



# Academic Senate of El Camino College 2010-2011

November 2, 2010

AC152, 16007 Crenshaw Boulevard  
Torrance, CA 90506-0001 (310) 532-3670 x3254  
www.elcamino.edu/academics/academicssenate/

## Officers & Executive Committee

President	<b>Christina Gold</b>	Co-VPs Faculty Development	<b>Briita Halonen &amp; Cristina Pajo</b>
VP Compton Educ'l Center	<b>Saul Panski</b>	VP Finance and Special Projects	<b>Lance Widman</b>
Curriculum Chair	<b>Lars Kjeseth</b>	VP Legislative Action	<b>Chris Wells</b>
VP Educational Policies	<b>Chris Jeffries</b>	Secretary	<b>Claudia Striepe</b>

## Senate Mailing List

<u>Adjunct</u>	(1 yr term)	<u>Health Sci &amp; Athletics/Nursing</u>	<u>Natural Sciences</u>
_____ (vacant)		<b>Tom Hazell*</b> 10	<b>Chuck Herzig</b> 11/12
_____ (vacant)		<b>Tom Hicks</b> 10	<b>Miguel Jimenez</b> 11/12
		<b>Mina Colunga</b> 12/13	<b>Teresa Palos*</b> 10/11
<u>Behavior &amp; Social Sciences</u>		<b>Pat McGinley</b> 12/13	<b>Pete Doucette</b> 12/13
<b>Randy Firestone</b> 11/12		<b>Kathleen Rosales</b> 11/12	_____ (vacant)
<b>Christina Gold</b> 10/11			
<b>Michelle Moen</b> 11/12		<u>Humanities</u>	<u>Academic Affairs &amp; SCA</u>
<b>Lance Widman*</b> 10/11		<b>Brent Isaacs</b> 11/12	<b>Francisco Arce</b>
<b>Michael Wynne</b> 11/12		<b>Peter Marcoux</b> 11/12	<b>Karen Lam</b>
		<b>Kate McLaughlin</b> 11/12	<b>Jeanie Nishime</b>
<u>Business</u>		<b>Briita Halonen</b> 11/12	<b>Claudia Lee</b>
<b>Phillip Lau</b> 11/12		<b>Jenny Simon</b> 11/12	<u>Associated Students Org.</u>
<b>Jay Siddiqui*</b> 11/12			<b>Jessica Lopez</b>
<b>Kurt Hull</b> 12/13		<u>Industry &amp; Technology</u>	<b>Dalal Budri</b>
		<b>Patty Gebert</b> 12/13	
<u>Compton Educational Center</u>	(1 yr term)	<b>Harold Hofmann</b> 12/13	<u>President/Superintendent</u>
<b>Jerome Evans</b> 10/11		<b>Lee Macpherson</b> 12/13	<b>Thomas Fallo</b>
<b>Chris Halligan</b> 10/11		<b>Douglas Marston*</b> 12/13	
<b>Tom Norton</b> 10/11		<b>Merriel Winfree</b> 12/13	<u>The Union</u> <b>Editor</b>
<b>Saul Panski</b> 10/11			
<b>Estina Pratt</b> 10/11		<u>Learning Resource Unit</u>	<u>Division Personnel</u>
<b>Darwin Smith</b> 10/11		<b>Moon Ichinaga</b> 10/11	<b>Jean Shankweiler</b>
<u>Counseling</u>		<b>Claudia Striepe*</b> 10/11	<b>Don Goldberg</b>
<b>Cristina Pajo</b> 11/12			<b>Tom Lew</b>
<b>Brenda Jackson*</b> 10/11		<u>Mathematical Sciences</u>	
<b>Chris Jeffries</b> 10/11		<b>Michael Bateman</b> 12/13	<u>Counseling</u> <b>Ken Key</b>
		<b>John Boerger</b> 10/11	<u>Ex-officio positions</u>
<u>Fine Arts</u>		<b>Greg Fry</b> 10/11	ECCFT President
<b>Ali Ahmadpour</b> 11/12		<b>Susan Taylor</b> 11/12	<b>Elizabeth Shadish</b>
<b>Randall Bloomberg</b> 11/12		<b>Paul Yun*</b> 10/11	<b>Nina Velasquez</b>
<b>Mark Crossman</b> 11/12			Curriculum Chair
<b>Patrick Schulz</b> 11/12			<b>Lars Kjeseth</b>
<b>Chris Wells*</b> 11/12			<u>Institutional Research</u>
			<b>Irene Graff</b>
			<b>Carolyn Pineda</b>

Dates after names indicate the last academic year of the senator's three year term, except for Compton senators who serve one-year terms. For example 11/12 = 2011-2012.

\*denotes senator from the division who has served on Senate the longest (i.e. the "senior senator")



# Academic Senate of El Camino College 2010-2011

November 2, 2010

AC152, 16007 Crenshaw Boulevard  
Torrance, CA 90506-0001 (310) 532-3670 x3254  
www.elcamino.edu/academics/academicssenate/

## **SENATE'S PURPOSE (from the Senate Constitution)**

- A. 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."
- B. To facilitate communication among faculty, administration, employee organizations, bargaining agents and the El Camino College Board of Trustees.

## **ECC ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS** (1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesdays, usually)

### **FALL 2010**

September 7	DE Conference Room
September 21	DE Conference Room
October 5	Alondra Room
October 19	Alondra Room
November 2	DE Conference Room
November 16	Alondra Room
December 7	Alondra Room

### **SPRING 2011**

March 1	Alondra Room
March 15	Alondra Room
April 5	Alondra Room
April 19	Compton Board Room
May 3	Alondra Room
May 17	Alondra Room
June 7	Alondra Room

## **CEC ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING DATES AND LOCATIONS** (Thursday after ECC Senate, usually)

### **FALL 2010**

September 9	Board Room
September 23	Board Room
October 7	Board Room
October 21	Board Room
November 4	Board Room
November 18	Board Room
December 9	Board Room

### **SPRING 2011**

March 3	Board Room
March 17	Board Room
April 7	Board Room
April 21	Board Room
May 5	Board Room
May 19	Board Room
June 2	Board Room



**AGENDA & TABLE OF CONTENTS**

		Pages
<b>A. CALL TO ORDER (12:30)</b>		
<b>B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>		<b>6-13</b>
<b>C. OFFICER REPORTS</b>	<b>A. President</b> <b>B. VP – Compton Center</b> <b>C. Chair – Curriculum</b> <b>D. VP – Educational Policies</b> <b>E. Co-VPs – Faculty Development</b> <b>F. VP – Finance</b> <b>G. VP – Legislative Action</b>	<b>14-20, 47</b>      <b>21-22</b>  <b>23-29</b>
<b>G. SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS</b>	<b>A. Dean’s Council Report</b> <b>B. Assessment of Learning Committee Report – Core Competency Summit</b> <b>C. ECC Federation of Teachers Report</b> <b>D. Officer Nominations</b>	<b>30-40</b>
<b>H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (1:00pm)</b>	<b>A. BP/AP 4055 – Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities (action item – second reading)</b>	<b>41-46</b>
<b>I. NEW BUSINESS</b>	<b>A. Academic Calendar Resolution (action item – first reading)</b>	
<b>J. INFORMATION ITEMS - DISCUSSION</b>	<b>A. International Education Policy</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>K. AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS</b>		



# Academic Senate of El Camino College 2010-2011

November 2, 2010

AC152, 16007 Crenshaw Boulevard  
Torrance, CA 90506-0001 (310) 532-3670 x3254  
[www.elcamino.edu/academics/academicssenate/](http://www.elcamino.edu/academics/academicssenate/)

---

<b>L. PUBLIC COMMENT</b>		
<b>M. ADJOURN – 1:45</b>		



## **Committees**

<u>NAME</u>	<u>CHAIR</u>	<u>DAY</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>ROOM</u>
<b><u>Senate</u></b>				
<b>ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING (SLOs)</b>	Jenny Simon	2 <sup>nd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> Mon.	2:30-4:00	Library 202
<b>COMPTON ACADEMIC SENATE</b>	Saul Panski	Thursdays	1:00-2:00	CEC Board
<b>COMPTON FACULTY COUNCIL</b>	Saul Panski	Thursdays	2:00-3:00	CEC Board
<b>CURRICULUM</b>	Lars Kjeseth		2:30-4:30	Board Room
<b>EDUCATION POLICIES</b>	Chris Jeffries	2 <sup>nd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> Tues.	12:30-2:00	SSC 106
<b>PLANNING &amp; BUDGETING</b>	Arvid Spor	1 <sup>st</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> Thurs.	1:00 – 2:30	Library 202
<b>FACULTY DEVELOPMENT</b>	Briita Halonen Cristina Pajo	2 <sup>nd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> Tues	1:00 – 1:50	West Lib. Basement
<b>CALENDAR</b>	Jeanie Nishime	Sep 30	3pm	Board Room
<b>ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY</b>	Jim Noyes, Virginia Rapp	Sep 24 Nov 12	12:30 – 2:00 pm	Library 202
<b><u>Campus</u></b>				
<b>ACCREDITATION</b>	Francisco Arce , Arvid Spor, Evelyn Uyemura			
<b>BOARD OF TRUSTEES</b>	Ray Gen	3 <sup>rd</sup> Mon	4:00	Board Room
<b>COLLEGE COUNCIL</b>	Tom Fallo	Mondays	1:00-2:00	Adm. 127
<b>DEAN’S COUNCIL</b>	Francisco Arce	Thursdays	9:00-10:30	Library 202
<b>CAMPUS TECHNOLOGY</b>	.			
<b>ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT</b>	Arvid Spor	1 <sup>st</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> Thurs	9-10:00 am	Library 202

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES  
19<sup>th</sup> October 2010

**Adjunct Faculty**

vacant

**Behavioral & Social Sciences**

<u>Firestone, Randy</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Gold, Christina</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Moen, Michelle</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Widman, Lance</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Wynne, Michael</u>	<u>X</u>

**Business**

<u>Siddiqui, Junaid</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Lau, Philip S</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Hull, Kurt</u>	<u>X</u>

**Counseling**

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

**Fine Arts**

<u>Ahmadpour, Ali</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Bloomberg, Randall</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Crossman, Mark</u>	
<u>Schultz, Patrick</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Wells, Chris</u>	<u>X</u>

**Health Sciences & Athletics**

<u>Hazell, Tom</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>McGinley, Pat</u>	
<u>Rosales, Kathleen</u>	
<u>Colunga, Mina</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Hicks, Tom</u>	

**Humanities**

<u>Isaacs, Brent</u>	
<u>Marcoux, Pete</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>McLaughlin, Kate</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Halonen, Briita</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Simon, Jenny</u>	<u>X</u>

**Industry & Technology**

<u>Gebert, Pat</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Hofmann, Ed</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>MacPherson, Lee</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Winfree, Merriel</u>	
<u>Marston, Doug</u>	

**Learning Resources Unit**

<u>Striepe, Claudia</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Ichinaga, Moon</u>	<u>X</u>

**Mathematical Sciences**

<u>Bateman, Michael</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Boerger, John</u>	
<u>Fry, Greg</u>	
<u>Taylor, Susan</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Yun, Paul</u>	<u>X</u>

**Natural Sciences**

<u>Doucette, Pete</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Herzig, Chuck</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Jimenez, Miguel</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Palos Teresa</u>	<u>X</u>

vacant

**Academic Affairs & SCA**

<u>Chapman, Quajuana</u>	
<u>Arce, Francisco</u>	
<u>Nishime, Jeanie</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Lee, Claudia</u>	<u>X</u>

**ECC CEC Members**

<u>Evans, Jerome</u>	
<u>Norton, Tom</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Panski, Saul</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Pratt, Estina</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Halligan, Chris</u>	

**Assoc. Students Org.**

<u>Budri, Lala</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Lopez, Jessica</u>	

**Ex- Officio Positions**

<u>Shadish, Elizabeth</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>Kjeseth, Lars</u>	<u>X</u>

**Guests, Dean's Rep, Visitors:**

J. Young, K. Key, B. Jaffe, Mediha Din (B&SS)

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 Fall 2010 semester was called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:35pm.

