**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

November 18, 2014

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

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Senate Co-Presidents Jeffries and Striepe called the Academic Senate meeting to order November 18, 2014 at 12:39 a.m.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the November 4 Meeting (pgs. 5 – 10) were approved with the addition of the full statement from ECC cadet regarding response to call.

**3. OFFICER REPORTS**

**A. Co-Presidents – Chris Jeffries (CJ) and Claudia Striepe (CS) (pgs. 11 - 20)**

CS: Tom Cody joined the hiring committee for the financial aid position. Three members are needed for the hiring panel for Dr. Arce’s position, probably Chris and Claudia will join, but we need another senate member. Barbara has not set a date. T. Mucky: I’ll volunteer. C. Striepe: We need to check on tenure requirements. Thanks Tim. In April, 2016, the Governor’s fee waiver students not meeting academic standard will lose their award. C. Pineda will take a closer look and William Garcia will speak to us about it. Without BOGFW, would a student enroll here? This may be a problem for us down the road. We want to get the information out. Alert your division to this issue. Regarding the Student Equity Plan, a new draft will be available for all of us. Faculty nominated for student success in EOPS will be honored. Puente is to go ahead! Counselor Castro and a counselor to be hired will be teamed with some faculty into two teams that can rotate. This will add security to the program. In the College Council minutes (pgs. 11-14) see that Distance Ed offerings include 77 courses for spring on p. 18.

CJ: Regarding the plenary, Chris Wells will speak to resolutions. One of the topics was the three technology initiatives. Next spring, senate will focus on each relevant initiative. Some will be piloted next spring. Some launched in spring, some in fall. On Friday, C. Gold presented on Distance Ed to the statewide senate. We had an excellent presentation from Vice Chancellor Patrick Perry on achievement measures. They will monitor metrics including student success, equity, student services, efficiency, access, etc. Alternative pathways and curriculum issues comprised other breakout sessions. The C-ID descriptors deadline is coming up, there’s a backlog at the chancellor’s office. Lori Suekawa will speak to this. C. Wells: The statewide senate enjoys passing resolutions and making sure they are phrased right. One issue was freedom to choose an accreditations team. ACCJC is not the only group. We should seek out others, some from states contiguous with California. Regarding SD967, the student sexual assault resolution I think that we should work with partners, CSU’s and UC’s to share best practices. Also, there was some discussion regarding curriculum AA transfer degrees have taken over, but some low level certificates may also be useful. We just have AA-transfer degrees, there’s a place for reactivating AA degrees. There is funding available for C-ID to make the process work. Repeatability is a system wide issue, as is chasing students from college to college that circumvent the policy. How to do that? Also, their was discussion we’re not united on baccalaureate degrees. Academic Senate does not support them but we want to be involved if we must have them. As for AA transfer degrees, how do we allow upper division courses taught as lower division? We shouldn’t call them upper division courses lower division, but should standardize guidelines. These are posted on statewide senate website, including Power Points. Predictive analytics can be used to increase student success. P. Flor: I went to a few breakout sessions, on legislation. There’s one they are pursuing with the chancellor that you can read about in the President’s newsletter. The senate is trying to redefine itself, mission statement, etc. I lose patience with the thesaurus use, etc. Academic Senate should build relationships with legislature and partnerships with local senates. Partnerships should be with other bodies, and AS be the authority. The relationships should be with local senate. 112 local senates should be part of local family, making decisions with decision makers. The term “unconscious bias” hit me in a gender equity presentation on Title 9, which is not just related to sports. It’s not a binary conversation but includes the transgender population and their rights. It was a really informative session. C. Wells: I meant to mention a discussion on the faculty hiring prioritization processes. One school has administrators and faculty, with separately published lists. The president uses faculty ranking over administrator’s ranking. A lot of colleges do an executive summary or abstract of program reviews. Ours fall into a dark hole and should be on a board agenda for our board and the public to see. There’s a recommendation to have a liaison with legislation. There is a lot coming out, and a new era of more and more legislation. P. Flor: Many campuses do not have a faculty liaison. At the center the board representative fulfills this role. There was a breakout session on the Brown Act and its applicability, and differentiating between open and closed sessions, and on early college options across state, such as middle and early colleges, and apprenticeships. It was all relevant to this venue.

CS: In our “Did You Know?” series, did you know the difference between union and senate bodies? There is a difference. The Academic Senate deals with academic and professional matters. The unions are involved in salary, working conditions, and contractual agreements. The state senate sends out publications with interesting information. Chris and I send out emails with information regarding larger bodies.

