ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES
March 3, 2009

<u>Attendance</u> (X indicates present, exc indicates excused, pre-arranged absence)

Behavioral & Social Sciences
Gold, Chris _____ X
Widman, Lance _____ X
Wynne, Michael _____ X

Business
Halamka, Dagmar
Saddiqui, Junaid _____ X
Lau, Philip S _____ X

Counseling
Beley, Kate _____ X
Gallucci, Linda
Jackson, Brenda _____ X
Jeffries, Chris _____ exc
Pajo, Christina

Fine Arts
Ahmadpour, Ali _____ X
Davidson, Jason
Wells, Chris _____ X
Crossman, Mark
Berney, Daniel _____ X

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

Humanities
Hong, Lyman _____ X
Marcoux, Pete _____ X
Uyemura, Evelyn _____ X
Kline, Matt _____ X
Adrienne Sharp _____ X

Industry & Technology
Gebert, Pat
Hofmann, Ed _____ X
MacPherson, Lee _____ X
Marston, Doug _____ X
Rodriguez, George

Learning Resources Unit
Striepe, Claudia _____ X
Ichinaga, Moon _____ X

Mathematical Sciences
Scott, Greg
Glucksman, Marc _____ X
Boerger, John _____ X
Fry, Greg _____ X
Yun, Paul

Natural Sciences
Cowell, Chas _____ exc
Herzig, Chuck _____ X
Palos Teresa _____ exc
Vakil, David _____ X

Adjunct Faculty
Kate McLaughlin _____ X
Jeremy Estrella

ECC CEC Members
Panski, Saul _____ X
Pratt, Estina _____ X
Smith, Darwin _____ X
Evans, Jerome
Norton, Tom

Assoc. Students Org.
Joe Udeochu _____ X

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. 1-6 of packet] from the last Academic Senate meeting were unanimously approved.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS
President's report – Pete Marcoux (henceforth PM)
PM asked for two faculty representatives from Fine Arts to serve on a hiring panel for a Fine Arts Division Dean. Health Sciences and Athletics faculty are also needed for a hiring panel. Interested faculty please contact PM.
PM asked attendees to note any changes in status on the Mailing List so that it would accurately reflect our membership.

Compton Education Center report - Saul Panski (SP)
CEC faculty are pleased at the larger enrollment. CEC leadership is consumed by the Accreditation issue and in response:
- Have put one CEC representative on the College Council
- Have had a crash course in Plan Builder
- Are working hard to reinvigorate the Compton Division Curriculum representatives and establish a Curriculum Advisory Committee
- Faculty representatives have met with the Compton Special Trustee to work on ways of showing progress
- It has been recognized that the integration of the two campuses must be speeded up and CEC leadership will share this with the CEC faculty.

Mr. Vakil asked how many CEC folk were on the upcoming Accreditation Task Force. SP replied that these details had not been fleshed out yet, but that he would try and get as many supportive CEC faculty as possible onto the task force.
Ms. Ichinaga noted that the initial "partnership" with Compton had now become an "integration" of the two campuses. How had this happened, and did the Accrediting Commission have the power to impose this interpretation on us? Dr. Arce noted that the CEC employees were still employees of the Compton District, not of the El Camino District. Whether the relationship was a partnership or an integration was still not completely clear but the Commission is holding the cards, and they seem to interpret the relationship as an integration of the campuses, so we must act accordingly. SP noted that this confusion was one reason the CEC was running on a dual track, with a Provost and a CEO.

Curriculum Committee report – Janet Young (JY)

[pp. of packet] JY reported that recommendations from the ACCJ – especially regarding Recommendation 3 – *"The college should revise its curriculum review process and cycles so that all curriculum across the college is reviewed consistently, that the cycle of review assures the currency of the curriculum, and that the curriculum review and program review processes are integrated so that an important element of program review will be part of the actual program review process."*- had provided a needed nudge to move forward to a 6 year review cycle. Curriculum had begun to analyze this problem last Fall. JY provided the following chart

Number of Courses Per Division			
Division	Number of Courses	Percentage of Campus Courses	Courses to Be Reviewed Each Semester to Maintain a 6-Year Cycle
Behavioral and Social Sciences	136	10%	11 -12 per semester
Business	115	9%	9-10 per semester
Fine Arts	239	18%	19-20 per semester
Health Sciences and Athletics	207	16%	17-18 per semester
Humanities	157	12%	13-14 per semester
Industry and Technology	342	26%	28-29 per semester
Mathematical Sciences	46	3%	3-4 per semester
Natural Sciences	78	6%	6-7 per semester
Total	**1320**	**100%**	**106 – 114 per semester**
These numbers will be reduced based on inactivations and blanket approvals for Cooperative Work Experience, Special Topics, and Independent Study Courses. However, these numbers **do not include** new courses, majors, certificates, or course revisions that are needed within the six-year cycle.			