Approval of last Minutes:

The minutes [pp.6 -14 of packet] from the September 21<sup>st</sup> Academic Senate meeting were reviewed. Ms. Jeffries noted an addition to a statement she had made (pg10) and a typo (pg 13). The minutes were approved as amended.

**REPORTS OF OFFICERS**

President's report – Christina Gold (henceforth CG)

[See packet pp.15 – 22]

CG noted that the **College Council** is working on their goals and objectives [see pp15-16 of packet] including the employee morale issue at both the ECC and CEC campuses. CG is also continuing her work on this issue. Talk at Council also revolved around the agenda for the Oct 18<sup>th</sup> Board meeting.

On the **Atlantis Grant cancellation** [see pp. 17-22 of packet] CG included the Daily Breeze article of 10/9/2010, Board Policy 7400 relating to conferences and faculty travel, and Article 16 of the ECC College District and ECC Federation of Teachers Agreement 92007-2010) regarding Professional meetings and Conferences for the senators' information.

The **ECC Board meeting** of the 18<sup>th</sup> October 2010 met from 4pm through 6 pm. CG reported that the Compton Education Center had sent a delegation to talk on the re-accreditation of the CEC and ask that ECC speed up this process, and also spoke in favor of rehiring Dr. Cox. At the Board meeting CG reported on two items:

A. The Atlantis Grant cancellation SLIDE

**Faculty Concern #1:** The Atlantis Grant offered a wonderful opportunity for 48 child development students to engage in international learning. The amazing experience that these students would have enjoyed was denied for the reason of preventing one faculty-member from engaging in less than a week of international travel. The administrative concerns of the college were clearly placed above the benefit to students.

**Faculty Concern #2:** The policy to disallow international faculty travel that primarily motivated the cancellation of the Atlantis Grant is arbitrary and violates the Academic Senate's collegial consultation Title 5 rights in the areas of faculty development and program development.

Mr. Widman asked if there are any procedures attached to BP 7400 referred to above, and Dr. Nishime said that unless the policy had been recently updated the answer is no. Mr. Widman noted that he then had a concern that the refusal re: the Atlantis Grant was an ad hoc decision. Dr. Nishime pointed out that the policy does require Board approval for international travel. Mr. Widman said that if a proposal is vetoed it would never reach the Board. Mr. Kjeseth said this would then become a 10+1 issue. "Pocket vetoes" are not in compliance with 10+1 and shows that a more direct line is needed between the Academic Senate and the Board, independent of Administration.

CG noted that as Academic Senate President she would like to look more closely at faculty concern #2.

B. The Academic Calendar SLIDE

**Faculty Concern #1:** The suggestion by Administration to eliminate Winter session and add two back-to-back summer sessions is primarily an effort to ease the administrative functioning of the college, and there are serious concerns that this will be detrimental to ECC student success and transfer and will negatively impact students involved in the Honors Transfer Program, athletics and the forensics (debate) team.

**Faculty Concern #2:** The Administration has dismissed faculty input on calendar decisions in the past, and this issue points to a broader concern that Administration often does not truly consult collegially with the faculty, nor does it consistently place student learning as a top priority in decision-making.

**Faculty Concern #3:** The current policies and procedures for making calendar changes do not abide by the collegial consultation required by Title 5 regulations.

CG also showed the Board excerpts from faculty emails and noted/summarized the most common faculty concerns (see above). CG noted that the concerns seemed motivated by larger issues – that there is insufficient collegial consultation on campus, and that the Administration seems to make decisions that favor administrative concerns over student interests.

**SLIDE: Larger Concerns Raised by the two Issues**

#1 They have highlighted the longstanding discontent with insufficient collegial consultation on campus and the related belief that Administration frequently overlooks the voice of the faculty.

#2 The Administration has assumed ultimate decision-making over some academic and professional responsibilities that are granted to the Academic Senate by state law through Title 5.

#3 Administration prioritizes the administrative functioning of the college over student learning. (mostly commonly raised concern)

Mr. Widman said that he had read Dr. Nishime's open email to President Fallo re: the pros and cons of the winter session and felt it to be too vague. Mr. Widman said that he still felt that the issue has been decided and that there has not been enough consultation. Dr. Nishime disagreed, stating that the decision has not yet been made and that all should have the opportunity to have their opinions heard via the planned forums.

CG halted the discussion here, noting that Board member Mr. Gen had asked that the Senate investigate the matter further and come back to the Board with findings. CG said it is important to follow through on this and may be calling on the Senators' help in this matter.

CG noted that the next Academic Senate meeting on Nov. 2<sup>nd</sup> will be held in the Distance Education conference room.

VP Compton Center - Saul Panski (SP)

SP reported on the California Nisei Diploma Project which saw a Nisei Honorary Degree Ceremony take place at the CEC on October 16<sup>th</sup> 2010. Approximately 400- 500 people were there, including the VP's of ECC and President Fallo. SP thanked Ms. Garten for her efforts in marketing the event. A video is being prepared and SP will share that with the Senate when it is done.

SP noted that the aforementioned appearance of a delegation from the CEC at the Board meeting had not been done in consultation with the CEC faculty and in his opinion some of the issues addressed by them were inappropriate.

SP thanked ECC faculty who had volunteered to serve on CEC hiring panels and evaluation committees.

SP noted that the ECC discussion on the winter session calendar had raised interest at the CEC and they will be discussing the issue there on Thursday. SP expects the CEC will vote in favor of the winter session.

SP said that now that the accreditation process issue has hit the newspapers, the CEDC has an embryonic Steering Committee of Accreditation and over the next 12 to 15 months hope to be ready to apply for eligibility.

Curriculum Committee – Lars Kjeseth (LK)

LK noted that the first set of course reviews have been completed through the new CurricuNET system. The Notification system is ready to go, and LK will be sending emails to the effect that faculty should no longer ignore the notifications.



VP Educational Policies Committee – Chris Jeffries (CJ)

CJ noted that she had no report, but she had some items for discussion later in the agenda.

VP Faculty Development – Cristina Pajo (CP) (Co- VP) and Briita Halonen (BH) (Co-VP)

BH said that the Adjunct Award applications were now closed. The ten nominees have been notified and are working on their applications.

VP Finance and Special Projects – Lance Widman (LW)

[see pp. 23- 24 of packet]

LW reported on the PBC Minutes of 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010 which saw the conclusion of 2010-2011 Final Budget review, endorsed by the Committee and sent to the President. LW urged those with questions on what revenue comes into the college to read these minutes, and the minutes from the last two PBC meetings, especially the meeting where the committee was joined by President Fallo who stepped through the budget in detail. The information on the budget is freely available, and senators can contact Mr. Spor or Ms. Ely for copied of the budget. The meeting also dealt with an update on planning activities as the PBC refocuses its attention from budgeting (at least until January) to planning, especially Plan Builder and program review.

VP Legal – Chris Wells (CW)

[see pg.25 of packet]

CW reported a letter from CSU Long Beach is in the packet re: accepting transfers, and the removal of impaction status for five majors.

**REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

Report on Deans' Council – Moon Ichinaga (MI)

[see handout distributed at meeting] for a summary of the minutes of the October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

MI reported that Dr. Nishime had gone over the calendar options discussions and had emphasized that the matter was not a done deal. Informational forums have been planned for November, as the discussion needs to be more wide-ranging and some issues need more understanding. MI reported on the graph presented by Mr. Kjeseth at the last Academic Senate meeting and noted that this data needs to be taken into account.

There was a discussion on the need for improving communication and various strategies on how to achieve this. This will be an ongoing issue.

The CEC Fall 2010 registration survey provided some interesting statistics, and attempts will be made to rectify some issues, like those relating to Financial Aid.

As a possible action item Mr. Warriar is going to investigate having ITS send email alerts to students during registration when changes are made to their schedules.

Dr. Nishime also discussed the Title V grant for \$3 million (approx) that has been awarded to ECC to improve graduation and completion rates. It was noted that the grant is not renewable.

Dr. Nishime noted that she would be speaking on this last item later on in the meeting.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**A. Curriculum Committee – Ex- Officio membership By-Laws – Lars Kjeseth (LK)**

[See pp. 26-32 of packet]

Action item: second reading. LK noted that all of the proposed changes actually appear on pg. 27 of the packet, and had been discussed at the last meeting. LK brought the motion that we approve the changes. This motion was seconded by Ms. Jeffries. The floor was opened for discussion. Mr. Panski had a concern about 1.6 #5 Dean – Compton Center, Academic Affairs and asked that it

be changed to read Dean/Assistant Dean. LK said that it was understood that it would be the noted members OR DESIGNEE, so the members could appoint someone in their stead. There was a call to vote on the motion to approve the changes and it was passed/approved unanimously.

**B. BP 5055 and AP 5055 Priority Registration - Chris Jeffries (CJ)**

[See pp.33-40 of packet]

Action item: second reading. CJ said that Mr. Mulrooney had forwarded a list of the current priority registration groups (EOPS, DSPS, veterans) and that these would retain priority registration rights, but all others will have to apply for priority registration status - these “others” including Honors students, athletes, international students, student government, Puente, Project Success, MESA, nursing students, debate students, etc.

Priority registration would begin on the first day of registration and every 15 minutes there would be an allotted slot for the groups to forward their applications. This will continue until 7pm on the second day of registration. It was noted that some groups are larger than other, but it had been observed that only about 10% of priority registration students take advantage of it.

The floor was opened for discussion. Mr. Ahmadapour asked if any groups other than the Academic Senate and the Educational Policies Committee had had any input into the issue. CJ said that in the past the issue has been at the whim of the Admissions director. I was also noted that students who have a higher number of units completed get a higher priority based on seniority. The question was raised whether students are TOLD they have this higher priority, or whether they get earlier registration dates without being told why? CJ was not sure. It was remarked that if they were told they might better understand how to use the priority registration system better. Dr. Nishime was of the understanding that students ARE informed. Ms. Budri (Student Government) was not sure that students understood, noting that students are just notified of a registration date.

