

ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE & MINUTES

20th March 2012

Adjunct Faculty

Sue Ellen Warren

Leah Pate

Behavioral & Social Sciences

Firestone, Randy X

Gold, Christina X

Moen, Michelle X

Widman, Lance X

Wynne, Michael X

Business

Siddiqui, Junaid X

Lau, Philip S

VACANT

Counseling

Pajo, Christina X

Sabio, Sabra X

Vaughn, Dexter X

Key, Ken X

Fine Arts

Ahmadpour, Ali X

Bloomberg, Randall X

Crossman, Mark

Schultz, Patrick X

Wells, Chris X

Health Sciences & Athletics

Hazell, Tom X

Colunga, Mina X

Baily, Kim X

Holt, Kelly X

Humanities

Isaacs, Brent X

Marcoux, Pete X

McLaughlin, Kate X

Halonon, Briita X

Simon, Jenny X

Industry & Technology

Gebert, Pat

Hofmann, Ed X

MacPherson, Lee X

Winfree, Merriel X

Marston, Doug

Learning Resources Unit

Striepe, Claudia X

Ichinaga, Moon X

Mathematical Sciences

Bateman, Michael X

Hamza Hamza X

Sheynshteyn, Arkadiy X

Taylor, Susan X

Barajas, Eduardo X

Natural Sciences

Doucette, Pete X

Herzig, Chuck X

Jimenez, Miguel X

Palos Teresa X

VACANT

Academic Affairs & SCA

Arce, Francisco X

Nishime, Jeanie

Lee, Claudia

Lam, Karen

ECC CEC Members

Evans, Jerome

Norton, Tom X

Panski, Saul X

Pratt, Estina

Halligan, Chris

Odanaka, Michael X

Assoc. Students Org.

Asher, Rebekka

Valdez, Cindy

Ex- Officio Positions

Elizabeth Shadish X

Guests, Dean's Rep, Visitors:

Carolyn Pineda, Arvid Spor, Alice Grigsby

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

The third Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2012 semester was called to order by Academic Senate President Gold at 12:36pm.

Approval of last Minutes:

[See pp.6-10 of packet]The minutes of the 6th March plenary meeting were approved as written.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

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

CG noted that as it was a full agenda she would be moving items along swiftly.

- CG noted that the 2nd reading of the Resolution of No Confidence has been moved forward to the next Academic Senate meeting of April 3rd to allow for fact checking and the inclusion of additional evidence. Mr. Norton had a request, clarified by Mr. Panski, to revise the resolution to make clear that the resolution referred to no confidence in the process of shared governance at the Torrance campus only. CG said that the Taskforce would meet again to look at the draft document.
- CG reminded all that it has been the custom now for a few years to have one Academic Senate meeting at the Compton Campus, and this year it will be the May 1st meeting.
- Student Success Taskforce Recommendations. To work on the recommendations, a committee - headed by Drs. Arce and Nishime - has been selected. The members are Dr. Mosqueda (First Year Experience/Counselor), Ms. Blake (Basic Skills Coordinator), Dr. Soden (Human Development), Mr. Durand (Industry and Technology), Mr. Wells (Academic Senate), and Dr. Gold (Academic Senate).

Ms. Taylor wished to recommend another member – Mr. Martinez, from Math – to represent Math basic Skills. CG regretfully informed her that the group was already considered too large. Dr. Arce suggested a member from the Compton Center should be added as the recommendations would affect that campus as well. Dr. Spor suggested Mr. Martinez (Math) be put on the Enrollment Management Committee as the two groups were going to be working closely together and looking at Basic Skills. .

VP Compton Education Center - Saul Panski (SP)

No report.

Curriculum Committee – Jenny Simon (JS)

No report.

VP Educational Policies Committee – Merriel Winfree (MW)

No report. MW will speak later in Agenda. Note minutes of the Ed. Policies Committee meeting of March 13th on pg 15 of packet.

VP Faculty Development Committee –Briita Halonen (BH) (Co-VP) and Moon Ichinaga (MI) (Co-VP)

[See pp 17- 25 of packet] MI thanked CG for documenting the emails pertaining to a free parking space for the winner of the Outstanding Adjunct faculty award. MI said that in Sept 2011 it was thought that a free parking spot had been secured as part of the award, but the offer had been revoked as the VP's felt

that procedures had not been adhered to, and they have requested policy guidelines from the Parking Committee and Chief Travis. The Fac. Dev. Committee has sent suggestions re: the requested guidelines to the Parking Committee. There have been no further communications/responses to date.