JY also noted the following strategies for improvement to the Curriculum process:

- Moving quickly to inactivate dormant classes and remove them from the 2009-2010 catalog.
- Piloting a Standard Review Sub- Committee to review courses with minor changes in order to increase number of courses.
- Piloting a six-year review cycle worksheet with faculty. One faculty member from each dept. will be asked to take the lead on this.
- Integrating Course Review with program Review based on the worksheet.
- Informally slowing down the influx of new courses until courses are up-to-date. 64 new courses were approved but never offered. Need and viability must be confirmed.
- Three Course Review workshops will be held in March, one will be held at Compton. More workshops may be added for April and May.
- Working to secure reassigned time for the new chair for Summer and Winter. This is felt to be vital to the success of the six- year review cycle.
- Working to maintain additional personnel for the Curriculum Office. Dr. Arce supports this, and it is felt to be vital to the success of the six- year review cycle.
- Working with Drs. Arce, Jaffe and Spor to respond to the ACCJC and provide evidence of progress.

PM noted that perhaps a list serve could provide a forum to share information on these initiatives with faculty. JY said faculty did need to step up and help solve the problems.

NEW BUSINESS
VP- Educational Policies Report – Evelyn Uyemura (EU)
No report. SEE New Business.

Faculty Development – Dave Vakil (DV)
No report.

Legislative Action – Chris Wells (CW)
No report.

Finance and Special Projects/ PBC (Planning and Budgeting Committee) – Lance Widman (LW)
No report.

ASO Representative Report - Joe Udeochu (JU)
No report.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES
NONE

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
NONE

NEW BUSINESS
Administrative Hiring. 1st Reading – Dr. Barbara Perez (BP)
(pp89 – 94 of packet) This is an attempt to codify the administrative hiring process. No procedures exist at present. A Police Officers Association representative will be added as appropriate.
Mr. Vakil queried the use of "in consultation with" (p 89:B4) and suggested that be replaced with "Mutual agreement". Mr. Vakil also noted a discrepancy between the amounts of people on some panels. BP noted that this document merely stated a minimum recommendation and that the Chairs were free to increase the panel member numbers if they so desired.
This is the first reading, the item will be voted on at the next meeting.
Please email further comments to PM or BP.

Code of Ethics. 1st Reading – Dr. Barbara Perez (BP)
(pp 95- 97 of packet) Dr. Perez noted that this was an Accreditation standard and requirement that a team had been addressing, and now a Committee had been formed. Information had been pulled from other institutions on this matter, and Dr. Perez noted that the Feather River College model had been admired for its "positive" style. Mr. Widman questioned a statement "Violations of the Code will be addressed through due

process and subject to disciplinary action….(pg.96 packet) saying that he was not aware of any provisions in our negotiated agreement that specified disciplinary action. Dr. Perez wondered if we needed a specific Board Policy on Disciplinary Action, or if we should let this issue go through the Union. Dr. Perez will follow up on this and talk to Don Brown. Mrs. Uyemura noted that there might be some areas where a conflict of interest could exist, and the document might need to be more specific in some areas. Dr. Perez noted that some areas are covered by State law, specifically the Education Code. Dr. Gold opined that the phrase "excellence in education" was too idealistic and suggested toning it down. Mr. Marston felt the phrase "do no harm" was too general and therefore meaningless, and the language in general should be tightened up.
Dr. Perez said that the Statement of Values had been used as a basis.
Mr. Widman wanted to know if the document just referred to actions on the campus, or off- campus/in the community as well. Dr. Perez said she did not envision that it would extend beyond the campus. Please send further suggestions and comments to Dr. Perez or Dave Vakil.

