. Students might at one time have invited an American Nazi Party representative to speak. The invitation might have sought to give the campus direct experience of a position all considered abhorrent. Once again, we should not assume that invitations represent endorsements. We should also give some credit to our student audiences. They do not need to be protected from outlandish ideas. They do not believe everything they hear, and they are on campus to learn to think critically.

Revulsion at ideas or fear of them is understandable, but ideas are best answered with thought and conversation, not with censorship. That is nowhere more true than at a college or university. Education will not be well served if only bland speakers with uncontroversial views are invited to campus. The costs--to education, to academic freedom, to the social good--are virtually always higher when an invited speaker is silenced rather than allowed to speak.

The opening five points represent the consensus reached at a September 2006 meeting where representatives of several higher education organizations discussed the AAUP's full statement on outside speakers. We should add that administrators appropriately may specify that no member of the academic community may speak for or act on behalf of the college or university in a political campaign.

For more information, the full statement, "Academic Freedom and Outside Speakers," is available on the AAUP website:

<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/About/committees/committee+repts/CommA/outside-spkr.htm>

You may also call AAUP at 1 800 424 2973.



EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Office of the Vice President-Academic Affairs

**DISTRICT-WIDE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE
PROCEDURES FOR REQUESTING CONFERENCE FUNDS**

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

The District-Wide Conference Committee is composed of one (1) Dean appointed by the Vice President-Academic Affairs and two (2) faculty members appointed by the President of the Federation. Committee members have the duty to monitor the practices of the divisions of the College pursuant to Article XVI, Section 5, of the Agreement and shall have the additional responsibility of allocating funds to 1) special situations which require the allocation of substantial expenses, and 2) conference expenses for faculty members in any division which has utilized its fund and where allocation of additional funds is desirable. The Committee will make decisions according to the guidelines listed below.

The District-Wide Conference Committee will consider all applications and shall award monies according to availability of funds, specified guidelines, relevance of activity to job responsibility, and any other elements pertinent to the application request.

Because 80 percent of the District's faculty conference and travel funds has been allocated to the divisions for disbursement, the primary responsibility to fund faculty travel requests resides in the division conference committees. District Conference Committee funds are designed to supplement and not replace division conference funds.

II. GENERAL GUIDELINES

These guidelines must be adhered to if the District-Wide Committee is to distribute monies in an expeditious and fair manner.

- A. All conference requests must be processed in the normal fashion through the division dean and reviewed by the Division Conference Committee before forwarding to the Office of the Vice President-Academic Affairs. All conference requests must be date stamped by the division upon receipt. Other sources of funding or requests for funding should be noted on the justification page.
- B. The guidelines apply to all conference requests, whether in or out of the state or overseas.
- C. To ensure equitable distribution of funds, normally one conference per person per academic year will be considered for funding.
- D. Conference expenditures will normally be approved up to \$300 per year and normally up to \$1,000 within a three-year period.
- E. All conference requests should be accompanied by documentation detailing the nature of the conference and individual participation, as well as registration and other costs. All conference requests must be accompanied by written justification, as well as a recommendation from the Division Conference Committee.
- F. Full-time faculty will have first priority; however, the committee will address applications by part-time or pre-retiree faculty as requested by the Division Conference Committee and the Division Dean. Priority will be given to part-time faculty whose conferences involve students or who are attending conferences that have an impact beyond the individual.
- G. Persons who have benefited from the monies received from this committee may be asked to share

conference/workshop information with their colleagues, with a department, and/or with the campus.

- H. Requests for transferring unused conference allocations to a different conference will be reviewed as new applications.
- I. To be considered for funding, requests must be received in the office of the Vice President-Academic Affairs at least one week prior to the committee's scheduled meeting and prior to the beginning of the conference. For meeting dates, see page 3, IV: Meeting Days and Time.

III. **SELECTION PROCESS**

A general parameter for all priorities will be support first for anyone who has not received funds in a preceding year. Should more than one person ask to attend the same conference, registration fees may have to be split among attendees if funds are low.

- A. **Priority #1: Campus-wide Impact (Funding normally not to exceed \$300)**
 - A faculty member will receive support for a conference or workshop providing information and/or training important on a campus-wide basis.
- B. **Priority #2: Division/Department-wide Impact (Funding normally not to exceed \$250)**
 - A faculty member will receive support for a conference or workshop providing information and/or training important on a division/department-wide basis.
- C. **Priority #3: Conference Presenter (Funding normally not to exceed \$250)**
 - A faculty member will be supported for a conference or workshop wherein he or she has a special invitation to participate.
 - Presentation must be documented by written confirmation such as letters and/or program schedules.
 - If funds permit, both travel and registration fee will be approved.
 - If there is more than one presenter, the funding will be shared equally.
- D. **Priority #4: Officer and/or Official representative of Professional Organization or Facilitator (Funding normally not to exceed \$100)**
 - A faculty member requesting support as an official representative must have written documentation of a participant's position and responsibilities in the organization or role in the conference.
- E. **Priority #5: Individual Professional Impact (Funding normally not to exceed \$75 per event)**
 - A faculty member will receive support for a workshop/seminar/ conference having a significant impact on a faculty member's professional development (the District does not fund faculty members to take regular courses at colleges, universities, and/or private schools).

