ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & Minutes

3 April 2014

**Adjunct Faculty(1 year)**

Vacant

Vacant

**Behavioral & Social Sciences**

Gold, Christina X

Daniel-DiGregorio, Kristie\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Widman, Lance \_X

Wynne, Michael X

Vacant

**Business**

Lau, Philip S.

Miller, Tim

Troesch, Josh\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

**Counseling**

Castro, Griselda

Jeffries, Chris \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_EXC

Vaughn, Dexter

**Fine Arts**

Ahmadpour, Ali \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Wells, Chris\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

McMillin, Russell\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_EXC

Palacios, Vince\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_EXC

Whitnay, Karen \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

**Health Sciences & Athletics**

Colunga, Mina

Baily, Kim\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_EXC

Hicks, Tom\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Lipe, Mark\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Uphoff, Robert\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

**Humanities**

Cerofeci, Rose Ann\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Gallagher, Ashley\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Marcoux, Pete \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

McLaughlin, Kate­­­­­­

Jaffe, Barbara\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_EXC

**Industry & Technology**

Durand, Ross\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Fields, Mark\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Gebert, Pat \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

MacPherson, Lee\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Muckey, Tim\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Winfree, Merriel\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

**Learning Resources Unit**

Striepe, Claudia \_X

Ichinaga, Moon \_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

**Mathematical Sciences**

Barajas, Eduardo

Hamza Hamza\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Marks, Jachary\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Sheynshteyn, Arkadiy\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Martinez, Alice

**Natural Sciences**

Jimenez, Miguel

Di Fiori, Sara\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Valle, Anne\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

VACANT

VACANT

**Academic Affairs & SCA**

Arce, Francisco\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

Klier, Bob

Nishime, Jeanie

**Compton Education Center**

French-Preston, Essie

Pratt, Estina

Halligan, Chris

Odanaka, Michael

VACANT

**Assoc. Students Org.**

Ecklund, Stefan

**Ex- Officio Positions**

Donnell, Sean (ECCFT)

Velasquez, Nina (ECCFT)

Pineda, Carolyn (Instit Research)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_X

**Guests, Dean’s Rep, Visitors:**

Dean Lew, Dean Rodriguez, Joshua Rosales, Steve Cocca, Daniel Suvater, Hiram Hironaka

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

The fourth Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2014 semester was called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:34pm. The meeting had been relocated to the Distance Education room.

**Approval of last Minutes:**

Two sets of minutes were presented for approval.

The February 18th, 2014 were accepted and approved as written.

Re: the March 4th, 2014 minutes, Mr. Lipe noted that he had attended the meeting, and not Mr. Hazell, as noted (see attendance sheet). The minutes were accepted and approved as amended.

AS President Gold thanked the senators for completing the Accreditation “homework” of reviewing sections.

AS President Gold made a request to reorder the agenda to accommodate the schedules of presenters. This was agreed to.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**Academic Program Review Materials Revision: [pg. 37-64 of packet]**

C. Gold noted that this was the second reading of the item**,** and that minor changes had been made in an effort to improve the process.

A signature page had been added to show the representatives involved and their sign-off. It was noted that sign-off does not assume agreement with the contents.

An option to include a contrary/dissenting opinion had been added on the recommendation of Mr. Klier Assistant Dean of Student Affairs.

A Student Satisfaction Survey requirement was added, as this will provide useful feedback and data.

L.Widman moved to approve, and P. Marcoux seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the item went to the vote. The vote was unanimous in favor of the revision.

**Compton Educational Center Faculty Council By-Laws: [pg. 65- 69 of packet]**

The CEC faculty body has voted on and ratified these revisions. This is the second reading at ECC. C. Gold read a statement from M. Odanaka of CEC, noting that the CEC had decided to keep the tenure and service years and that a change had been made in the curriculum area.

L. Widman moved to approve, seconded by P. Marcoux. Discussion followed. It was noted that the proposed changes are in **bold.** The item was opened for discussion.The curriculum area section had been discussed by M. Lipe and the CEC. C. Gold noted that the main reason for the by-law changes was the divisional reorganizations at the CEC. C. Wells asked whether the changes would have an impact on the number of representatives needed. C. Gold thought not. L. Widman opined that the tenure issue was exclusive of new faculty. The item went to vote. The vote was unanimous in favor of the revisions. P. Marcoux called M. Odanaka with the results of the vote as the CEC faculty were standing by to elect their representatives. Our prior vote was needed as the Faculty Council is a sub-committee of the Academic Senate.