CJ noted that the concept could still be made clearer to students, and she still had a concern for the athletes, but felt comfortable knowing that they would be able to petition for priority registration. CJ also noted that the updated BP and AP would not go into effect immediately as there were still some issues to iron out, and that gave the groups time to get organized. Dr. Nishime agreed, saying Mr. Mulrooney had indicated it would take about a year to implement. Ms. Taylor asked if so few take advantage of the opportunity, why offer it at all, as it is fundamentally unfair to others – citing concerns with VII #1 & 2 specifically and extra- curricular activities. Ms. Taylor felt it would be better to have no priority registration at all. Mr. Ahmadapour agreed, noting perhaps an exception for seniors needing to graduate. Mr. Kjeseth said that he, too, had questions about VII. Firstly that the language used suggests that the burden of proof is on the student group. And while some groups like the athletes and nurses may have concerned faculty who will speak for them, there are others who would not have this advantage. Mr. Kjeseth felt the playing field should be level for all. Secondly, the terms groups is weak, and there should be a basic principles description of what constitutes a group.

Mr. Key noted that at-risk populations seemed to always qualify for priority registration, so asked if that was part of the definition? At least this would be something concrete, and if there are no concrete terms the definitions are too vague and it becomes harder to assess eligibility.

CJ said that was a good point and said she would take these concerns to the College Council. Mr. Marcoux agreed, noting that this was a 5000 policy which did not need Academic Senate approval. CJ decided to bring the issue back to Mr. Mulrooney and to the College Council which next meets in November.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**A. BP & AP 4055 – Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities – Chris Jeffries (CJ)**

[See pp.41-46 of packet]

Action Item: First Reading. CJ noted that she was speaking for Dipte Patel – Director Special Resource Center, who could not be present.

It was noted that the Academic Senate had seen something of this policy in May. Math had had some concerns, and so the Math department had looked at it and the policy had then returned to the Ed. Policies Committee.

CJ noted that pg. 41 referenced State regulations, and changes to the Policy could be seen on pg. 42. There used to be three levels of accommodations and now there are two – the course waiver has been removed, and has been incorporated into Level 2 Course Substitution #7 - pg. 44. This was done because it occurred so rarely. CJ noted that the Director of Staff and Student Diversity have also looked at this.

CJ opened the floor for questions.

Mr. Kjeseth noted that re: Level 2 #7 course waiver, it was most often a math requirement that was at issue. Mr. Kjeseth noted that it seemed misleading to term it a course waiver when it was really a degree requirement waiver. CJ noted that this issue is addressed in the middle of pg.42 “...reasonable accommodations, which may include course substitution of degree requirements.”

Mr. Panski had two questions. Could it be validated that all the Level 1 services mentioned were also available at the CEC? Mr. Panski noted that if the Policy is adopted it must apply to the CEC as well as ECC. Dr. Nishime noted that meetings on the issue have included ECC and CEC staff. Also Ms. Patel does accommodations for Compton but Dr. Nishime will raise the issue with her again to be certain. Mr. Panski next asked if there was an ADA compliance officer only at ECC? The answer was that Ms. Biggers oversees both campuses in this regard. CJ noted that the second reading of the AP and BP would take place in two weeks.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS – DISCUSSION**

### **A. ECC Federation of Teachers Report – Elizabeth Shadish (ES)**

ES reported that the faculty contracts have expired and the Federation wants to go into negotiation.

ES noted that the Federation is closely watching the discussion of the Winter Calendar. From the Federation’s perspective if the changes go through this would mean a change in working conditions, and possibly a breach of contract.

Dr. Ahmadapour asked who to go to if one had concerns on issues. ES said faculty could email her or Mr. Don Brown - [eshadish@elcamino.edu](mailto:eshadish@elcamino.edu), [dbrown@elcamino.edu](mailto:dbrown@elcamino.edu)

Mr. Wells asked if the Federation or District had set any deadlines and ES said no. Mr.

Ahmadapour commented that the faculty did not seem very involved with the Federation and felt that more support and involvement were needed to make demands felt. ES agreed.

### **B. Winter Session Information/Proposed Calendar Changes – Chris Gold (CG)**

[See pp. 47 – 75 of packet]

CG noted that she understood the calendar to be a negotiable item, and in the packet had included the Board Policy (pg 47), a letter from Dr. Nishime to President Fallo (pgs 48-49), Article 7 of the Contract (pgs 50-52), and a document “Alternative Calendars” 9pgs. 53- 75) from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges which offers recommendations and advice on the issues. CG thanked Mr. Marcoux for forwarding this last mentioned document to her.

CG opened the floor for discussion.

Ms. Jeffries asked Mr. Panski for comments on his CEC experience with two summer sessions.

Mr. Panski felt that two summer sessions were beneficial, noting that they got two different groups. Some took both sessions, and noted that CEC had run a winter session as well. Ms.

Jeffries asked if the summer sessions were back to back. Mr. Panski said that last summer they were, but now the trend was to do the same as the ECC campus, which is a six and an eight week session overlapping. Mr. Panski noted that the classes had been full in both five week summer

sessions, saying that while the students were selective, they did not seem to mind which class was in which session so long as they could take the classes. Mr. Panski believes CEC will go along with the ECC format, but felt that the winter session was vital. Ms. Jeffries asked if ECC could do a similar schedule to CEC, but Dr. Nishime said there was no interest in 5 week summer sessions. Mr. Panski said that ECC thought that these sessions did not have enough academic rigor.

Mr. Wells felt that no decision should be made without more research and data and suggested the IR begin the research and data collection. Mr. Wells distributed a handout, and noted that 38 of 54 colleges did offer winter sessions.

Mr. Ahmadapour noted that Senate had spoken on the issue before and it was his understanding that the issue had been tabled and asked why Senate was debating it again.

CG said it was because the proposed change had been brought to the Calendar Committee.

Mr. Kjeseth felt it appropriate to go back to the Board Policy at this point, stating that the Calendar Committee had never before been tasked with proposing new calendar patterns. He noted that as this is a 4000policy an argument could be made that developing calendar patterns is a 10+1 issue. The question is - Is the Board Policy in compliance with Title V, and can the Calendar Committee be tasked with developing new calendar patterns..

Mr. Yun noted that he had polled the math department and had found 25 faculty support the Winter , but other emails quoted different figures, and he felt the figures we were being shown were not valid. Dr. Nishime said the figures were based on faculty and staff surveys. Mr. Wells asked if the figures could be broken down to show faculty and staff votes separately, and Dr. Nishime said that could be done.

Mr. Ahmadapour raised another aspect re: teachers needing growth and development time to research, read and prepare for classes. Teachers were another aspect of the issue, besides students and retention, that should be looked at.

Ms. Colunga said that the end aim of some programs was employment, not transfer and these students, for instance, radiology, felt that two summer sessions and no winter would get them finished and into the market earlier.

Ms. Taylor said she had heard hints about a possible reason that the Administration might wish to make the change regarding shifting FTES, and asked that Dr. Nishime elaborate. Dr. Nishime said that there will be informational forums coming up and FTES would be discussed, but it was important to look at all of the information.

Ms. Budri requested that students be kept in the loop to, otherwise they just hear rumors. Drs. Gold and Nishime said that the forums would include all parties.

Ms. Gebert noted that winter sessions help graduation in her field of Cosmetology. The winter session helps the students complete the hours they need to finish the program and leave. Winter helps with growth in their program.

Mr. Key noted that he deals with high-unit majors, and they feel that it would be harsh to lose the winter session as they use it to complete general education courses and so be able to concentrate on their majors in the spring and fall semesters. No winter means they would be here longer, and the students view it as the removal of an opportunity.

Ms. Simon asked what was the rationale for originally moving to a compressed calendar?

Mr. Isaacs noted that we went from 18 to 16 week semesters, and that there had been resistance from Math and Science departments at the time, but we were losing students to colleges like Santa Monica and Harbor, that had already made the switch, and once there the students stayed at those schools and ECC needed to stay competitive.

Ms. Simon asked if that would not happen again?

Mr. Isaacs said probably so, and it would also impact part-time faculty.

**C. Title V Grant –“Get Ready, Get Set, Go for the Associate’s Degree” – Dr. Nishime**

[see pp. 76-77 of packet]

Dr. Nishime reported that the college has received a grant for \$ over a 5 year period. The grant has three components:

Get Ready – gets students ready to study for placement exams, brush up on math and other basic skills, and gain financial aid awareness.

Get Steady – involves getting students through the developmental classes and into the transfer courses. The focus here will be on developmental students and faculty development in this area.

Go for the Associate’s Degree – the college is moving on this and as a first step is hiring two evaluators to do pre-degree checking.

Dr. Nishime said the most important step right now is to hire a project director. The college is working on the details of a job description. The college will advertise internally and outside for this five year position.

## **AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

None

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

## **ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 2:00pm with a reminder that the next Academic Senate meeting on Nov. 2<sup>nd</sup> will be held in the Distance Education conference room.

Cs/ecc2010

EL CAMINO COLLEGE  
Office of the President  
Minutes of the College Council Meeting October 11, 2010

Present: Francisco Arce, Ann Garten, Irene Graff, Jo Ann Higdon, Jessica Lopez, David Mc Patchell, Jeanie Nishime, Susan Pickens, Gary Robertson, Lynn Solomita, Arvid Spor, and Chris Wells.

1. The draft community college budget was distributed. This document was produced by the Community College League of California. The Governor has not signed the budget yet. He has cut \$1 billion more out of the budget. We do not know how the 2.2% enrollment growth is going to be distributed. The bad news is there are more deferrals. That means the burden of making payroll becomes more on college. If we don't have cash in the bank we are not earning interest. We also incur interest expense on borrowing. At this time there are no changes to our budget.
2. Objectives for College Council Goals 2010-2011
  1. Continue to improve internal college communications.
    - a) Objective: On a weekly basis each representative will email minutes to constituents in group and request feedback as appropriate. (College Council draft minutes.)
  2. Increase the amount of recognition for work well done. An objective was not developed for this goal. We will discuss this further when all College Council members are present. The following is a summary of the discussion on how to achieve this goal:
    - a) Sending Applause cards by email would be more efficient.
    - b) Send E-Cards for special recognitions.
    - c) It was noted that ECC Matters is a platform for recognizing people.
    - d) Have a classified "STAR" of the month. This could include a monthly parking spot as part of award.
    - e) The Foundation could put aside some money for a "SPOT AWARD" to give a gift certificate for a restaurant.
    - f) Recognize employees who participate in outside organizations.
    - g) Division meetings have an item on agenda for "KUDOS" to recognize employees.
    - h) Have a management award. This could include a yearly parking spot as part of the award.
3. Continue to incorporate evidence-based decision making when evidence is available.
  - a) Objective: Recommending constituents to promote group inquiry at staff meetings and record where data was used to support decisions, answering the question of "why" we make decisions. Remember to make decisions in light of the College's Strategic Goals as well as the College's overarching goal of increasing student graduation rates.