P. Flor: I spoke with Dr. Fallo about Dr. Arce’s position hiring committee and asked for a representative from center. I’ll consult with Barbara. Maybe I can sit in the third position. CS: We’ll see if panel can be made larger.

**B. VP –: Compton Education Center – Paul Flor**

We met the day of the election. Measure C passed by a large majority, 76 %. This positions the center to leverage funds with state monies to do infrastructure building the campus needs. Up to three instructional buildings. This is welcome news. Last week, Dr. Arce visited campus to lead us in an Accreditation 101 workshop to entice newer faculty to play a role in process. Our younger faculty will carry the process forward.

**C. Chair – Curriculum – Mark Lipe**

Nothing to report.

**D. VP – Educational Policies – Chris Jeffries**

Nothing to report.

**E. VP – Faculty Development – Kristie Daniel –DiGregorio**

K. Daniel –DiGregorio: You saw our getting the job flyer. Please help us get word out. It will cover do’s and don’ts for adjuncts and things to keep in mind for cover letters and resumes. Part 2 in spring will focus on interviews. December 5 is our first panel. There is limited registration with CV review. Thanks to colleagues for sharing ideas with the Spotlight on Great Ideas. We’ll have another this semester to continue the conversation on student success. At our next meeting, December 2, we will reveal our 2014 adjunct faculty award announcement. It makes a significant impact on adjuncts, and comes with a $500 cash award. It will be a great way to end the semester. P. Marcoux: Are they replacing Donna Manno? K.Daniel –DiGregorio: It’s been advertised. There have been applicants. A. Ahmadpour: Regarding the adjunct award, why can’t we convince departments to recruit this awardee as a full-timer? If they are significant, why can’t we lobby to hire them? CJ: The panels are confidential. A. Ahmadpour: We can at least petition divisions to pay attention to this. Name recognition is not practical. Lets take it further. L. Widman: The President’s newsletter shows that a sizable number of hires were adjuncts here. CJ: We have two in counseling.

**F. VP – Finance – Lance Widman**

I’m just happy to be here.

**G. VP – Academic Technology – Pete Marcoux (pgs. 21 - 23)**

Nothing to report.

**H. VP – Instructional Effectiveness/ Assessment of Learning Committee and SLO’s Update – Karen Whitney (pgs. 24 - 25 )**

Karen: I’ll discuss changing an SLO or PLO statement. This semester we put together bullet points to clarify ILO’s. They’re up on the website to clarify main ideas. This will be more important as we create new ILO assessments. Faculty can refer to this. More detail is available on website. There are Trackdat trainings this semester. Three more will be held. Bring data and we can help you put in a report. A. Ahmadpour: Where’s the video? K. Whitney: It’s in the approval process. Regarding PLO norming. Here are some guidelines. This semester there will be multiple assessments due. We can’t be too specific because programs differ, as does curricula. There is no single way to do this. A PLO that looks course level is not appropriate, include scope. Multiple course assessment data, and recently gathered data is OK too. It could all be done this semester. On page 24 you’ll find a checklist. It will help you make sure you’re making it program level appropriate. There can be multiple targets for multiple courses. Under data analysis, examine breadth of program. Contact facilitators. They will help us, I’m available and Russell Serr is too. V. Palacios: I’m a facilitator. Are there any guidelines? Is there an assessment faculty can look at as a reasonable assessment? K. Whitney: In our division, we’ve done assessments before. The standards haven’t changed, but we’ve done well in past. There are two choices: The first is taking in all course level data, commonalities, etc. for PLO’s, especially for sequential courses. Gather already gathered data and reanalyze. The other choice is a secondary form of assessment: a survey for students, a questionnaire for faculty. If there’s any question if course data is enough, it’s safer to go with a second level of assessment. V. Palacios: Some folks in art are bewildered and want direction. Where’s the goal post? Where’s the standard? K. Whitney: We can sit down and look at them on an individual basis.

**4. SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**A. ECC VP of Academic Affairs and ECC VP of Student and Community Advancement – Francisco Arce and Jeanie Nishime**

**No report.**

**5.UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**6. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. BP 1600 – Full Inclusion of People with Disabilities. – C. Jeffries and C. Striepe. (pg. 26)**

This policy was introduced in College Council and is an informational item only. A number of policies were covered with college council. We don’t want to bring them all at once. But you’ll see informational items in the next year. This one is an update from Dipte Patel. Referring to most regulations regarding students with disabilities or employees. It’s rather straightforward. M. Lipe: It’s not the SRC’s purview to accommodate students. It’s a district responsibility to accommodated students with disabilities. CJ: That’s what this policy is saying. CJ: You’ve all had students with accommodations. SRC tells you what the accommodations are. A. Ahmadpour: This is supplementary; it doesn’t all refer to classrooms. M. Lipe: There are statements in Distance Ed. M. Ichinaga: It’s never been clear if the ECC website is fully compliant. CJ: We’ll find out if there are procedures that follow. T. Muckey: I use my own website. Does it need to be compliant? CS. Yes. A. Ahmadpour: And they provide it? S. Di Fiori: the SRC will Close Caption videos for you.