**Academic Senate – Vice President Officer Position Nominations and Elections:**

This is the second round of nominations and election of VP Instructional Effectiveness, VP Finance and Special Projects, and VP Academic Technology.

The position of Co-VP Faculty Development will not be available this session as one of the current Co-VPs, Kristie Daniel-DiGregorio, will continue the next term as sole VP.

C. Gold reported that Sara Di Fiori has accepted the position of Academic Senate Secretary when C. Jeffries becomes Co-President of the Academic Senate next semester.

P. Marcoux nominated L. Widman for the position of VP Finance and Special Projects. L. Widman accepted and all voted aye.

C. Striepe nominated P. Marcoux for the position of VP Academic Technology. P. Marcoux accepted and all voted aye.

Later in the meeting C. Striepe nominated K. Whitney for the position of VP Instructional Effectiveness. K. Whitney accepted and all voted aye.

**BP/AP 4021 Program Discontinuance: [see pg. 34-36 of packet]**

This is the second reading of the item. The BP/AP is under the 10+1 purview of the Senate. C. Gold reported that this is a new policy/procedure that has been approved by the Educational Policies Committee, Deans Council and the VPAA. The draft here contains revisions reflecting discussion from the first reading at the Feb 18th 2014 Senate meeting.

P. Marcoux moved to approve and L. Widman seconded the motion. The item was opened for discussion. C. Gold noted changes on pg. 34 are meant to clarify that undergoing the investigation process does not necessarily mean the program will be discontinued. C. Gold noted that some changes were made to clarify the language. The changes at the bottom of pg. 35 are meant to provide opportunities for faculty and Dean participation and feedback. The change on the top of pg. 36 is meant to clarify what events may trigger the process of investigating a program for discontinuance.

C. Striepe noted that S. Cocca had brought copies of an alternative policy and wished to address the Senate.

S. Cocca felt that the proposed Policy and Procedure does not take into account all the qualitative and quantitative criteria that need to be addressed, or needs of the community and students. He proposed to read his alternative policy. C. Gold felt it might be better if all Senators had a hard copy in front of them.

S. Cocca felt one needed to look at other factors affecting a program, like a recession. Also one should have input from the community and what they perceive as important for that community. S. Cocca also had an issue with what he felt was an attempt to discontinue programs that are seen as “expensive”. He felt the programs might be expensive to fund and run, but the students would later become employers in the community and would generate money for the community. He cited colleges like SMCC that had discontinued programs and later retracted their actions.

A. Ahmadapour felt that S. Cocca had valid points, and that the Senate should not cave in to the demands of Sacramento and the Administration. The community and citizens rights as taxpayers should not be forgotten.

C. Gold noted that this is a required policy and we had been discussing it for five years already.

K. Daniel-DiGregorio asked whether the proposed procedure “will collect data and conduct search necessary” [pg.35} and the factors listed [pg.36] including conducing job market analysis, would not address these concerns. S. Cocca agreed that they might, but urged the Senate to take responsibility for academic affairs. He noted that our programs do a two yearly labor study already, and our progams are viable. Senate was urged to give them a fair shake, and not kill off because of economics. C. Gold noted that the Senate did participate in building the policy, and could not decide, but only make recommendations to the Board of Trustees. S. Cocca opined the recommendation process was flawed. Industry and Technology programs like Cosmetology and the Fire Academy are expensive programs, but based on industry co-operation. Industry likes the programs as we send them work-skilled, employable students. Achievement data seems skewed, as not all the students need a certificate, but have still achieved their goal. P. Marcoux noted that the committee is usually made of 6 people from across campus –including a Dean, Senate President, 2 faculty, etc. S. Cocca asked what happens in the event of a tie. It was agreed that language was needed to cover this, and also to explain how a recommendation is made to the BOT. The procedure needs to spell out how the decision is made. K. Daniel DiGregorio agreed that clarification and fine-tuning were needed. A. Ahmadapour felt were are destroying a culture, and turning the college into something akin to a transfer institution. C. Wells felt that a flawed policy is better than no policy, given that we are required to have one, and have not for many years. He noted that no-one liked policies, and we could revisit the policy at a later date.

S. Coca asked for an explanation of the meaning of factor 5 [pg.36]”The need for and present adequacy of resources”, and felt the last 2 factors are shortsighted. M. Lipe asked for a clarification of the timeline were we to table this item, given that fall is critical for the publication of the catalog, and policies are usually published in the catalog. C. Gold noted that the catalog is already done for the year as we work well in advance.

