

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES
March 17th, 2009

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

Behavioral & Social Sciences	
<u>Gold, Chris</u>	X
<u>Widman, Lance</u>	X
<u>Wynne, Michael</u>	X

Business	
<u>Halamka, Dagmar</u>	
<u>Saddiqui, Junaid</u>	X
<u>Lau, Philip S</u>	X

Counseling	
<u>Beley, Kate</u>	X
<u>Jackson, Brenda</u>	EXC
<u>Jeffries, Chris</u>	X
<u>Pajo, Christina</u>	

Fine Arts	
<u>Ahmadpour, Ali</u>	X
<u>Davidson, Jason</u>	
<u>Wells, Chris</u>	X
<u>Crossman, Mark</u>	
<u>Berney, Daniel</u>	X

Health Sciences & Athletics	
<u>Hazell, Tom</u>	
<u>Orton, Tory/Victoria (sharing)</u>	
<u>Stanbury, Corey</u>	
<u>McGinley, Pat</u>	X
<u>Moon, Mary (sharing)</u>	
<u>Parsley, Guenever</u>	

Humanities	
<u>Hong, Lyman</u>	X
<u>Marcoux, Pete</u>	X
<u>Uyemura, Evelyn</u>	X
<u>Kline, Matt</u>	X
<u>Adrienne Sharp</u>	X

Industry & Technology	
<u>Gebert, Pat</u>	
<u>Hofmann, Ed</u>	X
<u>MacPherson, Lee</u>	X
<u>Marston, Doug</u>	X
<u>Rodriguez, George</u>	

Learning Resources Unit	
<u>Striepe, Claudia</u>	X
<u>Ichinaga, Moon</u>	X

Mathematical Sciences	
<u>Scott, Greg</u>	
<u>Glucksman, Marc</u>	X
<u>Boerger, John</u>	
<u>Fry, Greg</u>	
<u>Yun, Paul</u>	X

Natural Sciences	
<u>Cowell, Chas</u>	
<u>Herzig, Chuck</u>	X
<u>Palos Teresa</u>	X
<u>Vakil, David</u>	X

Adjunct Faculty	
<u>Kate McLaughlin</u>	X
<u>Jeremy Estrella</u>	

ECC CEC Members	
<u>Panski, Saul</u>	X
<u>Pratt, Estina</u>	EXC
<u>Smith, Darwin</u>	EXC
<u>Evans, Jerome</u>	EXC
<u>Norton, Tom</u>	EXC

Assoc. Students Org.	
<u>Joe Udeochu</u>	X

Ex Officio Attendees: Francisco Arce, Jeanie Nishime, Janet Young,
Guests and/Other Officers: Arvid Spor, Dr. Goldberg (Dean's Rep), Barbara Perez, Lars Kjeseth, Barbara Jaffe.

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

The first Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2009 semester was called to order at 12:33pm.

Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes [pp. 1-7 of packet] from the last Academic Senate meeting were unanimously approved with one correction to the spelling of Dr. Nishime's name on pg.2.

Mr. Hoffman reported on FIRST (For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology) where high school students are given 6 weeks to build a robot. El Camino Students helped out in several High Schools for this worldwide competition. El Camino aided projects won several awards, including a Blue Ribbon.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

President's report – Pete Marcoux (henceforth PM)

No Report.

Compton Education Center - Saul Panski (SP)

No Report.

Mr. Panski had prepared a handout/resolution regarding Partnership for Senate Plenary.

VP - Legislative Action – Chris Wells (CW)

CW reported that Mr. Kjeseth will be the El Camino College delegate to the State Plenary in San Francisco, 15 – 17 April.

The Area C meeting on the 28th March will be held at LA Valley College. The Area meetings preview resolutions that will be presented at the Plenary. CW, Mr. Vakil, Mr. Panski, and Mr. Smith will all be attending.