IV. **Selection Process for Technology, Diversity and Retention Conference Funding**

A. Full-time Faculty will receive support as follows:

- To attend a conference or workshop which provides information and/or training in technology, diversity and retention, not to exceed \$1,000 per conference up to a maximum of \$1,500/year.
- To attend a conference or workshop which is not specifically designed for technology, diversity and retention, but offers sessions directly related to these areas, not to exceed \$500/session.

B. Part-time faculty will receive support as follows:

- To attend a conference or workshop which provides information and/or training in technology, diversity and retention, not to exceed \$750 per conference up to a maximum of \$750/year.
- To attend a conference or workshop which is not specifically designed for technology, diversity and retention, but offers sessions directly related to these areas, not to exceed \$375/session.

V. **MEETING DAYS AND TIME**

The District-Wide Conference Committee will meet monthly on the first and third Wednesdays, September through May (as needed), to review requests for funding. However, the committee does not meet during the summer months, and conference requests for the fall semester will not normally be accepted after December.

To be considered for funding, requests for conference attendance should be submitted in writing to the dean at least one (1) month prior to the conference (Article XVI, Section 4, of the Agreement).

The applicant has the following responsibilities:

1. Secure the appropriate conference forms.
2. Submit paperwork to the Division Conference Committee for review and support.
3. Submit appropriate paperwork to this committee *at least two weeks* prior to the conference.
4. Any request for summer conferences must reach the DWCC through the division process by the last meeting held in May of the preceding spring semester.

VI. **COMMITTEE PROCEDURES**

At the beginning of each academic year, the committee will review guidelines and procedures, prepare a summary of the previous year's award list, and make appropriate revisions to the procedures as necessary.

Reimbursement claims are due to the Academic Affairs Office no later than one month after the conference has taken place. If requests for reimbursement funds are not made within the one-month time line, said funds may be subject to reallocation. Claims for the previous academic year submitted after July 1 will not be paid unless authorized by the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Committee approved: Fall 1990

Revised: 5/2/01, 10/17/05, 10/4/06

EL CAMINO COLLEGE
Planning & Budgeting Committee
Minutes
Date: August 30, 2007

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alario, Miriam – ECCE | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spor, Arvid – Chair |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jack, Christina – ASO | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Taylor, Susan – ECCFT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jackson, Tom – Academic Affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> Tyler, Harold – Management/Supervisors |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reid, Dawn – Student & Community Adv. | <input type="checkbox"/> Westberg, David – ECCFT (temporary) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shenefield, Cheryl – Administrative Svcs. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Widman, Lance – Academic Senate |

OTHERS ATTENDING:

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Arce, Francisco | Mancia, Luis | Taylor, Susan |
| Dever, Susan | Marsee, Jeff | Turner, Gary |
| Ely, Janice | Nishime, Jeanie | Wagstaff, John |
| Fleming, Art | Smith, Luukia | |

- Handouts:**
- Memorandum: Differences between Tentative and Final Budgets – 2007-08
 - \$3 Million Augmentation for 2007-08

The meeting was called to order at 1:07 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

1. Page 1, correction to #8: \$900,000 requested for 5-year computer replacement plan *was reduced to \$450,000 which will be transferred from Capital Outlay back to the general fund.*
 - a. \$450,000 is not enough money for the 5-year replacement cycle. Seem to keep addressing same computer replacement funding issue. Use meeting minutes to track this issue. An action item or recommendation from PBC would be appropriate to address this issue.
 - b. ITS will conduct an existing units inventory that will include computer location and age of unit. Main consideration for replacement is a computer's inability to run current operating system. Can determine computer lab class usage from the lab schedule and room book data. Casual walk-in data is harder to track than class usage. Suggest PBC recommend to technology committee to reassess/review the optimal usage for drop-in facilities.
 - c. Why treat augmentation as one-time funds? Compton and ECC can terminate relationship any time during partnership, which could last 10 years or less until Compton receives its accreditation
2. Page 2, #2a - Janice Ely working to find missing electronic data equipment insurance number and breakdown.
3. When will program review reflect updated augmentation? Planning software training is planned for fall. In process of gathering backup documentation for augmentation requests. Deadline to turn in backup is tomorrow. Need to develop evaluation criteria.
4. The minutes were approved as amended. Suggestion proposed to approve meeting minutes by consensus versus motion with affirmative/negative vote. Will be discussed at a later date.