- b) We are already doing some of this with the expansion of data used in Program Reviews and with regular reporting of Student and Community Advancement metrics.

Agenda for the October 18, 2010 Meeting:

1. Minutes of October 11, 2010
2. Board Agenda
3. Board of Governors meeting – November 8-9, 2010
4. Develop objectives for College Council Goals 2010-2011

College Council Goals 2010-2011

1. Continue to improve internal college communications.
2. Increase the amount of recognition for work well done.
3. Continue to incorporate evidence-based decision making when evidence is available.
4. Communicate accreditation eligibility issues facing the College throughout the year.
5. Support, review, and discuss results of a Student Campus Climate survey.
6. Define and discuss the issue of employee morale and student satisfaction at both locations. Support initiatives to improve employee morale and student satisfaction as defined by campus discussions.
7. Complete 10 + 1 policies and accompanying procedures.
8. Continue to build a sense of community.

EL CAMINO COLLEGE  
Office of the President  
Minutes of the College Council Meeting October 18, 2010

Present: Thomas Fallo, Ann Garten, Christina Gold, Irene Graff, Jo Ann Higdon, Jessica Lopez, David Mc Patchell, Jeanie Nishime, Susan Pickens, Virginia Rapp, Gary Robertson, Elizabeth Shadish, Luukia Smith, Lynn Solomita, and Arvid Spor.

1. The California Nisei Diploma Project event at the Compton Center was a great success. Michael Odanaka brought this forward last year. He started out with 4 people and ended up with 97 persons eligible to receive degrees. A total of 47 were in attendance and received their degrees. Others had representatives in attendance to accept degrees on their behalf.
2. Board Agenda
  - a. We have a letter from Isadore Hall stating that he will be at the Board meeting. His letter asks for community members to join him to address several issues. There is a lot of miscommunication about what we are doing and what our intentions are. We have moved the Board meeting to the Haag Recital Hall.
  - b. We are scheduling a public hearing to declare a vacancy of Board seat for Trustee Area 1, Inglewood, as a result of a medical determination.
  - c. Page 109 item 20 – is withdrawn.
  - d. Page 77 item 2 – this contractor provided training for Windows 7. Our trainer was not prepared to do this training.
  - e. Page 38 – On-Line Success and Retention Rates – faculty added 90 students for a class of 45. There is concern that this may have falsely affected success/retention rates. It was noted that since fall of 2002 there has been growth in on-line course offerings over longer period of time.
  - f. Page 111 – this is a new position that will report to either the Vice President or Director.
3. Supplemental Board Information
  - a. Page 30 – Winter Intersession recommendation to President from Dr. Nishime. There needs to be more discussion with the Academic Senate and more forums before a decision will be made.
  - b. Page 25 – Humanities Building water leak. Concern was expressed for employee safety.
4. The Board of Governors meeting is at ECC on November 8-9, 2010. College Council members are invited to lunch and a reception. Lunch is on Monday, November 8<sup>th</sup> at 1:15 p.m. The reception will be on Monday, November 8<sup>th</sup> from 5:30-7:00 p.m. There will be a tour of the Compton Center on November 9<sup>th</sup>.

Agenda for the October 25, 2010 Meeting:

1. Minutes of October 11, 2010 and October 18, 2010
2. Board Policy 2350 - Speakers
3. Develop objectives for College Council Goals 2010-2011



### College Council Goals 2010-2011

1. Continue to improve internal college communications.
2. Increase the amount of recognition for work well done.
3. Continue to incorporate evidence-based decision making when evidence is available.
4. Communicate accreditation eligibility issues facing the College throughout the year.
5. Support, review, and discuss results of a Student Campus Climate survey.
6. Define and discuss the issue of employee morale and student satisfaction at both locations. Support initiatives to improve employee morale and student satisfaction as defined by campus discussions.
7. Complete 10 + 1 policies and accompanying procedures.
8. Continue to build a sense of community.

EL CAMINO COLLEGE  
Office of the President  
Minutes of the College Council Meeting October 25, 2010

Present: Janice Ely, Ann Garten, Christina Gold, Jo Ann Higdon, Jessica Lopez, David Mc Patchell, Jeanie Nishime, Susan Pickens, Gary Robertson, Elizabeth Shadish, Luukia Smith, Lynn Solomita, and Arvid Spor.

1. Classified service awards date is Tuesday, October 26, 2010 at 2 p.m.
2. California Community Colleges Board of Governors meeting will be held at ECC on November 8-9, 2010. College Council members are invited to participate in the following activities on November 8<sup>th</sup>: 1) lunch (1-2 p.m. in Alondra room); 2) walking tour of ECC programs (2-3 p.m.); and catered reception (5:30-7 p.m. in Alondra room). An invitation will be sent out via email. Please note that College Council will not meet on November 8<sup>th</sup>.
3. Board of Trustees meeting. There was an article in the Daily Breeze, "Independence Sought for Compton College." Susan will send article to College Council members. Saul Pansky sent a letter to President Fallo in support for the partnership and the Accreditation process. Susan will also send that out to Council members.
4. It was noted that College Council is a safety valve. Any issues we have at the College can be brought to College Council for discussion.
5. College Council Goal # 2 – Increase the amount of recognition for work well done.
  - a. Applause cards –Make more meaningful for the individuals receiving them and publicize. Jeanie will bring a report of how many Applause cards are issued.
  - b. STAR award – It was suggested that this award be given once a semester. The winner could have their name on the marquee. There was concern about who would be in charge of administering the award. There was also a concern about someone being left out.
6. BP 2350 Speakers – number 4. There was a suggestion to change the second sentence to read "Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of five minutes on non-agenda items." There was a suggestion to change the third sentence to read "Thirty minutes shall be the maximum time allotment for public speakers on any one agenda or non-agenda item regardless of the number of speakers." Susan will distribute the CCLC Sample BP 2350 and will also check codes cited in the policy.
7. BP and AP 5055- Enrollment Priorities. These will be brought back next week. The managers want to include in the procedure registration priority for new in-district high school students.

Agenda for the November 1, 2010 Meeting:

1. Minutes of October 25, 2010
2. Team Reports

3. Board Policy and Administrative Procedures 5055 – Enrollment Priorities
4. Board Policy 2350 – Speakers
5. CCLC Sample Procedure – 4026 - Philosophy and Criteria for International Education
6. College Council minutes
7. Develop objectives for College Council Goals 2010-2011

#### College Council Goals 2010-2011

1. Continue to improve internal college communications.
2. Increase the amount of recognition for work well done.
3. Continue to incorporate evidence-based decision making when evidence is available.
4. Communicate accreditation eligibility issues facing the College throughout the year.
5. Support, review, and discuss results of a Student Campus Climate survey.
6. Define and discuss the issue of employee morale and student satisfaction at both locations. Support initiatives to improve employee morale and student satisfaction as defined by campus discussions.
7. Complete 10 + 1 policies and accompanying procedures.
8. Continue to build a sense of community.

Dr. Fallo:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Executive Board of the Faculty Council at Compton, and wish to convey the following points:

The Council strongly believes that The Accreditation Process document, recently released, charts a path by which Compton will gain eligibility, candidacy, and eventual accreditation as prescribed by the ACCJC, and is a palpable sign of good faith and commitment on the part of ECC to restoring Compton's accreditation. The Steering Committee is in the process of being finalized and the work will soon be underway. In this effort we have great confidence in the leadership at both institutions. We are excited about the work and accomplishments that await us!

While many individuals and groups on our campus have expressed support for specific administrators, we believe it is inappropriate to bring this matter before the ECC Board, particularly when the individual concerned is solely an employee of the CCCD. At the same time we have expressed, per discussion by our members, the importance of administrative stability as we seek to move forward.

We want to add that the programs recently cited as needing to return to Compton were either never offered by the CCCD or were discontinued by the CCCD prior to the partnership. Moreover, we wish to stress that numerous innovative courses have been added to our curriculum since the partnership, including robotics, HVAC maintenance, and aircraft fastening, to name a few. In addition ECC has added to its curriculum several former CCC programs, including non-credit ESL, the LVN program, and commercial music.

We categorically reject any aspersions, accusations, or questioning of the good character of administrators on either campus, either Board of Trustees, the President-Superintendent of ECC, or the Special Trustee or CEO of the CCCD.

We want to stress that the faculty leadership would only support a presentation to either Governing Board after careful consideration of the facts and the comprehensive review and approval of our membership. In this connection, we want to emphasize that no one speaks for the faculty at Compton save the faculty itself, through its elected leadership.

Finally, we wish to reiterate once again our commitment to the partnership, which has led us to fiscal solvency, solid enrollment, improvement in our planning and program review processes, and countless other positive developments. We look forward to the continuation of this partnership until accreditation can be restored and thank the ECC BOT for its continued support of this effort and of the residents of the CCCD.

Saul

Saul Panski  
Faculty Council Chairperson

Saul J, Panski  
President, Compton Community College District Academic Senate  
Chairperson, El Camino Compton Center Faculty Council  
Vice President, El Camino College Academic Senate  
Professor of History, Compton Education Center  
[spanski@elcamino.edu](mailto:spanski@elcamino.edu)  
[panski\\_s@compton.edu](mailto:panski_s@compton.edu)  
[saulp@aol.com](mailto:saulp@aol.com)  
310 900-1600 ext. 2560

---

**EL CAMINO COLLEGE**  
**Planning & Budgeting Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**Date: September 16, 2010**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Enomoto, Ryuichiro (Rio) – ASO                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shenefield, Cheryl – Administrative Svcs. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ott, Jonathan – Campus Police         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spor, Arvid – Chair (non-voting)          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patel, Dipte – Academic Affairs       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Turner, Gary – ECCE                       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quinones-Perez, Margaret – ECCFT      | <input type="checkbox"/> Tyler, Harold – Management/Supervisors               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reid, Dawn – Student & Community Adv. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Widman, Lance – Academic Senate           |

**OTHERS ATTENDING:** Chris Gold, Luis Mancia, Jeanie Nishime, Emily Rader, John Wagstaff

---

**Handouts:** Acronyms of Categorical Programs Fund 12 Funding Source  
2010 PBC Evaluation

---

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

**Approval of August 26, 2010 Minutes**

1. Page 1, #2b – No new information on health insurance rates - may not come out until November. Estimates used to come out around June or July. Check with Lynn Solomita.
2. Page 2, #9 – when will bond go on sale and how is the amount in the budget book determined? The entire amount is listed in the budget book, but not all will be spent. 2008-09 and 2009-10 reflect actual spent. The balance of the full amount is \$180M - what is left or unsold and does not include future sales. Received approval from voters to sell, but when to sell is based on need and market conditions. These are local bonds, not treasury notes.
3. Page 3, #15b – TRANS can earn interest, but that is not the purpose of the notes.
4. Page 4, #17 – would like to ensure actuarial computation is tabled for further discussion. New actuarial study will be conducted next fall - may discuss computation between now and then. Not concerned about the actual dollar amount, but need clarification about general computation. Is it based on number of retirees and age factor? A. Spor will ask J. Higdon if PBC can get easy-to-understand computation explanation from the actuary.
5. The minutes were approved with no changes.