**7. INFORMATION ITEMS –DISCUSSION**

**A. Articulation/C-IDs – Lori Suekawa**

L. Suekawa: See two handouts (copy of presentation and letter from chancellor’s office.) C-ID stands for Common Course Identification Number. CJ: We got a cheat sheet at the plenary. It’s mandated that California and CSU’s have common numbering system. C-ID began in 2009. We have 112 community colleges, but they all have different numbers. In 2012 alignment was mandated because of AA transfer degrees. ECC course must match ADT. It’s a super numbering system for the whole state. We are not articulated to course descriptors, with one descriptor across the UC’s, Community Colleges and CSU’s. Templates are available. The templates for AA transfer degrees are also available on the website. If textbooks are out of date, please use current textbooks. Also be compliant with prerequisite. There are some time constraints. But there is also a backlog so the deadline moved to 2015. Another CCC challenge is that we’re afraid of losing articulation. SDSU changed standards and did not accept some schools’ classes. They lost some articulation. Total units are not calculated effectively. I send denied descriptors to deans, who send them to appropriate faculty. Some changes are really minor. Look at it when you do content reviews. Update textbooks. If a course is denied, provide a rationale if you don’t want to make a change. For example, philosophy is already articulated, just use C-ID as a starting point. Don’t take stuff out of your outlines. We also articulate to private colleges, not just CSU’s. If you have questions, communicate with Quajuana Chapman or me. Pros of C-ID’s: content is clear and specific, updates textbooks, all colleges held to same criteria, it’s reviewed every five years, etc. Cons: responses are delayed, reduction of units in some courses. Changes course load and content. Sometimes an enforced prerequisite is not validated. We may have prerequisites that are denied. Some colleges refuse. Nursing students may not take introductory algebra their first semester, etc. Inconsistent reviews, schools within larger districts were getting inconsistent reviews. V. Palacios: Who writes the descriptor? L.Suekawa: Faculty write them. You can go in and comment on them. The more they hear from faculty the more they will agree. V. Palacios: it seemed like a state mandate. L. Suekawa: It is. A. Ahmadpour: There are courses that are dying. Some schools don’t offer these courses and the outlines are archaic. What should we do? How comprehensive should it be? L. Suekawa: Use your outline as a base, but add in some stuff from their descriptor. L. Suekawa: Try to match it closely. Use these websites as resources. T. Muckey: Can I get the process started? L. Suekawa: In Industry and technology, CTE’s are local degrees. You won’t see them. P. Flor: How many faculty serve as course reviewers? That could explain inconsistency and delays. We’re given a boilerplate and match submittals. I have to meet the template. There are some flaws to system. CJ: They recommended not to inactivate courses. There may be more flexibility. Don’t deactivate majors. A. Ahmadpour: Can we revisit it? CJ: Yes.

**B. PRP(ProgramReview&Planning)systemsinTracDat–I. Graff & R. Klier (pgs.27 – 30)**

I. Graff: If you’ve been in Planbuilder, for program review, there’s a word doc program. Planbuilder is for annual plan. It is aging. We got a new system to merge program review and planning. If we get dinged, here’s a remedy. Were using Trackdat, the same environment you use to form SLO’s and PLO’s, but a new page. It improves reporting, and the summary. It should be faster and more efficient for you all. For the 15/16 plan year, it’s a live pilot. We have trainings under way. Leaders were invited to trainings.

You can finish your plan in a one hour workshop. Sign up for trainings. They are underway. The deadline extended until mid-December. Planbuilder will exist only for current objectives. It will be a surprise and a shock. If you have an existing program review, copy and paste it into Trackdat. We hope you’ll like it. CJ: has anyone used it? Irene: only a few have been trained. CJ: It sounds easy, but there’s a transition, and great people will help you with that. Get it done at the training. T. Muckey: On program review, it’s hard to find all the data. As we move forward, will there be data on a website? Right now, certificates and degree data is had to find. I. Graff: That’s phase II. It’s coming.

**8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**9. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**10. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 1:55.
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