VP - Faculty Development – Dave Vakil (DV)

DV reported that the first Faculty Development meeting was spent developing a short & long term "Faculty Development Plan." The first step is a "Needs Assessment", and the committee is working on the survey questions and format.

The committee is continuing to work on updating the Distinguished Faculty Award, based on adapting the Hayward Award.

The committee is pursuing additional models for a Distinguished Adjunct Faculty Award (one per division or funded by FT faculty). Will discuss further, may survey the deans DV announced that the Teaching Book Club's new book is *Brain Matters: Translating Research into Classroom Practice* by Patricia Wolfe. They may invite the author to give presentation(s) on a flex day. Mr. Kjeseth agreed that Ms. Wolfe gave a great

presentation and remarked that he had also been hoping to get her to come and speak and that perhaps the two groups could share the fee.

The two “Getting the Job” workshops drew 100 attendees. Another benefit was the useful feedback and the committee hopes to offer an improved version next year.

DV shared news on the mentorship pilot project. The Humanities faculty were showing scant interest in the project, so the Faculty Development Committee has expanded the project into the Natural Sciences Division, where 4 people have signed up. The plan is still to take the project campus- wide.

VP- Educational Policies – Evelyn Uyemura (EU)

[pp. 43 of packet]

EU listed four policies that may be obsolete and can therefore be dealt with quickly:

- BP 4270 Substitute Courses for Health Education (Dean Drew)
- BP 4312 Soliciting Funds from Students (Dr. Nishime)
- BP 4320 Public Performance by Students (Dean Schwartz)
- BP 4255 Student Progress Alert and Referrals (B. Mulrooney)

Some may no longer be relevant, the last may be a procedure, and not a policy.

Please send feedback to EU. These will then go to the Board as items to be deleted.

- BP 4020 Program and Curriculum Development. EU noted that there is no policy by that name and number on our list of Board Policies. EU had received a paper copy of a version that was passed by the Curriculum Committee and Academic Senate back in September and October 2001. There is an indication that it was presented to the Board for a first reading in 2002, but was pulled and no action was ever taken.

Dr. Perez said that there were a whole lot of policies that had got to the Board and had subsequently faded. Dr. Perez will try and investigate what happened to them. EU said it was relevant especially in terms of the recent Accreditation warning. Dr. Perez and EU will keep each other in the loop.

Mr. Tyler and EU met to try and reconcile the Academic Honesty Policy. Senate can approve whether to fold the policy back into the larger document or have it stand alone. This will be discussed in detail later in the meeting, as will the Course Repetition Policy.

Curriculum Committee report – Janet Young (JY)

[pp. 19 – 42 of packet]

JY reported that **three Course Review Workshops** have been conducted, two at ECC and one at the Compton Center. They were well-received. Three more will be scheduled in April and three more in May.

- **The Standard Review Committee** (which reviews courses submitted for course review or minor changes) is working well and is allowing for additional courses to be reviewed at each meeting.
- **Response to Recommendation Three** – Chair Young was involved in the input for the response. Felt the response was well-crafted and accurate. Kudos to the final authors.
- **Six-Year Review Cycle Worksheet and Report Form** were piloted at the last CCC meeting. It will now be presented to each department so the faculty can plan

their curriculum submissions in order to “get on” and then “stay on” a six-year review cycle.

Curriculum Chair Reassigned Time must be increased from 30% to 50% on a 12 month basis or with a stipend for Winter and Summer to maintain a six year review cycle plans. At present, Chair Elect (L. Kjesth) and Current Chair (J.Young) are volunteering many extra hours each week.

VP - Finance and Special Projects/ PBC (Planning and Budgeting Committee) – Lance Widman (LW)

[pp. 44-45 of packet] contains the Council of Deans, 2/2/08 (!) minutes: although these are old, they do give a historical perspective.

[p. 46 of packet] illustrates the percentage of spending on employee salaries and fringe benefits from the District’s unrestricted General Fund.