**Approval of September 2, 2010 Minutes**

1. Page 1, #3 bottom of page – G. Turner will research explanation about adjustment to the Workers' Compensation Fund.
2. Page 1, #2 – the Board voiced no concern about the \$6M deficit spending at the last Board meeting.
3. Page 2, #6 top of page –
  - a. Did not have chance to get update from Bob Gann about the Voice/Data fiber optic replacement. Replacement may not happen for another year. A. Spor will send email to Bob Gann and forward his response to the committee.
  - b. Clarification: facilities plans are processed by steering committee – nothing in place for Technology plans. Should technology plans be part of ITS unit plan? Technology Committee reviews plans but don't drive it. Plans used to be reviewed by PBC for recommendation. Two previous plans were approved for funding directly by the VPs. A.

- Spor will check with the VPs to determine if recommendations should come from the Technology Committee or PBC. Comment was made that Technology Committee should prioritize technology plan items that require funding and move them forward in the process. Technology plans are global and may not be part of a unit plan.
4. The minutes were approved with no changes.

**Assumption “10.b” Discussion** (page 72 in the budget book)

1. Recommendation was made to change how first sentence is worded. Change would not be in effect for this year. Discussed omitting reference to SLOs and enrollment management efforts. Focus still remains on one-time projects. Should avoid identifying particular programs. Suggestion was made to take out “historically.” Issue brought up about providing language that suggests utilization or how funds should be used.
2. A. Spor will forward recommendation to change sentence to “\$3 million (Fund 15) is included in the Interfund Transfers Out (#7300) and has been available primarily to fund one-time programs.”

**Categorical Funding Source**

1. A. Spor will ask J. Ely to add defined acronyms to the glossary section of the budget book, referencing the pages from the Funding Source page.

**2010 PBC Evaluation Discussion:**

1. PBC responsibilities on page 32 of the budget book were revised and the evaluation reflects new purpose and responsibilities (planning budgeting, and communication).
2. Complete and email evaluation anonymously. Suggestion was made to send evaluation survey through *Survey Monkey*. A. Spor will work with Irene Graff to provide survey online. Will bring survey results to discuss possible changes needed based upon results. No expected percentage of members/alternates to complete survey. Committee evaluation is not mandatory, but beneficial for accreditation and planning purposes. Evaluation is based on the committee’s performance, not its relevance.
3. Suggestion was made to send survey to last year’s members instead of new members because evaluation is based on committee’s past year performance.
4. Issue was brought forward about the composition of the committee having more managers. Would like to see committee expand to include more balanced representation of voting members. It was pointed out that there is solidarity in voting pattern – no distinctive split between managers and other voting members. Even so, this is more about equality/balance in representation. PBC representation follows same composition as College Council.
5. Concern voiced about critical committee meeting dates in summer scheduled during peak periods, making it difficult for counselors to attend meetings. Suggestion was made to change meeting dates. Meetings to discuss budget are built around release of State budget. Part of problem is both primary and back-up Federation representatives are from Counseling. May need another back-up. M. Quinones will speak to Elizabeth Shadish about this issue.
6. H. Tyler is working to replace student representative, Rio Enomoto, who has class the same time PBC meets.

The next meeting is scheduled on October 7, 2010.

The meeting adjourned at 1:52 p.m.

## Implementing the Academic Component of SB 1440 (Padilla)

Jane Patton  
President, ASCCC

Michelle Pilati  
C-ID Faculty Coordinator  
Vice President, ASCCC



### SB 1440

#### Associate Degree for Transfer

1. To earn an “associate degree for transfer” a student must complete 60 semester units ... that are eligible for transfer ... that consist of:
  - IGETC or CSU GE Breadth
  - a major or area of emphasis of at least 18 units, as defined by the CCC
2. No additional local graduation requirements may be required
3. Minimum GPA of 2.0 is required

#### If a student completes an “associate degree for transfer”

1. “the CSU shall guarantee admission with junior status”
2. “Admission to the CSU... does not guarantee admission for specific majors or campuses”
3. “the CSU shall grant a student priority admission to his or her local CSU campus and to a program or major that is similar to his or her CC major or area of emphasis, as determined by the CSU campus to which the student is admitted”

#### Once a student completes an “associate degree for transfer” and is at the CSU:

“The CSU may require a student transferring pursuant to this article to take additional courses at the CSU **so long as the student is not required to take any more than 60 additional semester units or 90 quarter units** at the CSU for majors requiring 120 semester units or 180 quarter units.”

#### Once a student completes an “associate degree for transfer” and is at the CSU:

“The CSU shall not require students transferring ... to repeat courses that are similar to those taken at the CC that counted toward the associate degree for transfer.”

### Plan B

**112 colleges develop 112 different degrees in each major...**

## Plan A

- a concerted, statewide response
- a transfer model curriculum developed by intersegmental discipline faculty

## How it works

- C-ID discipline groups
- Develop transfer model curriculum
- All drafts are vetted online
- Once model curriculum is finalized, colleges may “adopt”
- Chancellor’s Office will expedite approval

## Results:

- Coordination of intersegmental discipline faculty
- Clear pathways for students statewide
- Students earn an associate degree, complete major prep, and are given admission priority

## “Transfer Model Curriculum”

- Appropriate courses for an associate degree
- Preparation for transfer
- “Double-counting” encouraged
- 60 units total

## Structure of the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC)

- Common “core” minimum of 6 units
- Additional courses selected from list(s)

## Example – Psychology (DRAFT)

- Core –
  - Introduction to Psychology (SS GE)
  - Statistics (QR GE)
  - Research Methods (May be critical thinking)
- Select one of (LS GE)
  - Biological Psychology
  - Introduction to Biology
  - Human Biology



## Example – Psychology (DRAFT)

- Select one of:
  - Intro to Biostatistics (CSUCI)
  - Intro to Critical Thinking (Cal Poly, Sonoma)
  - Intro to Child Dev (CSUCI, CSUSB, SLO)
  - Intro to Cognition and Learning (CSUCI)
  - Intro to Family Psychology (SLO)
  - Intro to Learning (SDSU)
  - Intro to Social Psychology (SLO)
  - Intro to Theories of Personality (CSUCI)
  - Lifespan Psychology (CSUSB, SDSU)
  - Intro to Sociology (Cal Poly, Stanislaus)
- Select one of.....

## What you can do

- Go to [www.c-id.net](http://www.c-id.net)
- \*Sign up for discipline listservs
- Provide input to draft TMC
- Volunteer to help with statewide C-ID and I440
- [info@asccc.org](mailto:info@asccc.org)
- Senates & AOs will get updates

## Progress already

- 11 intersegmental discipline groups met Oct. 7 - 8
- All have draft transfer model curriculum
- Go to [www.c-id.net](http://www.c-id.net)

## High-Unit Majors/"Highly Sequenced"

- Consider "ideal" and "acceptable" preparation
- Consider the limits that small colleges face
- Develop recommendations

## **The Bills the Governor Signed**

**AB 2385**, as amended, John A. Perez. Pilot Program for Innovative Nursing and Allied Health Care Profession Education at the California Community Colleges.

Existing law establishes the California Community Colleges, under the administration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, as one of the segments of public postsecondary education in this state. Existing law establishes community college districts, each of which is administered by a governing board, throughout the state, and authorizes these districts to provide instruction to students at the community college campuses maintained by the districts. The bill would establish the Pilot Program for Innovative Nursing and Allied Health Care Profession Education at the California Community Colleges under the administration of the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to facilitate the graduation of community college nursing and allied health students by piloting innovative models to expand the state's capacity to prepare a qualified health care workforce. The bill would require the chancellor's office to establish the pilot program at up to 5 campuses throughout the state according to specified requirements. The bill would express legislative intent that the pilot program be funded with a combination of state apportionment funding, federal\ grants, employer-based partnerships, and private philanthropic resources. The bill would require the chancellor's office to collect appropriate data for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the pilot program. The bill would require the chancellor's office to analyze this data, and contract with an external evaluator to conduct an independent evaluation, with findings and recommendations with respect to the pilot program to be reported to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2017. The bill would provide that its provisions would be implemented in any fiscal year only to the extent that the chancellor's office determines that sufficient moneys are available to administer the program. The bill would provide that the pilot program would become inoperative on July 1, 2017, and as of January 1, 2018, would be repealed.

**SB 1440**, as amended, Padilla. California Community Colleges: student transfer.

Existing law establishes the 3 segments of public postsecondary\ education in this state. These segments include the California State University, the campuses of which are administered by the Trustees of the California State University, the University of California, which is administered by the Regents of the University of California, and the California Community Colleges, which are administered by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Existing law establishes community college districts throughout the state, and authorizes them to provide instruction to students at community college campuses. Existing law, known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act, authorizes the community colleges to grant associate in arts and associate in science degrees. The act also requires the regents, the trustees, and the board of governors to have as a fundamental policy the maintenance of a healthy and expanded program to increase the number of transfer students from community colleges. This bill would enact the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act, which, commencing with the 2011-12 academic year, would require a student that receives

an associate degree for transfer to be deemed eligible for transfer into a California State University baccalaureate program when the student meets prescribed requirements. The bill would condition a community college district's receipt of state apportionment funds on its development and granting of associate degrees for transfer, unless each of the state's community college districts waives reimbursement for specified state-mandated costs of implementing the bill in accordance with a prescribed procedure. This bill would prohibit a community college district from imposing any requirements, in addition to these requirements, for a student to be eligible for the associate degree for transfer, and would prohibit remedial noncollegiate level coursework from being counted towards the units required for the associate degree for transfer. This bill would require the California State University to guarantee admission with junior status to any community college student who meets the requirements for the associate degree for transfer. This bill would not guarantee a student admission for specified majors or campuses, but would require the California State University to grant a student priority admission to his or her local California State University campus and to a program or major that is similar to his or her community college major or area of emphasis, as determined by the California State University campus to which the student is admitted. This bill would authorize the California State University to require a transferring student to take additional coursework at the California State University in specified circumstances, and would prohibit the California State University from requiring a transferring student to repeat courses that are similar to those taken at the community college that counted towards the units required for the associate degree for transfer. This bill would also require the Legislative Analyst's Office to review and report to specified legislative committees and subcommittees, within a prescribed time period, on specified outcomes and recommendations related to this act. By requiring a community college district to grant the associate degree for transfer in exchange for receipt of state apportionment funds, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement. This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

**AB 2302**, as amended, Fong. Postsecondary education: student transfer. (1) Existing law, the Donahoe Higher Education Act, establishes the 3 segments of public postsecondary education in this state. These segments include the California State University, administered by the Trustees of the California State University, the University of California, administered by the Regents of the University of California, and the California Community Colleges, administered by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. A provision of the act applies to the University of California only to the extent that the regents, by resolution, make that provision applicable. Existing provisions of the act require the governing bodies of the 3 public postsecondary segments, with appropriate consultation with the academic senates of the respective segments, to develop, maintain, and disseminate a common core curriculum in general education courses for the purposes of transfer. This provision requires that a person who has

successfully completed the transfer core curriculum is to be deemed to have completed all lower division general education requirements for the University of California and the California State University. Existing law requires the governing board of each community college district to direct the appropriate officials at their respective campuses to provide students with a copy of the current transfer core curriculum and to distribute and publish copies of the transfer core curriculum in a specified manner and in specified locations. This bill would require the California State University and the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to work together to establish the most effective methods to inform students, college advisers, and the general public about specified transfer pathways. The bill would require the final methods to be completed prior to the beginning of the fall term of the 2011-12 academic year and included as part of a specified report. The bill would authorize community college districts to use the methods established by the California State University and the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to inform community college students of the California State University majors that are considered to be similar to community college majors or areas of emphasis required to obtain an associate degree for transfer.