The full-time faculty winners were never offered a parking space, as they receive a monetary prize, but it was hoped to offer the adjunct faculty winner a plaque and a parking spot for a year. As it stands, the winner just receives a plaque.

Dr. Baily asked, should the matter be resolved favorably, whether there would be 2 spaces next year – one for the last year’s award winner? MI noted that hopefully some arrangement could be made, but we would have to wait and see.

Mr. Marston asked whose idea it was to allow students to park anywhere after 6pm? He asked that this arrangement be at least pushed out to 6:30 or 7pm. CG asked that Mr. Marston email her on the matter and she would pass it on in College Council.

VP Finance – Lance Widman (LW)

LW asked all to spare a moment to consider the plight of those in Mexico who had this morning experienced a 7.4 earthquake.

[See p. 27 of packet] This notes the current status (as of 3/1) of revenues and expenditures. Due to “prudent fiscal actions” it is anticipated that any shortfall at this point will be taken from reserves. The numbers are still moving and shifting weekly, if not daily. LW noted that, unlike the quote from his favorite film “Invictus” – “I am the master of my fate...” – we are all at the mercy of Sacramento. LW related that he has served on the Academic Senate for 25 years, and had worked with Senate Presidents D’Amico, Bonano, Marston, Perez, Dever, Marcoux, Vakil, and now Gold, and wanted to express his admiration and thanks to President Gold for her leadership and diplomacy.

VP Academic Technology Committee – Pete Marcoux (PM)

PM noted that the next Academic Technology Committee meetings would take place on March 29th in the Alondra room 1-2pm, and May 10th in the Stadium Room.

VP Instructional Effectiveness – Kelly Holt (KH)

KH will speak later in agenda.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

CSULB Admission Policy Hearings – Chris Wells (CW)

[See pp 28 – 34 of packet] Mr. Wells reported that CSULB is proposing moving to major-specific admissions criteria. This would have a significant impact on our ECC students. Recent news also indicates that the CSUs may eliminate Spring admissions. In response to a question from GC, CW noted that the Long Beach Promise program will be cut 10%, these students could come to ECC instead. In response to a question from Ms. Winfree, CW noted that different admissions criteria are being proposed based on major, depending also how impacted these majors field become. CW said our AA degrees would become more important, and we should push the majors degrees here.

Mr. Marcoux noted that the state of Connecticut was proposing to eliminate remedial classes from the community college system there, so that was another trend to keep an eye on, what with the number of remedial classes offered here at ECC.

CW also mentioned the Santa Monica College proposal to move to a two-tiered fee system. It appears the SMC Board approved the proposal, but we will have to watch for the Chancellor’s Office reaction.

Mr. Panski requested the Compton Center have input on the majors degrees. Dr. Arce said interested parties should be sure to get onto the Division Curriculum Committees. Discussion followed on which majors degrees are offered at ECC. CG also noted that interested parties should email her and she would send them a link for C-ID, or one could Google the term.

Dr. Arce asked how many transfer degrees have been approved state-wide – Dr. Simon thought around 21 degrees. Dr. Arce noted that we have 3 or 4 approved, and noted how advantageous they were for students applying to a university. Dr. Simon further noted that students with one of these degrees get a grade point boost.

Later, CG forwarded an email from Dr. Simon.

Jenny Simon asked that I forward the following information to the Academic Senate:

Dear Senators—Just to follow up on the conversation from the meeting today. The following transfer degrees have been approved by the CCC:

Communication Studies

Geology

Psychology

Sociology

The following transfer degrees are in progress:

Administration of Justice

Kinesiology

Mathematics

Physics

The following link shows the “TMCs” (transfer model curricula) which have been finalized and are currently being vetted at the state level: <http://www.c-id.net/degreereview.html>.

Calendar Committee Report:

[See packet pp 35-43] CG began with a recap - The Board of Trustees was presented with two calendars. A 2012 – 2013 calendar with a Winter session, which was approved, and a 2013-2014 calendar without a Winter session, which the Board did not approve, saying it needed more information. To this end, Dr. Nishime convened three subcommittees to gather information in the areas of Efficiency, Economy, and Academics. Information compiled by the committees [See packet pp35-39 – with summary on pg 43] was presented at the last Board meeting. After listening to 4 hours of testimony, the Board decided to Keep 2012/2013 Winter session, and eliminate 2013/2014 Winter session. The new calendar can be seen on pp40-41 of packet. The main reason for the decision was budgetary, and to preserve a strong Spring and Fall and those sections.