[pp. 47-48 of packet]contains thee Budget Calendar, which LW felt is very ambitious with tight time frames.

[pp. 49-51of packet] contains the PBC 2/5 minutes: State budget update as of this date, Budget Calendar discussions, initial Planning Model discussions.

[pp. 52-53 of packet] LW noted a repetition of the Budget Calendar.

[pp. 54-59 of packet] Planning Model, subject of today’s discussion by Arvid Spor.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Accreditation – Dr. Arce

[pp 90-135 of packet] Dr. Arce thanked EU, JY and Dr. Spor for all their helpful work in creating a response to the Commission. More work will be done to strengthen this follow-up report, which will then be given to the Board of Trustees to review.

The first report notes that the plan is to become Proficient. There is some discussion as to whether we have already attained that goal. Dr. Arce noted that we have a good planning program in place and Dr. Arce congratulated the Curriculum chairs, JY and Mr. Kjeseth for their work in this area, along with Dr. Jaffe. Dr. Arce noted that ECC would have 1220 active courses, and that 60% would be out of compliance with a 6 year review cycle, but the new plan would move things along quicker. EU and JY agreed to meet and clarify some points re: the Curriculum process. Please look at the draft follow- up report and send comments to Dr. Arce or Dr. Spor.

Student learning Outcomes and Assessment – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

[pp60 – 70 of packet] LK noted an error on the dates of the minutes. The February 23rd date on pp62 should read March 9th.

LK noted that two groups had worked on responses to the Accreditation report – the Assessment of Learning Committee members and Drs. Goldberg, Gallucci, Simon and Jaffe. A draft will be ready by the end of the semester for the October 15th response. Please send any suggestions/thoughts to the above named. LK spoke of the need to revive the Division- level SLO Committees. The Assessment of Learning Committee has been

tasked with developing a rubric that will assist faculty in developing their SLO and reports. LK will report back at the April 7th Academic Senate meeting.

ASO Representative Report - Joe Udeochu (JU)

No report.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

PM pulled the Institutional Code of Ethics 2nd reading from the agenda as it is not ready.

Academic Honesty – 2nd Reading – Evelyn Uyemura (EU)

(pp 71- 78 of packet) Previously most of this content was contained in the Standards of Student Conduct Board Policy [see pg71 of packet], under the purview of Harold Tyler. The Policy was being revisited and the Ed. Policies Committee looked at it and felt the section on Academic Honesty was a faculty matter and therefore faculty should be involved. Therefore a new policy, named Academic Honesty, is being drafted. [see pg 76 of packet].

The Ed. Policies Committee felt that Academic Honesty was a little different from Student Conduct and therefore warranted a separate policy. However, it is understood that the proposed policy may remain a separate policy, or it may be refolded back into the Standards of Student Conduct Policy.

The Academic Honesty Policy [pg 76 of packet] has been written in a positive tone. The second part – AP4500 gives examples of what might be considered academic dishonesty. Mr. Vakil suggested in point#9 taking out the word “both” and having it read “the instructors”.

Mr. Widman said the Dean’s Council is concerned that a new policy is being created from an already existing policy. The Council felt it might be a better idea to reorganize the current Policy so that Mr. Tyler would not have two different disciplinary Policies to deal with. Dr. Arce agreed that the policy seemed premature and would add another layer of work to Mr. Tyler’s office. Dr. Arce felt there needed to be more dialogue on campus on how to address academic honesty at ECC.

EU felt that, while there is currently no State- wide mandate/ requirement concerning this matter, it is important to show that ECC values academic honesty in and of itself.

It was decided to table the issue pending a Thursday meeting between EU and Mr. Tyler. This will return to the agenda on April 7th.

