

Academic Senate Minutes

September 18, 2013

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

The first meeting (September 4th meeting was cancelled) of the Academic Senate was called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:40pm on Tuesday, September 18, 2012. The meeting was held in the Alondra Room.

Approval of Minutes

[See pp.5-10 of packet] for minutes of the May 29th meeting. Being it had been last semester since our previous meeting; no one saw any glaring mistakes or omissions in the minutes. President Gold explained that in the past we never really took an actual vote for approval of the minutes, but instead looked at the minutes as informational and gave blanket approval as amended if needed. Everyone agreed that this format could be continued, so C. Gold offered a motion and it was seconded to approve minutes in the abbreviated form. The motion was approved unanimously. The minutes from the previous meeting were approved without any amendments.

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

[See pp.6-25; 50-51]

CG started by introducing the Executive Board of the Senate and welcomed back C. Jeffries as Secretary who is replacing C. Striepe who is now co-chair of Faculty Development. All other officers stayed the same with the exception of Michael Odanaka moving into the position of VP of the Compton Educational Center. There is also a vacancy for the VP of Instructional Effectiveness with the departure of Kelly Holt and for now will be reported on by CG.

CG reported that there is definitely cheating going on around campus as evident by the recent emails regarding Turnitin.com. CG also showed a picture of an actual posted note that was found across campus advertising the selling of exams and even gave a phone number that could be texted for more information. It was suggested that someone call that number!

CG referred us to page 4 of the packet which listed the various Senate and campus committee meetings throughout the semester. Any changes should be submitted to CG.

The Senate needs members for four committees:

- 1) Sustainability committee – an active committee
- 2) Representative to the Associated Students Organization
- 3) Educational Policies
- 4) Academic Program Review

Handout sheets were passed around for senators to submit their names.

There are also two committees from last year that need to be reconvened and those are the Student Success Task Force headed by Dr. Nishime and the Evaluation Committee chaired by CG. More information to follow.

CG presented a copy of the budget for perusal.

CG reminded the Senators of the Diversity Conference being held on our campus on 9/28. The conference is free and is being sponsored by FAAC. C. Wells said he has attended in the past and it is terrific.

Pg. 24 of the packet refers to The Chancellor's Office press release regarding passage of Student Success Act of 2012. The act is now being legislated.

Pgs. 17-19 are a list of the Chancellor's Office legislative updates. C. Wells talked about AB 852 (Fong) that addresses rehire rights for part-time faculty. He suggested this bill would change the way we function in regards to hiring part-timers.

Pgs. 20-23 explain the differences between Propositions 30 and 38. We as a Senate cannot support either proposition as for or against since it is a political item. CG did note that the Chancellor's Office, the Community College League of California (CCLC) and the State-wide Academic Senate have all came out in favor of Proposition 30.

Pgs. 50-51 contain the press release from the Chancellor's Office on the budget cuts in California and how it has resulted in an historic enrollment decline at California Community Colleges. The document states that "over the past three years we've lost more students than are enrolled at all California State University campuses combined." Irene Graff confirmed that statement was true.

Pgs 12-15 contain information regarding the Collegial Consultation process here at ECC. CG went over the history of the recent efforts to develop collegial consultation on our campus. On April 3, 2012, the Academic Senate passed a resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of the Collegial Consultation Process at the Torrance campus. On that same day, the ASCCC/CCLC conducted a presentation on the process. This presentation was discussed by College Council from May thru July in a number of two hour meetings. CG felt the conversation was open and refreshing and everyone had a chance to air their problems. From these discussions, a task force was created that produced the draft document "Making Decisions at El Camino College." CG said the E-board has had a chance to discuss this draft and the main worries were whether or not the words will translate into actions. L. Widman asked if there was any closure on the discussions with prescribed actions and CG said there is only the document at this time. She will present it to Senate when it is all finished. P. Marcoux brought up the fact that we do have BP 2510 which is suppose to address the collegial consultation process, but it has not been revised in quite some time even though the accrediting agency wants to see it updated. In fact, it is a sticking point for accreditation. CG said there are no plans to revise that policy at this time, but it is being used as a reference document. The finished "Making Decisions at El Camino College" will be used for accreditation. PM said the new document should match BP 2510. M. Ichinaga asked if this new document was going to be approved by the Board of Trustees. Dr. Nishime stated that since it is a College Council item, it will most likely be presented to the Board, but not voted on. C. Striepe wondered if this process went as far deep as the department level and was told no by CG. CG noted that it would more guide collegial consultation committees like the Calendar Committee and the PBC. A. Martinez asked if this would affect the Insurance Benefits Committee, but since that is not a collegial consultation committee, the answer is no. J. Nishime stated that College Council is only looking at the formal collegial consultation process as defined in BP 2510. Our draft document was modeled after similar documents by Moorpark and Orange Coast colleges. A. Martinez asked if those schools had any results from producing their documents, but no one knew that answer.