CG noted that Summer School would still run 6 and 8 week sessions this year, but there were no guarantees thereafter, perhaps we would see two back to back 6 week sessions in the future. Mr. Widman noted the importance of Summer School to high school graduates, and Mr. Panski noted that if Summer School begins in June, the statistics can be used for either fiscal year. Dr. Spor agreed that the start date for Summer sessions was important.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Nominations for Academic Senate President, and Co-VP Faculty Development

- **Co-VP Faculty Development Committee**

Vice Presidents: The vice presidents shall preside over meetings of their respective standing committees, as outlined in *Robert’s Rules*, report to the Senate, interface with the college administration in the appropriate areas, and bring proposals to the Senate for approval by the body.

Vice President of Faculty Development, in coordination with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, shall investigate, monitor and propose policies for faculty professional development activities, and present proposals for use of faculty development funds to the Senate.

Nominations are called for a two year term as Co-VP. Fall 2012-Spring 2014.

CG declared the position open for nominations. Ms. Halonen noted that she was stepping down as the senior VP, and the new VP would be the junior VP, with Ms. Ichinaga stepping up as senior VP. Ms. Halonen said this was part of the reason for having staggered VP’ s so that a new person

had time to learn the ropes from a more seasoned officer. No nominations were heard, so CG said she would field the position again at the April 17th meeting, and also have the vote at that time.

- **Academic Senate President**

The president shall preside over meetings of the Senate as outlined in *Robert's Rules of Order*; chair the Executive Committee; represent the Senate to the administration, the Board of Trustees, and the State Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges (ASCCC); and appoint a parliamentarian, newsletter editor and sergeant-at-arms, as deemed necessary. CG noted that this is a 2 year term running from Fall 2013 through Spring 2015. The first year the incumbent would serve as President Elect. CG opened the floor for nominations. Ms. Ichinaga nominated CG to serve a second term. Ms. Winfree seconded the nomination.

BP/AP 4025 Philosophy for Associate Degree & General Education – Merriel Winfree (MW)

(Second reading)

[See pp44-48 of packet] MW noted that Senate had seen the policy/procedure last Fall, and had approved them in theory, but had asked that the policy be revisited by the Ed. Policies Committee for a reworking of the language regarding who would create the procedure. Thus the Committee has provided 3 options for consideration that the Senate needs to vote on. CG asked that Senate discuss the three options presented. Mr. Wells asked if the options complied with the CCLC template. MW was not sure. Mr. Widman suggested opting for option 2 as it seemed the clearest. Mr. Marston noted that option 3 mentioned both collegial consultation AND mutual agreement...and asked what our arrangement with the Board was. CG said we have mutual agreement with the Board. Ms. Taylor also liked option 3 as having the broadest possibilities. Mr. Widman noted that the second sentence of the options was key, as that is where the crux of the issue lay. CG called for a motion to vote. Mr. Marston moved to vote, seconded by Mr. Norton. CG called to approve BP 4025 with the inclusion of option 2 with the second sentence to be amended to read "*These procedures are developed through a collegial consultation process of mutual agreement between...*" The vote showed all in favor, with no Nays or abstentions.

The BP [see pg 48 of packet] had had no changes requested, so a motion was made to approve the procedures. Mr. Widman moved to approve, seconded by Mr. Marcoux. The vote showed all in favor, with no Nays or abstentions.

NEW BUSINESS

BP/AP 4225 Course Repetition – Merriel Winfree(MW) (First reading)

[See pp 49-56 of packet – Policy 49-50, Procedures 51-56] MW noted that the changes are extensive, but required by law – a Title V change. Changes are being made in response to changes to the law which allows students to attempt a course only three times.

Students can attempt a course three times, but the third attempt will trigger a request for intervention and a plan. W's will count as attempts, as will an F grade. It was noted that the Policy has been slimmed down to the basics. Further changes to the law are anticipated and these changes will be reflected in the Procedures.

Ms. Taylor requested that similar changes be made in the wording of the first paragraph as had been requested for BP/AP 4025.

Mr. Panski noted a typo pg 49 – designate should be designee.

Mr. Wells asked whether we should not approve the process later when all changes had been made. Mr. Natividad said no, as we have to be in compliance. Mr. Marcoux asked if we would be voting on this at the next meeting. CG replied in the affirmative, noting that this would give the Ed. Policies committee time to make the suggested changes to language.

INFORMATION ITEMS –DISCUSSION

Planning and Budgeting – Arvid Spor (AS)

AS said he wanted to get input on possible changing due dates on PlanBuild reports. AS noted that December end is the current due date for plans, and wondered whether people felt this was too early/late.

He pointed out that some Divisions had moved the date up internally, and come up with their own dates more suitable to their operations. AS noted that the plans are really due in February, but many worked ahead as they did not necessarily work during Winter. AS asked for comment.