1. Memo to President Fallo gives overview of differences between the preliminary and final budget – includes a supporting schedule that shows unrestricted actual and tentative revenue and expenditures
2. Key points on memo:
 - a. Principal apportionment (#8610) increase reflects \$2 million increase in state budget – did not receive notification until July, after the tentative budget was presented to the June Board. The increase reflects difference between state allocation and what was received from other sources – revenue limits. Compton designation from center to college occurred in July.
 - b. Lottery adjustment based on actual versus estimated amount per FTES allocation.
 - c. (#8980) – \$450,000 transfer from fund #41 (construction fund) back to general fund. Correction to memo: “Funds will be used to replace outdated *support*” should read “*support service functions.*”
 - d. Salary account changes related to actual salary increases for prior year and projected for current year. Includes positions funded but not yet filled.
 - e. Staff benefits (#3000) – bottom line net difference between tentative and final are negligible. Reflect projected salaries and increases.
 - f. Negative net decline in overall benefits reflect reduction in estimated projections to announced increase.
 - g. Board election (#5700) reduced by \$400,000 because elections were not needed.
 - h. Other Program Services (#5910) reflects \$500,000 increase from revenue. Negotiated after tentative budget was approved.
 - i. Equipment budget (#6400) was reduced to \$450,000.
3. Have not received state appropriation. There is a \$68,000 difference between what is projected and what will be received in state apportionment. An adjustment will be made in October.

#3 Million Augmentation for 2007-08

1. Working draft still in review process which is why it is not on agenda for September board. Total approved so far is \$2,253,506. \$424,615 still being considered.
2. Augmentation requests driven by proposals with specific outcomes & expectations from academic affairs, administrative services, and student services programs.
3. Appendix refers to backup documentation.
4. Correction to #3 – Instructional/Non-instructional Assignment - HTP. Should be marked ‘Yes.’ Add \$70,000 to ‘Yes’ total. The original request for \$100,000 was reduced to \$70,000 after reassessing needs.
5. #10 – HTP Counselor - should be deleted (already included in #3).
6. Athletics \$78,000 (#42, #43, & #44) – currently funded by auxiliary services.
7. Suggestion was made to identify items sometime this year for next year – programs last year did not have time to utilize all funds because received towards end of fiscal year.
8. Will augmentation funds be used to cover Student Services extended office hours? Having difficulty finding staff willing to work alternative schedule. Why do key offices, i.e. cashiers, financial aid, have different office hours? Trying to set up consistent hours during add drop period - cashiers will try to parallel.
9. \$900,000 requested for computer equipment was reduced to \$450,000. Where is the plan to support this and the decision to set aside \$1 million for GASB? PBC approved plan for GASB. Suggestion was made to revisit issue of spending one-time money on on-going expenses.
10. Should request #40 for maintenance overtime come from the bond? The purpose of this request was to upgrade currently unplanted areas. A college’s appearance is an important reason for students to return.
11. One-time funds can be used for pilot program salaries, not for ongoing salaries.

12. Cabinet, not PBC, is involved in decisions regarding the hiring of permanent employees. October 2, 2007
13. With unspent revenues last year and increased reserves, why not spend more? Why carry a \$10 million reserve? The district is required to keep a 5% reserve (\$6 million). Need more time to discuss at a future date. Would also like a better understanding of base revenue through detail review of page 28 in budget book.

Final Budget (walk-through continued) Janice Ely

1. Page 22 – Bookstore Fund. Sales and other income, purchases, payroll expenses and costs to use VISA/MasterCard. Non-operating expenses include auxiliary support for the student body (\$276,000). Bookstore was losing money the last few years. Markup on books still less than other college bookstores.
2. Page 23 – Associated Students Fund. Income includes \$24,000 transfer from auxiliary services to support student activities. Expenditures on organizational groups and Inter-Club Council.
3. Page 24 - Auxiliary Services. Major funding source for costs not included in general fund: athletic programs (uniforms, training room, and transportation), Fine Arts student plays and productions, and Union newspaper.
4. Does PBC recommend approval of the budget or is it enough to say that the committee reviewed it? Suggest PBC recognizes budget as an evolving plan, but an acceptable starting point for this year. The main point is that PBC reviewed the budget and the committee is neither for nor against it. *As it stands, PBC recommends the budget for passage.*

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 pm.