Academic Honesty - 1st Reading – Evelyn Uyemura (EU)
(pp 86-87 of packet) Previously most of this content was contained in the Standards of Student Conduct Board Policy, 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. The proposed policy may remain a separate policy, or it may be refolded back into the Standards of Student Conduct Policy – but at least the faculty will have had a voice in it. Academic Honesty is not just a matter for students, but for the entire academic community, EU noted.
The language has been modified and updated and #9 has been added "Handing in the same paper or other assignment in more than one class without the knowledge and permission of both instructors".
The Consequences section has added "Where there is **evidence** of dishonesty…" and the evidence should be tangible. There was a brief discussion as to whether "opinion" can be considered tangible evidence, and EU said that a teacher must be able to back actions/accusations up. An instructor should at least document opinions/suspicions. Students would have a right to contest accusations.
On the question of failing a student for dishonesty, it was noted that it had been previously agreed to go with only a zero for the assignment, not for the entire class, though a student might still fail as a result of that zero grade. Students have due process rights that are not examined here.
There was a query on # 4 "If there is evidence of serious or repeated violations…" What would constitute "serious and repeated violations"?
It was felt that this document should also go to Student Government. Dr. Nishime said this document should be used in tandem with the Standards of Conduct.
There was discussion of the term "evidence". It was felt to be tough to pin down, but it was generally felt to be best to fill in a form stating what you had witnessed even if it could not be termed "hard evidence". Pp 114-116 of packet has some forms for use, or forms are available from the office of Mr. Tyler. It was also advisable to get evidence/forms to the Division Deans as quickly as possible so that they were forewarned

of potential situations, and so that other faculty could be alerted. The use of forms would also build up an "evidence of repeatability". It was noted that repeated cheating could lead to expulsion, as noted in # 4.

Mr. Ahmadapour noted that these concepts were not clearly stated in the Schedule of Classes, and it was noted that this document would replace the current statement in the Schedule.

Course Repetition - 1st Reading – Evelyn Uyemura (EU)
(PP88 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 - for instance, to allow for repetition if the course material has changed substantially since the student last took the class, due to the nature of the subject (computer sciences), or a long time- lapse.

It was also noted that students also have the option to audit classes, or certain classes could be changed to an *abcd* desination allowing for more repeats. It was suggested to remove "one time only" from line 4 of the document.

This document should also go before Student Government.

Syllabus Template – 1st Reading – Dr. Susie Dever (SD)
(pp30-36 of packet) SD gave a little background to the issue, noting that the CEC is facing FCMAT demands for specific course syllabi. Thus Compton faculty have been working on a syllabi template, as their need is urgent. SD acknowledged that the CEC Humanities Division Chair, professor Shelby has done the bulk of the work along with herself, and with input from Dr. Arce. They have come up with a beta test version, and Prof. Shelby gave a workshop at the ECC Flex day.

SD has taken all the syllabi and made a checklist of content (see pp30-31 of packet) This allows faculty to be notified of what has been done/needs to be done regarding syllabi. Pg32 of packet shows the template format. Anyone is welcome to use this.

Pg34 of packet shows the standard language to use on a standard syllabus. The CEC is moving forward to see if they can get everyone to use this language on their syllabi. Some people have more detail, but this would be the desired minimum. SD complimented the CEC faculty on their cooperation. PM noted that there is also a committee at ECC working on a similar project. It was suggested to start a "Best practices" page, with recommendations and suggestions.

SD noted that this is all just for informational purposes, and was presented recently at a Dean's Council. It is hoped to have everyone on track by Summer.

This is the first reading, but it is not a voting item. PM thanked SD.

Planning Model (Informational) – Dr. Arvid Spor (AS)
This item was tabled for the next meeting.

Program Review Model – 1st Reading
(pp 98 – 103 of packet) One recommendation from the Accreditation Commission was that we needed to improve our Program Review model. Dr. Jaffe has been spearheading this. This is an informational item.

Please read the relevant pages and send comments to Dr. Jaffe or PM. The idea is to put all of this into Plan Builder. Mr. Kjeseth commented that the more we conceded that it is all one process with three components, the easier it would be. If Program Review is held every 5/6 years, as with Curriculum Review, efforts could be better coordinated. It was noted that they were better aligned in the past, but somehow got out of sync.

PUBLIC COMMENT
NONE

The meeting adjourned at 1:56pm

CS/ecc2009