C.Gold noted that we would always need the agreement of Administration when crafting policy and documents. P. Gebert said that 20 years ago the situation was much different with 13 full-time and 5 part-time faculty, and program discontinuance was a real concern. C.Gold noted that at the time the Division was unprotected by a policy.

S. Cocca said his alternate policy allows for 3 possible outcomes: continuation of program, continuation with qualifications, discontinuance- there were options.

C. Wells noted that other institutions have similar language, but C. Gold noted it had been rejected here in the past.

Dean T. Lew said that while he understood the passion in the debate, he felt the senators might not understand the process for developing a policy and accompanying procedure. T. Le pointed to the references at the bottom of the BP/AP noting that these are the enabling regulations. The policy and procedure must be based on Title V regulations and Title V cites the Education Code. The Committee does not write the disputed factors and points, they are directly from Title V and we cannot change them.

T.Lew noted it had been hoped t get a Policy by year’s end, and the committee had boiled it down to essentials so as to generate the least controversy. These laws have been in place for decades. S. Cocca respectfully submitted that the laws/statutes could be interpreted variously. C.Wells asked how close the policy is to the CCLC template?

L. McPheron made a motion to table the policy and look at the alternate version. M.Ichinaga asked whether it was possible to vote just on the policy and not the procedure. C. Gold said it was possible to split them for a vote. C. Wells thought it not a good idea and the procedures have to be aligned with the policy. A motion was made to table the item and bring it back with more information. Aye was the majority vote, with one nay, and no abstentions. C. Wells asked that the pertinent section of the Ed. Code be included.

**SPECIAL REPORTS**

**Student Success Showcase: Welding.**

The Student Success Showcase highlights six ECC programs hat are particularly successful in providing one or more of the six factors students say they need to succeed: directed, nurtured, focused, engaged, connected and valued.. Renee Newell presented on the Welding program, and distributed a handout. R. Newell noted that 2014 saw the beginning of a boom for welding, which is showing a 9 – 13% job growth. Older welders are also retiring and industry is looking for younger technicians. Requirements are dropping and it is easy to find jobs. The jobs pay well and it I hard to keep the students in school. Some students do not want an Associate’s degree, just enough techniques to get jobs. The program will document the jobs they are getting. , Students are encouraged to stay in school and the program has stackable certificates so the pupils can leave with a certificate, and get more as they progress through the program. The certificates also help the track their time/hours in labs. R. Newell showed examples of metal forming exercises completed by students. The program offers L.A. Certification tests, Certificates in C&C Fabrication, Stick welding and more. An AA degree is important for managerial positions, and the stackable certificates give the students confidence to progress toward the degree. The program is beginning 8 week classes so that the students can finish quicker. They have striven to create a community where students feel comfortable and supported. K. Daniel DiGregorio asked whether the program tracked the students and R. Newell said not officially, but she keeps in touch with some informally. The program has developed a creative curriculum that looks at student needs and goals.

**Employee Campus Climate Survey 2013 Results**

Joshua Rosales of Institutional Research and Planning gave the presentation accompanied by ppt.slide shown in the packet [pg 16-33].

The aim was to survey the campus working environment. Surveys were completed on paper and online.

The survey was based o a modified 2010 survey. Responses were decent in number, administration was particularly well-represented, but more adjunct feedback is needed in future. There was a new question regarding sexual identity which will need to be clarified as some did not understand the term GLBT

Looking at the 2010 survey IR found six groups of commonalities: Mission, Inclusion, Planning, Communication, Work Environment, and Service to Students. The 201 survey showed some declines compared to 2010. How are the results used? The results are reported across campus to committees. Dr. Arce noted that results are used to identify trends, and the information is used in decision making and to improve processes – for instance in the area of communication. C. Gold had noted the low showing of Communication satisfaction and I. Graff of IR had suggested focus groups on the topic to get to the real factors behind the dissatisfaction. T. Muckey said he would like to see suggested actions and follow-up done as a result of survey results to see how we are using the data. Are we doing cross-correlation studies? J. Rosales replied that we had done a student survey in 2013 and IR could put these together and see whether there were any correlations. C.Wells asked if we compared our findings to other institutions? J. Rosales answered no. Dr. Arce noted that the intent is to survey our campus and improve this institution. We can collect enough data on other colleges from benchmarked studies for comparison.

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

None

**NEW BUSINESS**

The items were tabled.

**OFFICER REPORTS**

There was no time for Officer reports. Minutes are included in the packet.

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00pm.

CS/ECC2014