The September 6th and 13th meetings are cancelled. The next meeting is scheduled on **Thursday, September 20th at 1:00 p.m. in the Alondra Room.**

Note taker: Lucy Nelson



PLANNING & BUDGETING COMMITTEE
September 20, 2007
1:00 – 2:30pm
Location: Alondra Room

Facilitator: Arvid Spor

Note Taker: Lucy Nelson

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Planning and Budgeting Committee serves as the steering committee for campus-wide planning and budgeting. The PBC assures that the planning and budgeting are interlinked and that the process is driven by the institutional priorities set forth in the Educational Master Plan and other plans adopted by the college. The PBC makes recommendations to the President on all planning and budgeting issues and reports all committee activities to the campus community.

Members

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Arvid Spor, Chair (non-voting) | <input type="checkbox"/> Cheryl Shenefield, Administrative Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Miriam Alario, ECCE | <input type="checkbox"/> Susan Taylor, ECCFT |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Christina Jack - ASO | <input type="checkbox"/> Harold Tyler, Management/Supervisors |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Thomas Jackson, Academic Affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> Lance Widman, Academic Senate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dawn Reid, Student & Community Adv. | |

Attendees

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Luis Mancía – Alt., ECCE | <input type="checkbox"/> John Means – Alt., SCA | <input type="checkbox"/> Janice Ely – Support |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ken Key – Alt., ECCFT | <input type="checkbox"/> Bo Morton – Alt., Mgmt/Sup. | <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Marsee – Support |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teresa Palos – Alt., Acad. Senate | <input type="checkbox"/> _____ - Alt ASO | <input type="checkbox"/> Jeanie Nishime – Support |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tom Lew – Alt., Ac. Affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> Francisco Arce – Support | <input type="checkbox"/> John Wagstaff – Support |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rocky Bonura – Alt., Adm. Serv. | <input type="checkbox"/> Peter Marcoux – Support | |

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes for August 30, 2007 ----- All PBC participants ----- 1:00 p.m.
2. Revised \$3M Augmentation ----- Jeff Marsee ----- 1:10 p.m.
3. Discussion of the Base Revenue ----- Jeff Marsee / Janice Ely ---- 1:50 p.m.
4. Administrative Services Indicators ----- Jeff Marsee ----- 2:10 p.m.
5. Adjournment ----- 2:30 p.m.

Board Policy 2510 Participation in Local Decision Making

The Board is the ultimate decision-maker in those areas assigned to it by state and federal laws and regulations. In executing that responsibility, the Board is committed to its obligation to ensure that appropriate members of the District participate in developing recommended policies for Board action and administrative procedures for Superintendent/President action under which the District is governed and administered.

Each of the following shall participate as required by law in the decision-making processes of the District:

Academic Senate(s) Title 5, Sections 53200-53206.)

The Board or its designees will consult collegially with the Academic Senate, as duly constituted with respect to academic and professional matters, as defined by law. Procedures to implement this section are developed collegially with the Academic Senate.

The Board will normally accept the recommendations of the Academic Senate on academic and professional matters as defined by Sub-Chapter 2, Section 53200, et seq., California Administrative Code, Title V, and as listed below:

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.

The Board of Trustees designates the Vice President-Academic Affairs as the liaison to the Academic Senate for the items listed above.

If the District Governing Board of Trustees disagrees with the recommendation of the Academic Senate, representatives of the two bodies shall have the

obligation to meet and reach mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation, or policy of the Governing Board.

Nothing in this policy shall be construed to impinge upon the due process rights of faculty, nor to detract from any negotiated agreements between the Federation of Teachers and the District. Written notification shall be given to the El Camino College Federation of Teachers by the District at the beginning of discussions between the Academic Senate and the District on academic and professional matters.

Staff (Title 5, Section 51023.5)

Classified staff shall be provided with opportunities to participate in the formulation and development of District policies and procedures that have a significant effect on staff. The opinions and recommendations of the Police Officers Association (POA), El Camino Classified Employees (ECCE) and confidential groups will be given every reasonable consideration.

Students (Title 5, Section 51023.7)

The Associated Students shall be given an opportunity to participate effectively in the formulation and development of District policies and procedures that have a significant effect on students, as defined by law. The recommendations and positions of the Associated Students will be given every reasonable consideration. The selection of student representatives to serve on District committees or task forces shall be made after consultation with the Associated Students.

Except for unforeseeable emergency situations, the Board shall not take any action on matters subject to this policy until the appropriate constituent group or groups have been provided the opportunity to participate.

Nothing in this policy will be construed to interfere with the formation or administration of employee organizations or with the exercise of rights guaranteed under the Educational Employment Relations Act, Government Code Sections 3540, et seq.

Reference:

Education Code Section 70902(b)(7); Title 5, Sections 53200 et seq., (Academic Senate), 51023.5 (staff), 51023.7 (students)

Replaces Board Policy 3605

El Camino College

Adopted: 7/15/02