(2) Existing law requests the University of California, among other things, to address deficiencies in the articulation of major preparation courses between the community colleges and University of California campuses, to identify commonalities and differences in similar majors across University of California campuses, to articulate courses and course sequences at each campus of the California Community Colleges for specified major degree programs for purposes of student transfer, and to conduct a specified review of transcripts of transfer students. This bill would request the University of California to continue those efforts with a goal of working in collaboration with the California Community Colleges to design community college transfer degrees that provide students adequate preparation for entry into a major. The bill would also request the University of California to consider and implement other specified actions to increase transfer between the university and the California Community Colleges. The bill would require the University of California to provide an interim report on the university's review, and a final report on the university's implementation, of specified transfer pathways to the relevant policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature by specified dates.

(3) Existing law requires the Chancellor of the California State University to establish transfer student admissions requirements to give highest priority to certain transfer students, to specify lower division transfer curriculum for specified major degree programs, and to articulate courses at each campus of the California Community Colleges for specified major degree programs for purposes of student transfer. Existing law requires each campus of the California State University to identify non-elective course requirements beyond System wide lower division transfer curriculum requirements for each major for purposes of student transfer, in accordance with prescribed requirements.

~~This bill would make these provisions inoperative on July 1, 2011, and would repeal these provisions on January 1, 2012.~~ This bill would require the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, in a manner that is consistent with the general common course numbering system used by community college districts, to establish a process to facilitate the identification of courses that satisfy lower

division preparation requirements throughout the California Community College system, which would be required to be included as part of a specified report.

(4) This bill would provide that it would not become operative unless SB 1440 of the 2010-11 Regular Session is chaptered.

**SB 1143**, as amended, Liu. Community colleges: student success and ~~completion.~~ completion: taskforce and plan.

Existing law establishes the California Community Colleges, under the administration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, as one of the 3 segments of public postsecondary education in this state. This bill would require the board to adopt a plan for promoting and improving student success within the California Community Colleges and to establish a taskforce to examine specified best practices and models for accomplishing student success. The bill would require the taskforce to develop and present specified recommendations to the board for incorporation into the plan to improve student success and completion within the California Community Colleges. The bill would require the board, prior to implementation of the plan, to report the contents of the plan, and the recommendations of the taskforce, to specified legislative committees by March 1, 2012.

# El Camino College and Compton Center

## SLO Assessment Results

### Core Competency III: Communication and Comprehension

---

In the spring of 2010, El Camino College's Core Competency III was assessed to determine how well exiting students<sup>1</sup> have mastered the following "Communication and Comprehension" competency.

***III. Students effectively communicate in written, spoken or signed, and artistic forms to diverse audiences. Students comprehend and respectfully respond to the ideas of others.***

#### Methodology

El Camino College assessed the Communication and Comprehension core competency in courses that are typically taken as students exit the college (either through degree/certificate completion or transfer to a 4-year institution) in order to create the greatest opportunity to gain such skills through interaction with the College. These included advanced career/technical courses, transfer-level courses, and transferrable English and math courses.

The assessment of this core competency was conducted in three ways:

1. Student self-assessment of aspects of the Communication and Comprehension core competency,
2. Faculty assessment of students' overall competency of Communication and Comprehension, and
3. Academic performance of exiting students courses with an emphasis in communication and comprehension.

#### Sample Selection

Student self-assessments and faculty assessments of students were carried out for a sampling of sections from courses that students typically take towards the end of their time at El Camino College (see Section H of the Appendix, p. 11). Two samples of sections were taken:

1. Random sample of sections: Both Student and Faculty Assessments
2. Purposeful sample of sections (aka "volunteers"): Student Self-Assessment Only

The intention of adding a second, purposeful sample was to gather more information and promote greater discussion of results by including sections of faculty participants who serve on

---

<sup>1</sup> Exiting students are defined as those who appear to be in their last semester at El Camino College, enrolling in courses that students typically take during their last term.

the Assessment of Learning Committee or are active in Student Learning Outcomes assessment at El Camino College or Compton Center. This first assessment also serves as a pilot to determine how best the College should evaluate each core competency in the future. Therefore, active contribution from faculty on the design and results of the assessment was important. Since the student self-assessment is the primary source of detailed competency feedback, only this portion of the assessment was distributed to the volunteers.

### Final Sample Size

For the Spring 2010 assessment, faculty from a total of 16 sections returned the student surveys. Eight faculty completed the faculty assessment of students. A total of 440 students submitted self-evaluations (margin of error:  $\pm 4.6\%$ ). Faculty submitted evaluations on 287 students (margin of error:  $\pm 5.7\%$ ).

*Table 1: Sample Selection and Size*

Location	Surveyed Group – Section Count		Evaluations Received	
	Random	Volunteers	Student	Faculty
Compton	1	3	*	81
Torrance	7	5	*	206
<b>Total</b>	8	8	440	287

\*Student self-assessments not identified by location.

### Student Self-Assessment Results

Students were asked to rate their own competence with respect to five skills or activities that reflect aspects of Communication and Comprehension. Students rated themselves using the following scale:

- 5 = very competent (easily able to do the activity at school or work)
- 4 = mostly competent
- 3 = somewhat competent
- 2 = slightly competent
- 1 = not competent

Mean scores were calculated from 412 valid responses for each activity (Table 2, “Mean” column). All mean scores rated well above 3 (“somewhat competent”), with all but one activity rating over 4 (“mostly competent”). The lowest scoring item was “communicating a message through art” and the highest by far was “expressing your own ideas.” Of note were the mean scores that were close to 4 which include “delivering a presentation” and “communicating ideas to diverse audiences.” No students believed that they were “not competent” in “writing a paper” and “respectfully critiquing and discussing ideas of others” (Appendix, Section A, p. 6).

It is very likely that all students exiting El Camino College would rating themselves above 3.5 on the art communication activity, above 3.8 on delivering a presentation and communicating to diverse audiences, and above 4.0 on all others (Table 2, “Population Means” columns).

**Table 2: Mean Scores by Activity – Student Self-Assessment**

Activity/Skill	Mean*	Population Means*	
Writing a paper	4.25	4.06	4.45
Delivering a presentation	4.01	3.82	4.19
Communicating a message through art	3.70	3.53	3.87
Expressing your own ideas	4.41	4.21	4.61
Respectfully critiquing and discussing the ideas of others	4.27	4.07	4.46
Communicating an idea to diverse audiences	4.06	3.87	4.25

\* The “Mean” column represents the self-assessment rating from the sample. The mean rating of ALL students (had they all been surveyed) would likely fall inside the range of scores under “Population Means.” Additional descriptive statistics can be found in section A of the Appendix of this report.

In terms of raw percentage responses (see Appendix, Section I, p. 12), over 74% of students indicated that they were “mostly” or “very competent,” except for communicating a message through art at 58%. Further, well over 80% of students assessed themselves in these categories in terms of writing a paper, expressing one’s own ideas, respectfully critiquing, and discussing ideas of others.

### Faculty Assessment of Students

Faculty from selected sections (described above) were asked to give a holistic rating of general competence of their students in the areas of communication and comprehension. A total of 8 faculty submitted student assessments in 8 sections (N=281 valid assessments).

**Table 3: Overall Mean Rating – Faculty Assessment of Students**

Assessment	Mean*	Population Means*	
Faculty Rating of Students’ Overall Communication & Comprehension	3.52	3.32	3.72

\* The “Mean” column represents the holistic faculty rating from the sample. The mean rating of ALL students (had they all been surveyed) would likely fall inside the range of scores under “Population Means.”

Using the same scale as the student self-assessment, the average rating was **3.52** (If all students were assessed, the average rating would fall within the 3.32 – 3.72 range), placing El Camino College’s exiting students into the “somewhat” to “mostly competent” range of the scale as



assessed by faculty. This overall rating is lower than most of the *students'* average scores for the activities associated with this competency on the self-assessment.

### Course Grades

During the student self-assessment phase, ID numbers were collected so that historical enrollments and course grade performance could be collected from exiting students. Due to the fact that course enrollment and grade information are divided by instructional location, parallel course grade information is provided for both the ECC Torrance campus and Compton Center—its purpose is to inform rather than compare. Overall, exiting students performed well in their courses where Communication and Comprehension were emphasized (courses that were “mapped” with a maximum score of 4 in terms of coverage of this Core Competency were included in this analysis).

For the Torrance campus, success and retention rates were 81% and 90%, respectively, for these courses. At the Compton Center, students achieved success and retention rates of 74% and 85%, respectively, in these courses. Although these rates are higher than overall college rates, comparison is inappropriate since this analysis does not include all courses that students take during their college careers. Overall GPAs in Communication and Comprehension courses were healthy for ECC and Compton at 3.20 and 2.83, respectively.

On average, exiting students at the Torrance campus enrolled in 8 to 9 courses that emphasized this core competency during their career. At Compton Center, students enrolled in between 5 and 6 Communication and Comprehension courses.