Ms. McLaughlin noted that Journalism liked their Jan/Feb deadline as they were often too busy to attend to the plans during the semester. Mr. Wells asked if the college could not leave matters as they are, up to the discretion of the Divisions? AS noted that he would like something more formal as some areas had a habit of procrastinating, and with a firmer plan we might see better continuity. Mr. Norton suggested a deadline of the Friday before classes begin in January. AS noted that many folks do not like working over the Christmas period. CG asked if eliminating the Winter session would make the January deadline more feasible? AS said it might give more flexibility, but not much. He noted the college would like to have a consistent system for Accreditation purposes. CG asked AS what he would recommend? AS suggested working toward an October deadline, noting there had been many late submissions at the CEC. Mr. Norton said he would “nag” the Compton faculty. Mr. Panski noted that the late submissions may have been due to unclear instructions – people were waiting for approvals. Mr. Wells noted that part of the problem lay with the software and instructions should be clearer. Mr. Widman said he would vote for Dec 31st.

AS said that the Accreditation teams look at what is actually done.

AS went on to talk about the ACCJC noting that he had received a letter on 1st February re: Rubric status, noting that ECC is required to meet all standards pertaining thereto. Six recommendations were made and we must be sure to link them to planning and comment on them in Program Reviews. We are at risk of failing in some areas. Some training for managers has been mandated to try to remedy the situation.

AS said he was thinking of having a planning workshop for faculty on how to write content for the Goals, Evaluation, and Objectives sections and helping with fine-tuning plans could be included in the workshop

Core Competency Assessment Results – Assessment of Learning Committee – Kelly Holt (KH) and Carolyn Pineda (CP)

KH stepped Senate through the following slides re: ECC’s Second Core Competency Assessment: “Critical, Creative, and Analytical Thinking”

The full core competency statement reads: **Critical, Creative, and Analytical Thinking:**

Students solve problems, make judgments and reach decisions using critical, creative and analytical skills.

KH noted that a student survey had been prepared to allow students the opportunity for

Self-assessment of 6 discrete skills in critical, creative, and analytical thinking.

- 1) Draw conclusion based on evidence or information
- 2) Evaluate quality and credibility of a source or evidence
- 3) Create a work that meets defined standards
- 4) Use standards to make judgment
- 5) Apply theory to analyze data or solve a problem
- 6) Create solution or approach to a problem

The survey compared student’s assessment of the competency at the beginning of education at El Camino College against their current rating and an overall rating.

KH showed the survey

El Camino College
Student Survey: Critical, Creative and Analytical Thinking

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your participation is very important in helping the college measure whether students are meeting the following college-wide learning outcome:

Critical, Creative and Analytical Thinking: Students solve problems, make judgments and reach decisions using critical, creative and analytical skills.

Your responses to these questions will be grouped with other students' responses and will help the college make decisions about how to improve programs and services to enhance student learning on the campus.

Note: By providing your student ID number, you are giving ECC's research office access to your student records, including grades. However, please rest assured this information will not go beyond the research office and that providing this information will not affect current or future grades in your classes. Your records will not be considered individually. Instead, your information will be grouped with other students' information and analyzed as a whole. By providing this information, you will be helping the College improve programs and services for its students.

Please **ONLY** use a #2 pencil and fill in the bubble completely.

1. Student ID Number:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Instructions: Based on your overall experience at the college, not just this course, rate how well you are able to do the following general activities (in bold). Do not rate yourself on all of the activities in the parentheses-these examples are meant as guides. Rate yourself 1-5, where 1=beginner and 5=advanced.

1. **I am able to draw a conclusion based on evidence or information** (for example, from a text, a mock investigation, or scientific evidence, etc). 1 Beginner
 2
 3
 4
 5 Advanced

2. **I am able to evaluate the quality and credibility of a source or evidence** (for example, a web site or article, etc). 1 Beginner
 2
 3
 4
 5 Advanced

3. **I am able to create a work that meets defined standards** (for example, an essay, a lab report, a poem or art work, etc). 1 Beginner
 2
 3
 4
 5 Advanced

4. **I am able to use standards to make judgments** (for example, evaluate another student's essay, or make a drawing by judging proportion of the subject, etc). 1 Beginner
 2
 3
 4
 5 Advanced

(OVER)

And discussed the design of the assessment tool

Faculty Survey

- o Faculty evaluated students in only the categories they were familiar with and that their courses covered.