Mr. Tyler noted that the issue of academic dishonesty dealt with in the faculty contract, where Section 9 pg 3 describes ways for faculty to deal with these situations. Mr. Tyler noted that there has been an increase in cheating, especially electronic cheating – for example, forged transcripts. Mr. Tyler distributed copies of an article “Making Honor Codes Work”. Mr. Tyler felt the campus needed to install an honor code on campus and even have a student court to deal with instances of cheating. Student representative Joe Udeochu felt that the issue needed to be presented to students in a more direct way – like having them sign a contract as many do not read the syllabi, or class schedule.

Dr. Nishime noted that many policies were being revised but there was a concern about where to put them. They are all in the Catalog, but more students get the Class Schedule than get the Catalog.

Please send further comments on this issue to EU.

Course Repetition – 2nd Reading Evelyn Uyemura (EU)

[pg 78 of packet]

EU noted that this is not a Policy, but a Procedure. The intent is to permit certain repetitions if students desire to do so. This is not intended to allow continuous recycling of classes, nor would the State allow this.

It was suggested to remove “one time only” from line 4 of the document.

Line 1 of the document – “class” will be changed to read “course”.

Dr. Perez again noted that student still had the option to audit the classes.

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Administrative Hiring. 2nd Reading – Dr. Barbara Perez (BP)

[pp79 – 84 of Packet] This is an attempt to codify the administrative hiring process and provide guidelines. No procedures exist at present. This mimics many of the procedures of faculty hiring. BP repeated that this is a Procedure, NOT a Policy.

Mr. Vakil asked whether this would apply to the hiring of a President or Vice- President.

BP felt it might apply to the hiring of a Vice- President, but not the position of President.

It was noted that the italicized point 6 was just an editing glitch and would be corrected.

Some other minor changes on pgs 79 and 81 would also be made.

Mr. Ahmadapour had a concern about the Screening Committees and sufficient Division representation. BP referred Mr. Ahmadapour to point 4 which speaks to ensuring adequate faculty representation. Mr Ahmadapour still felt that more autonomy should be given to the Divisions, not to the Academic Senate in appointing people to the hiring panels. PM said that the Academic Senate DID look first to the divisions when soliciting people for hiring committees, and felt that the Academic Senate president was able to add third party objectivity.

The motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Resolution Regarding Partnership – Saul Panski (SP)

Mr. Panski had prepared a handout/resolution regarding Partnership for Senate Plenary, however, due to time constraints this was tabled for the next meeting.

Planning Model (Informational) – Dr. Arvid Spor (AS)

[pp 54- 59 of packet] This is intended to create more awareness of what we are doing re: planning on the campuses at ECC and the CEC. AS went through the document. It was noted that recommendations would follow each Program Review. These would need to be prioritized and put into Plan Builder, from where they would move forward to the Vice Presidents and the PBC.

Mr. Vakil queries where Planning and Budgeting came into the document and AS referred him to pg 57, point 6. Mr. Vakil opined that it was still not obvious to him, and it should be headlined or it would be easy for others to overlook. AS noted that this document was merely intended to create an awareness of planning, but Mr. Vakil felt the linkage between planning and budgeting should be made clearer, especially as it was an area noted by the Accreditation group. AS noted that the budget calendar would come to the Board each year. AS promised to make the budgeting and planning link more obvious and that the model was a work in progress. More general discussion followed, some suggestions were made re: adding to the diagram, providing an overlay to the diagram, and adding another link for evaluation. PM asked who the audience for the model was and AS said it would be any interested party from Dr. Beano, to the Board, to faculty. AS said that he welcomed questions and concerns. The issue of aligning the cycles was raised, or having all cycles be 6 – year cycles, but on a staggered rotation. EU noted that at a recent planning summit, the group had discussed adding SLO's to the planning model diagram, and to the planning statement and planning narrative, as SLO's are driving many of our actions, they should be more visible in the planning process, and this would also serve as a reminder of the central role of the student in the college.

PUBLIC COMMENT

NONE

The meeting adjourned at 1:56pm

CS/ecc2009