CG announced that the accreditation follow-up report is due on October 15th and that we will be having a site visit on November 13th. It is a small visit of only 3-4 individuals. CG stated that in her review of the follow-up report she felt there were lots of things for faculty to brag about such

as SLO's and Program Review, but the only sticky points were the input into the planning process. She asked that anybody who has feedback please send it to her via email. L. Widman asked if there would be any open meetings with a panel of the site visitors and J. Nishime said she didn't think so since most of the time would be spent at Compton. The chair is the new president of Lake Tahoe Community College. LW asked if any individual can send an independent report to the Accreditation Committee and JN responded that the Commission usually does not accept those. This particular visit is only looking at the five recommendations from the previous accreditation report and the next comprehensive visit would not happen until Fall 2014. The student representative, S.Montague-Jackson asked what is a site visit. JN explained that they will be looking at whether or not there has been any progress in the five recommendations made by the Commission. These include:

- 1) Linking program review and planning with budget allocations
- 2) SLO progress
- 3) The quality and consistency of Distance Education classes
- 4) The integration of SLO assessment into the faculty evaluation process
- 5) The fiscal management plan especially at the Compton Center

VP - Compton Educational Plan report – Michael Odanaka (MW)

There was ethics training for the faculty on the second day of flex day at the beginning of the semester. Topics included cheating, record keeping, grading and “pay or play for grades.” It is the responsibility of the faculty member to report a colleague if they see them doing something unethical which of course is a touchy subject. They are currently working on rewriting the Faculty Code of Conduct. There will also be the implementation of a “We Tip Hotline” which is an anonymous hotline to be used if any unethical behavior is observed. J. Nishime stated that this is a requirement by the Accreditation Commission. Budget is also a crucial part of accreditation and the CEC has adopted a 2012/2013 budget and closed out the old budget for the first time in years. MO noted that some classes have been cut and this has raised a concern regarding the collegial consultation process since there is no current program discontinuance policy in place and the CEC faculty wants to have input on these cuts. A discussion of cuts at LBCC ensued and C. Wells pointed out that our Program Discontinuance Policy needs to be looked at again. CG explained that the policy was approved by the Senate two years ago, but it was too lengthy and it was cut down considerably by the deans and now Dean Lew and Dean Miranda are currently working on it to incorporate both the Senate's policy and the dean's policy. Discussion followed regarding what is happening on other campuses and how much input will faculty have in the process. CG said a Task Force will be initiated and asked for volunteers to contact her.

Curriculum Committee Report – Jenny Simon and Mark Lipe (JS and ML)

Pgs. 26-32. JS noted that course review is on target for the 6-year cycle and approximately 200 courses would be reviewed each year. ML who is chair-elect to the College Curriculum Committee explained the repeatability issue outlined on pgs. 26-29. This change affects activity courses and goes into effect for Fall 2013. Students will no longer be able to repeat courses a number of times as is now allowed in our abcd courses. These three exceptions are allowed:

- 1) Mandatory for transfer
- 2) Intercollegiate athletic courses
- 3) Intercollegiate academic competition like journalism or debate/forensics

Departments can develop a “family” of courses that are similar in nature like beginning swimming, intermediate swimming and advanced swimming. C. Fitzsimons stated that this will definitely pose a problem in the Fine Arts division. Especially in the area of art and music, many need to be afforded the repeating of certain courses. She will be working with JS and ML on solutions to this problem. ML explained the difference between repeatability and repetition and further discussion ensued.

JS went on to explain the El Camino Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) to the group. Twenty-one degrees have been approved by the state and currently El Camino has four approved (Sociology, Communication Studies, Psychology, and Geology), has two pending (Administration of Justice and Physics), has two approved with revisions in Curriculum (Kinesiology and Math), nine are planned for Fall 12 and four for Spring 13. JS stated that these will be a priority in Curriculum.

VP - Educational Policies Committee – Merriel Winfree (MW)

No report.

CO-VPs – Faculty Development – Moon Ichinaga and Claudia Striepe(MI and CS)

No report.

VP - Finance – Lance Widman (LW)

No verbal report was given, but LW did want the Senate to pay particular attention to the 8/23 PBC minutes beginning on page 35. This was a particularly important meeting because this is when President Fallo met with the PBC to discuss the underlying assumptions and policy issues contained in the 2012-13 Fiscal Budget prior to it being submitted to the Board for action in September. Pgs. 35-36 is the 2012-13 Final Budget presentation. Pgs. 36-37 and also pgs. 39-49 contain information about the upcoming Bond or Measure E. Pgs. 37-38 is an overview of the 2012-13 Final Budget by President Fallo.

VP – Academic Technology – Pete Marcoux (PM)

No report.

VP Instructional Effectiveness – Vacant (Christina Gold reporting)

No report.

Enrollment Priorities – Jeanie Nishime (JN)

The new enrollment priorities were passed by the Board of Governors and goes into effect Fall 2014. The first priority goes to activity military duty, foster youths, and DSPS and EOPS students. After those are new students who have completed assessment, orientation, have educational plans (counseling) and for continuing students those who are in good standing. After that is any local priorities decided by the District. Students can lose priority if they have accumulated over 100 units or have been on probation for two or more semesters. JN stated that we will need to clear up our MIS reporting to determine some of these priorities and there is a question as to whether or not this priority is only for one semester or multiple semesters. JN also noted that we may need to shift our enrollment timing and maybe separate our summer and fall registration periods. There are also questions on how to handle transfers and those bringing in AP exams.

Associated Students Organization – Simone Montague-Jackson

ASO has begun a campaign jump off for Bond Measure E (pgs. 39-49) which is being supported by the students. There are plans for a Halloween Maze mixer which will coincide with the Homecoming festivities.

Future Agenda Items

CSULB Resolution – Chris Wells

Public Comment

L. Widman – Tuesday, October 23, 2012, the League of Women’s Voters will be on campus to talk about Propositions 30 and 32 and all state-wide ballot propositions.

Discussion ensued as to whether or not there can be organized efforts to support Measure E which was asked by M. Ichinaga. Any time spent on this issue must be on break time or off duty times. The Bond is being endorsed and encouraged by the Administration. No further discussion was allowed as time ran out.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:02pm

CJ/ECCFall2012