Course Grades

- o Courses coded for alignment with core competencies in IR database
- o Only courses aligning with “critical, creative, and analytical thinking” core competency were included; only for students who participated in the survey and agreed to include their ID number

Faculty from 13 sections returned student self-assessments

- o 313 students submitted self-assessments
- o 8 faculty completed assessments on their students’ critical thinking skills
- o Faculty assessed 186 students

LP discussed the Student Self-Assessment and Faculty Assessment mean scores by Activity

Activity/Skill	Student Mean	Faculty Mean
Draw conclusion based on evidence or information	4.01	3.45
Evaluate quality and credibility of a source or evidence	3.99	3.56
Create a work that meets defined standards	4.11	3.72
Use standards to make judgment	4.07	3.73
Apply theory to analyze data or solve a problem	3.95	3.57
Create solution or approach to a problem	3.97	3.63

Along with the Overall mean scores – it was noted that students continue to self-assess higher than faculty rate them. But it was noted that students do seem to note an improvement in skills based on their time at the college

Critical Thinking Skills Rating	Student Mean	Faculty Mean
Beginning of education at El Camino College	3.42	N/A
Current	4.06	3.59

LP also discussed the student self-assessment mean scores by gender, noting both groups feel they have improved.

Activity/Skill	Female Mean (n=167)	Male Mean (n=119)
Draw conclusion based on evidence or information	3.93	4.14
Evaluate quality and credibility of a source or evidence	3.98	4.04
Create a work that meets defined standards	4.07	4.13
Use standards to make judgment	4.00	4.17
Apply theory to analyze data or solve a problem	3.50	3.78
Create solution or approach to a problem	3.66	3.82
Critical Thinking Skills Rating	Female Mean	Male Mean
Beginning of education at El Camino College	3.24	3.46
Current	3.99	4.08

And Student self-assessment mean scores by ethnicity

Activity/Skill	Asian (n=40)	African Amer. (n=86)	Latino (n=88)	White (n=45)
Draw conclusion based on evidence or information	3.73	3.88	3.94	4.47
Evaluate quality and credibility of a source or evidence	3.70	3.94	3.99	4.44
Create a work that meets defined standards	3.70	3.93	4.20	4.60

Use standards to make judgment	3.65	3.95	4.15	4.42
Apply theory to analyze data or solve a problem	3.05	3.71	3.64	4.02
Create solution or approach to a problem	3.25	3.78	3.63	4.07

Critical Thinking Skills Rating	Asian	African Amer.	Latino	White
Beginning of education at El Camino College	3.00	3.4	3.36	3.47
Current	3.63	3.95	4.08	4.44

LP discussed course grades at both campuses

- **Course grades in “critical, analytical, and creative thinking” courses—Torrance**
 - GPA=3.00
 - Average number of courses taken=7.5
 - Success=76%; Retention=87%
- **Course grades in critical, analytical, and creative thinking” courses—Compton**
 - GPA=3.14
 - Average number of courses taken=4.1
 - Success=75%; Retention=87%

And provided a summary of the data before opening the floor to questions to herself and KH.

- Students indicated their critical thinking skills have improved since they began ECC or CEC.
- Overall, faculty ratings of their students’ critical thinking skills were lower than the student self-assessment.
- Students demonstrate high performance in success, retention, and GPAs in courses with a greater emphasis on critical thinking.

The presenters noted that feedback is important especially in the following areas

After reading and reflecting about the Critical, Creative and Analytical Thinking Core

Competency assessment results, please answer the following questions:

- 1) **What are your general observations of the data?**
- 2) **What are the implications/recommendations for the college?**
- 3) **What are the implications/recommendations for your area/program?**

Do you have any specific questions or concerns about this core competency or its assessment?

Comments:

Ms. Halonen questioned the validity of self-assessment data. LP acknowledged that this is an on-going discussion at the ALC. There has been talk of administering a test, but this would be very time-consuming. KH agreed, saying that the ALC is actively looking for feedback, and understands that we need to work on authentic assessment, but are faced with enormous time constraints. Many faculty do not want to give up the classroom time. The whole college should be involved in the effort to think up better assessment methods. KH noted there are some plans to get a focus group together and have faculty design an assessment tool and move away from student self- assessment.

Another idea is to have a guest speaker on Flex Day, partnering with Faculty Development, on this topic. Mr. Marcoux asked if we had data from other schools to compare? KH said no, no schools had an identical statement that would provide a meaningful comparison. Dr. Simon pointed out that not many schools do institutional assessments at this point in time. CG asked if we could take program level assessment data to use in considering core competencies. KH said this was a good idea and would be considered.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Resolution of No Confidence in the Implementation of Collegial Consultation – April 3rd.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 2:01pm.

CS/ECC2012