**Table 4: Grades and Course Performance – Communication and Comprehension Courses (ECC)**

Grade	Count	% Tot
<b>A</b>	977	36%
<b>B</b>	694	26%
<b>C</b>	340	13%
<b>P</b>	176	7%
<b>D</b>	95	4%
<b>F</b>	118	4%
<b>Inc.</b>	12	<1%
<b>NP</b>	22	1%
<b>DR</b>	39	1%
<b>W</b>	220	8%
<b>Total</b>	2693	100%

Overall Outcomes	
<b>Success Rate</b>	81%
<b>Retention Rate</b>	90%
<b>GPA*</b>	3.20
<b>Undup students</b>	313
<b>Avg courses taken</b>	8.6

\* GPA excludes P, NP, DR, & W notations

**Table 5: Grades and Course Performance – Communication and Comprehension Courses (Compton)**

Grade	Count	% Tot
<b>A</b>	98	18%
<b>B</b>	111	20%
<b>C</b>	101	18%
<b>P</b>	92	17%
<b>D</b>	28	5%
<b>F</b>	25	5%
<b>Inc.</b>	0	0%
<b>NP</b>	10	2%
<b>DR</b>	20	4%
<b>W</b>	61	11%
<b>Total</b>	546	100%

Overall Outcomes	
<b>Success Rate</b>	74%
<b>Retention Rate</b>	85%
<b>GPA*</b>	2.83
<b>Undup students</b>	97
<b>Avg courses taken</b>	5.6

\* GPA excludes P, NP, DR, & W notations

## Conclusion

This report summarized the assessment process for Core Competency III: Communication and Comprehension, the first in a series of assessments of El Camino College’s core competencies. In general, the vast major of exiting ECC students rate themselves as mastering skills of communication and comprehension, except in areas such as the arts, a field of study in which perhaps fewer students have participated. Highest rated skills include writing, and the expression and discussion of ideas. Holistic competency ratings of respondents by their instructors yielded somewhat lower average assessments of competency, but with an average well above “somewhat” competent. Finally, analysis of course grades in this competency showed high performance in terms of course success, retention and GPA for exiting students in courses with greater emphasis on communication and comprehension. On average, students enrolled in a larger number of courses with this emphasis at both locations. Student comments are classified and summarized in the Appendix (Section B, p. 6). Individual (anonymous) student comments will be available at a later date. The remaining core competencies will be assessed in future years according to the *Core Competency Assessment Plan*.

## Addendum

A follow-up assessment took place in early Fall 2010 for this core competency that involves a parallel assessment of “entering” students. This assessment was intended to estimate the growth that students experience in this competency during the course of their ECC experience. Results from this assessment compared to exiting students are provided below (Section F, p. 10).

## Appendix – Additional Information

This appendix contains additional statistical information for each assessment, analysis of student comments, and exploratory analysis to inform future assessments.

### A. Descriptive Statistics – Student Self-Assessment

Activity/Skill	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Writing a paper	436	2	5	4.25	0.774
Delivering a presentation	414	1	5	4.01	0.930
Communicating a message through art	405	1	5	3.70	1.056
Expressing your own ideas	426	1	5	4.41	0.762
Respectfully critiquing/discussing others' ideas	405	2	5	4.27	0.813
Communicating an idea to diverse audiences	436	1	5	4.06	0.874

### B. Comments – Student Self-Assessment

Students were asked to list one to three experiences that *contributed most to their skills in communication and comprehension*. These experiences were combined into one list and categorized by theme and summarized. The table below shows 688 out of the 900 individual comments categorized (76%). Only categories with more than 10 responses were included. Some overlap occurred since in some cases multiple themes are found in a single response.

Category	Sub-Categories*	Count
English Class	8	156
Communication Studies Class	7	97
Other Classes	14	65
Library / Library Svcs	6	76
Counseling & Student Services	10	85
Good Teachers **	9	53
Clubs / Extracurricular Activities	12	52
Online Classes	3	31
Doing Presentations	2	27
Writing Center	2	27
Group Projects	6	25
Workshops	8	23
Fine Arts / Performances	2	22
HTP / Honors Classes	3	16

\*"Sub-Categories" refers to the number of ways each category was referenced by students. "Other Classes" reflects the number of unique course subjects cited by students.

\*\*"Good teachers" include both general and specific references to college professors at ECC and Compton Center.

Note: Sections C-E of this Appendix reflect exploratory follow-up analysis and record information only about Torrance campus participants since they represent the largest sub-group of respondents. The purpose of these sections is to inform the development of this and other core competency assessments; they are not part of the regular assessment plan.

### C. Student Self-Assessment Ratings by Ethnicity

In follow-up analysis, ratings were compared by student-identified ethnic group. Some differences between groups were found. Based on an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), the following statistically significant differences were identified among the groups indicated.

1. African American students showed higher ratings than Latino students on “writing a paper” and “expressing one’s own ideas,”
2. Asian or Asian American students had lower ratings than some other groups on “expressing own ideas” (lower than Black and White students), “respectfully critiquing” (lower than Black and Latino students), and “communicating to diverse audiences” (lower than Black students).

Count of Survey Responses by Ethnicity

Ethnic Group	Count	%
Asian	65	21%
African Amer.	39	12%
Amer. Indian	1	0%
Latino	89	28%
Pacific Islander	2	1%
White	79	25%
Two or More	4	1%
Unknown	34	11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>100%</b>

Student Self-Assessment Average Responses by Ethnicity

Ethnic Group	Writing Paper	Presenta-tion	MsgThru Art	Own Ideas	Critiquing	Diverse Audience
Asian	4.2	3.9	3.6	4.1	3.9	3.8
African Amer.	4.4	4.0	3.7	4.7	4.4	4.2
Amer. Indian	*	*	*	*	*	*
Latino	4.1	4.0	3.8	4.3	4.4	4.1
Pacific Islander	*	*	*	*	*	*
White	4.3	3.9	3.5	4.4	4.2	4.0
Two or More	*	*	*	*	*	*
Unknown	4.3	4.2	3.5	4.5	4.3	4.2
<b>Response Count</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>312</b>

\*Data suppressed due to student counts <5 per group.

**D. Cumulative Units – Descriptive Statistics & Average Student Rating by Unit Level**

Although the core competency assessment was administered in courses typically taken by students who are about to graduate or transfer, student participants had accumulated widely varying levels of college units. About one-quarter of the sample was found at each level of cumulative units in the second table below.

In a correlation analysis, the level of units correlated weakly on only “delivering a presentation” ( $r(360) = .159, p < .005$ ). No other statistically significant correlations were found. Interestingly, the *faculty* rating showed moderate correlation with number of units students had earned ( $r(263) = .267, p < .001$ ).

*Cumulative Units of Exiting Student Participants – Descriptive Statistics*

Min Units	Max Units	Avg	Std. Dev.	Count
0	141	37.5	26.6	385

*Student Self-Assessment Average Responses by Cumulative Units*

Cum. Units *	Writing Paper	Presenta- tion	Msg Thru Art	Own Ideas	Critiquing	Diverse Audience
>=54	4.2	4.2	3.5	4.4	4.3	4.1
31-53.5	4.3	4.0	3.7	4.4	4.3	4.1
18-30.5	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.4	4.3	4.1
<18	4.1	3.8	3.6	4.3	4.2	3.9

\*Between 23% and 28% of the sample was found in each of the cumulative unit categories in this table.

*Student Self-Assessment Average Responses by Academic Level*

Academic Level	Count	Writing Paper	Presenta- tion	Msg Thru Art	Own Ideas	Critiquing	Diverse Audience
College degree	22	4.4	4.3	3.7	4.5	4.2	4.1
Sophomore	102	4.2	4.0	3.7	4.4	4.3	4.1
Freshman	210	4.2	3.9	3.7	4.4	4.2	3.9
K-12 Special Admit	<5	*	*	*	*	*	*
Other	48	4.3	4.1	3.5	4.4	4.3	4.1

\*Data suppressed due to student counts <5 per group.

### E. Student Self-Assessment Ratings by Educational Goal

Further analysis of student ratings was conducted based on entering educational goal. The highest ratings in each category are in bold. Undecided students rated themselves significantly higher than Transfer students on “communicating a message through art” ( $p < .05$ ). No other differences were statistically significant.

#### Entering Educational Goal of Exiting Student Participants

Educ Goal Group	Count	%
Basic Skills/GED	10	3%
Degree/Certif.	10	3%
Enrichment	18	6%
Intend to Transfer	110	35%
Retrain/recertif.	12	4%
Undecided	64	20%
Unknown	89	28%
<i>Total</i>	<i>313</i>	<i>100%</i>

#### Student Self-Assessment Average Responses by Educational Goal

Educational Goal	Writing Paper	Presenta-tion	MsgThru Art	Own Ideas	Critiquing	Diverse Audience
Basic Skills/GED	4.2	4.1	3.7	4.4	4.1	4.1
Degree/Certif.	4.1	3.6	3.0	4.2	3.6	3.8
Enrichment	<b>4.3</b>	4.2	3.8	4.4	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Intend to Transfer	<b>4.3</b>	4.1	3.6*	4.3	4.2	4.0
Retrain/recertif.	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	3.5	<b>4.6</b>	4.2	<b>4.2</b>
Undecided	4.3	4.0	<b>4.0*</b>	4.5	4.3	<b>4.2</b>
Unknown	4.1	3.7	3.4	4.4	4.3	3.9
<i>Response Count</i>	<i>312</i>	<i>288</i>	<i>282</i>	<i>305</i>	<i>282</i>	<i>312</i>

\*Two groups differed significantly in this category ( $p < .05$ ).

#### *F. Comparison of Average Responses from Entering and Exiting Student Self-Assessments*

In addition to the assessment of “exiting” students conducted in late Spring 2010, a smaller group of “entering” students also participated in the core competency self-assessment. These were predominantly students in a purposeful (volunteer) sample of sections of pre-transfer reading, writing and ESL courses in Fall 2010.

Results below suggest that there are moderate differences at the beginning and end of students’ El Camino College experiences in most categories. A faculty assessment was not conducted for the “pre-survey” since faculty would not have a good sense of student competency at the beginning of the semester.

<b>Activity/Skill</b>	<b>Pre-Survey (N=248)</b>	<b>Post-Survey (N=439)</b>	<b><i>Difference (Post - Pre)</i></b>
Writing a paper	3.71	4.25	<i>0.54</i>
Delivering a presentation	3.52	3.99	<i>0.47</i>
Communicating a message through art	3.46	3.7	<i>0.24</i>
Expressing your own ideas	4.01	4.41	<i>0.40</i>
Respectfully critiquing and discussing the ideas of others	3.84	4.27	<i>0.43</i>
Communicating an idea to diverse audiences	3.55	4.07	<i>0.52</i>

### G. Final Sample Selection and Responses

Sections at both the Compton Center and Torrance campus were selected at random from a list of courses mapped as a “4” for the Communication and Comprehension core competency. Instructors assisted with a student self-assessment in each participating section.

The table below shows the courses of participating faculty at both locations by division (section detail suppressed). Faculty from a subset of sections selected for the student self-assessment also were invited to complete a holistic evaluation of students’ competency in Communication and Comprehension.

Location	Division	Course	Student Self-Assess.	Faculty Evaluations*
ECC	BSSC	HIST-1B	Y	
ECC	BSSC	POLI-1	Y	Y
CEC	BSSC	PSYC-5	Y	Y
CEC	BUS	CIS-13	Y	
ECC	FINE	ART-3	Y	
ECC	FINE	SCOM-25ABCD**	Y	Y
ECC	HS&A	RECR-217	Y	Y
ECC	HUM	COMM-1abc	Y	
ECC	HUM	ENGL-1A	Y	Y
ECC	HUM	ENGL-1B	Y	Y
ECC	HUM	ENGL-1C	Y	Y
ECC	HUM	ENGL-1C	Y	
ECC	HUM	GERM-21AB	Y	Y
ECC	ITEC	MTT-103ABCD	Y	Y
CEC	MATH	MATH-150	Y	
ECC	MATH	MATH-150	Y	
ECC	NATS	BIOL-102	Y	Y
ECC	NATS	OCEA-10	Y	

\*Only faculty from a subset of sampled sections were asked to rate their students.

\*\*A different Comm. Studies class was substituted since this course had ended before the assessment process began.



## **BOARD POLICY 4055**

### **Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities**

The El Camino Community College District provides reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities in accordance with compliance measures established by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, sections 504 and 508, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 (ADAAA). El Camino College shall provide reasonable accommodations to students with documented disabilities without compromising the student's course of study or the integrity of the college's academic standards. Reasonable accommodations are determined on an individual basis.

Reference: Title 5, Section 56006 (DSPS Regulations), 56027 (Academic Accommodations), 55063 (Minimum requirements for the Associate Degree)  
Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504 and Section 508  
Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA)  
ADA Amendments Act of 2008  
Title 5

El Camino College  
Adopted: October 20, 2003

## **Educational Policies Committee of the Academic Senate of El Camino College Procedure on Academic Accommodations for Students with a Disability**

The El Camino Community College District intends that its graduates master the competencies required by Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. This entails the completion of required courses to obtain a degree or certificate with appropriate documentation as specified in Title 5, Section 56006 (DSPS Regulations). El Camino Community College District's policy is to respond to a student request for reasonable accommodations in a timely manner. However, provision of these accommodations does not guarantee the outcome of the student's endeavors. The Superintendent/President or designee shall establish standards of review for academic requirements to ensure that such requirements do not discriminate against students with disabilities or have the effect of excluding students solely on the basis of disability.

Verification of educational limitations and prescriptive planning of academic accommodations with otherwise qualified students with a disability is the responsibility of the Special Resource Center (SRC). The El Camino College District shall provide students with a disability a process to request reasonable accommodations, which may include course substitution of degree requirements. As outlined in the SRC student handbook, it is the student's responsibility to request accommodations. Additionally, it is the student's responsibility to provide documentation of disability along with identified educational limitations to support their request for accommodations. Accommodation requests are considered on an individual basis. Considerations include, but are not limited to, whether the student is an otherwise qualified student with a disability, documentation of educational limitations, the essential nature of the course and program, accommodations and disability management strategies previously utilized by the student.

### Overview of Academic Accommodations

There are 2 levels of academic accommodations:

Level 1- Reasonable Accommodations – an adjustment that allows a student with a disability an equal opportunity to complete course requirements;

Level 2 – Course Substitution – the replacement of a required course with an approved alternative course.

### **Level 1: Reasonable Accommodations**

The District recognizes the provision of reasonable accommodations is intended to mitigate functional limitations to facilitate student's academic access and ability to complete a course or achieve proficiency. For most students with documented disabilities, this first level of

accommodation will involve an attempt to complete the course with additional help such as learning facilitation, in-class support services, educational material in alternate formats, assistive technology, auxiliary aids, test accommodations, and note-taking assistance. Other options may include a request to complete an extended version of the course, and/or advisement to complete developmental courses or courses in an alternate format to promote academic success.

Procedure for requesting an accommodation:

1. It is the student's responsibility to provide appropriate documentation of a disability and to request course accommodations with a counselor or disability specialist in the Special Resource Center. As an alternative, students who do not want to use the services of the SRC may contact the Dean of Enrollment Services and request reasonable accommodations.
2. The SRC professional staff, in collaboration with the student, will evaluate and determine reasonable accommodations based upon the student's educational limitation(s) related to a documented disability. Reasonable accommodations will commence in a timely manner relative to the term of enrollment, and are not retroactive.
3. After consulting with the SRC, if the student disagrees with the SRC's recommendation for accommodations, the student may request a review of the accommodations through the grievance procedure outlined in the SRC student handbook. Additionally, if a conflict arises regarding the recommended accommodations at this level with the instructor, the SRC will initially attempt to resolve the conflict. If a resolution is not attained between the SRC and the instructor, the student, instructor, or SRC professional staff will refer the matter to the 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative for review.
4. The 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative will convene an Academic Accommodations Committee (defined below) to investigate and resolve the issue within ten business days.
  - a. The Academic Accommodations Committee will evaluate and determine the appropriateness and feasibility of the accommodation to ensure access, and whether the requested academic adjustment fundamentally alters the course or program of instruction, or if implemented, will conflict with a direct licensing requirement or jeopardize a requirement essential to the program of instruction.
  - b. If necessary, the Academic Accommodations Committee will evaluate and determine alternative academic adjustments that may be considered to ensure the student is not denied the benefits of, or is excluded from participation in the academic program without impacting the integrity of the course.

- c. During this time period the SRC will continue to provide interim accommodations pending a final resolution.

## **Level 2: Course Substitution**

A course substitution is the replacement of a required course with an approved alternative course. The substituted course must provide concept mastery comparable to that of the required course.

1. A course substitution may be appropriate provided that a student with a verified disability believes that a) level 1 reasonable accommodations offered do not enable him/her to successfully complete a required course and b) that attempts with additional or different accommodations have been exhausted or if that his/her identified educational limitations are of such magnitude that any attempt at completing the course would be futile.
2. A course substitution can be granted under the following conditions:
  - a. The required course is found by the Academic Accommodations Committee (defined below) to be nonessential to the student's course of study.
  - b. The student is not likely to successfully complete the required course even with the provision of all reasonable accommodations by the college.
  - c. A suitable course for substitution exists.
3. The institution shall explore alternatives such as Independent Study, but is not required to develop a substitute course should one not exist. Academic requirements the college considers essential to the program of instruction being pursued by the student, or directly related to licensing requirements, will not be regarded as discriminatory.
4. As specified in Title 5, Section 56006 and the Special Resource Center's student handbook, the student submits an Academic Accommodations Request form with supporting documentation to the 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative.
5. Once a complete request is received, the Academic Accommodations Committee shall meet and resolve the issue within twenty business days within the primary (fall and spring) term.
6. Completion of a substitute course shall not be construed as meeting the prerequisite for any course for which the substituted course was a requirement.
7. A course waiver is the elimination of a required course from a student's program of study. A course waiver may be considered under the following conditions:

- a. There is evidence the student has met all of the requirements noted above for substitution.
  - b. There are no viable alternative courses offered at El Camino College, as determined by judgment of the Academic Accommodations Committee.
  - c. The required course is peripheral to the student's course of study or major, and the student must not require any further classes or training in the specified area.
8. A waiver of the course requirement will not be considered a waiver of the student's responsibility to complete the minimum number of units required by the institution for completion of the course of study. A waiver of a course requirement shall not be construed as a waiver of any prerequisite for any other course. The absence of a substitute course does not automatically establish grounds for a waiver.

**Exceptions to Timeline:**

An exception to the timeline will be made if the petition is received so late in the primary term creating a challenge for the committee to complete its process within the current term. In such case, the Chair of the Academic Accommodations Committee would convene the committee at the earliest possible time during the following primary term. The timeline for the committee's decision would remain the same, and begin the first day of instruction of the following primary term. Pending the decision of the Academic Accommodations Committee, accommodations will be made in this interim period as recommended by the 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative.

**Recognition by Other Institutions:**

El Camino College grants course substitutions or waivers for degrees and certificates conferred by El Camino College only. Students shall be informed that a substitution or waiver granted by El Camino College may not be recognized by another educational institution. It is the responsibility of the student for contacting potential transfer institutions regarding the acceptability of the substitution to meet transfer requirements.

**Academic Accommodations Committee:**

An appropriately qualified DSP&S Specialist will review all submitted documents for accuracy and completeness prior to submission to the Academic Accommodations Committee. The Committee shall be constituted as follows:

1. The El Camino College 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative (chair)
2. The dean of the division or a designee from the department in which the course is taught

3. A full-time instructor who teaches the course in question or an instructor from the department in which the course is taught, or if not available, from a closely related discipline
4. A full-time faculty member or representative from the department of the student's major or field of concentration
5. The El Camino College DSP&S faculty member knowledgeable with the disability and/or educational limitations of the student.

### **Review Meeting**

The Academic Accommodations Committee will convene to review the student's request in the specified timeframe. The student will have an opportunity to present his/her request accompanied by any relevant documentation for academic accommodations to the committee. If desired by the student, an advocate of the student's choice may accompany the student. Thereafter, the committee will deliberate and reach a consensus for the appropriate academic accommodations - course adjustments or substitution. The El Camino College 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative shall maintain records of all decisions of the Committee and notify the student of decisions.

### **Notification:**

The El Camino College 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer or representative shall notify the student, the Special Resource Center, the Director of Admissions and Records and all other pertinent offices of any changes allowed by the Academic Accommodations Committee to the student's course of study in writing within five business days after a decision has been determined.

### **Appeals:**

In the event a request for academic accommodations is denied, the student may appeal the Academic Accommodations Committee's decision. In the event there is new information available, the student may only appeal the decision one (1) time and submit documents or information not previously submitted that s/he and DSPS specialist believes are pertinent in support of the request. If the appeal is denied, the student may submit a written request to the 504/Americans with Disabilities Compliance Officer that the appeal be forwarded to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for review. This request must be submitted within 30 days of notification of the committee's decision. The decision of the Vice President of Academic Affairs is final.

E-mail – dated October 24, 2010

I just wanted to let you know that the Compton Faculty Council voted unanimously this afternoon to recommend the indefinite retention of the winter session, in order to meet the needs of students.

This motion passed after a discussion of the letter from Dr. Nishime to Dr. Fallo, and of the data compiled by Chris Wells on winter session at other community colleges. There was also discussion of the rationale for the proposed deletion of the winter session, as expressed in various meetings of the ECC Calendar Committee. Toni Wasserberger, our representative to the Calendar Committee, spoke on this issue, as did Associate Dean David Vakil.

I pass this on to the ECC Academic Senate for its consideration, as it moves forward on this matter.

Saul

# AP 4026 Philosophy and Criteria for International Education

Reference:

*Education Code 66015.7*

Note: This procedure is optional: AB 1342 amended Education Code to encourage districts to engage in international education as resources permit. Local practice may be inserted.

International education should encourage programs that support learning about other cultures, global issues, and the exchange of Californians and international students and scholars, such as:

- Develop courses of study in as many fields as possible to increase students' understanding of global issues and cultural differences.
- Offer courses in languages other than English to train students to communicate effectively in other cultures and to enhance their understanding of other nations' values.
- Provide opportunities for students in all majors to participate in study abroad programs to enrich their academic training, perspectives, and personal development.
- Provide opportunities for domestic and international students to interact effectively and routinely share their views, perceptions, and experiences in educational settings.
- Develop innovative public educational forums and venues to explore global issues and showcase world cultures.

For international students and scholars,

- Encourage the presence of qualified students from other countries with sufficient geographic diversity to inspire an appreciation for differences among cultures and a deeper understanding of the values and perspectives of other people.
- Facilitate faculty exchange and collaborative partnership programs with institutions in other countries.
- Initiate collaborative research undertakings to address issues of global significance.
- Recruit and retain the world's best and brightest faculty to educate California's students as globally competent citizens.

New 02/03