

ECC Academic Senate Minutes March 19, 2013

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

Academic Senate President Gold called the third Academic Senate meeting of the Spring 2013 semester to order on March 19, 2013 at 12:37pm. The meeting was held in the Alondra Room.

Approval of last Minutes:

[See pgs. 6-12 of packet] for minutes of the March 5, 2013 meeting. As there were no corrections to the minutes they were approved as written.

OFFICER REPORTS

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

CG talked about the importance of collegial consultation to accreditation especially now that we have been put on warning. The ACCJC is moving towards cycles for accreditation and faculty must be involved. If we consult on these accreditation issues, it avoids the perception that Administration is making us do things that we do not want to do. Areas where faculty involvement is critical is with the Assessment of Learning and SLO's along with program review and curriculum. The Institutional Academic Standards is another area where we are utilizing the consultation process which makes it easier for us to understand why we even have to create these standards. A prime example of where the collegial consultation process is happening on campus is with the creation of the Distance Education Task Force. The Task Force is working on implementing the new accreditation standards which includes student authentication and regular, effective contact. Originally decisions were made without going thru the collegial consultation process, but by using this process of cross-campus collegial consultation, it creates more buy-in with the decision and further embeds accreditation into our campus conversations and processes.

VP – Compton Educational Center report – Michael Odanaka (MO)

The revisions to the Council By-laws have been pulled because they did not get the needed 2/3 vote from the faculty to ratify them.

Pg. 15 is a resolution for The Proposed Reorganization of Departments and Disciplines at the Center. The resolution has been passed by the Faculty Council. In addition, about 25 faculty met with Barb Perez to talk about the reorganization of departments and disciplines. She appeared to listen and seemed receptive towards the dialogue.

Pgs. 16-20 can be found a document titled "Programs at the Compton Center" that was authored by David Vakil along with the help of MO and other faculty. The purpose of the document is to help clarify the definition, role and list of academic programs at El Camino Compton Center. One of the questions that came from the document is to whether or not we should have programs when there are only 2-3 classes in those areas.

There will be a public forum on Monday, March 25, 2013 at 1pm in the Student Lounge to discuss the finalists for the CEO position.

Curriculum Committee report – Jenny Simon (JS)

No report.

VP – Educational Policies – Merriel Winfree (MW)

Merriel was not able to be there today, but CG said the committee is working on policies and procedures for Academic Freedom and Credit by Exam.

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

The “Getting the Job” workshop was very successful and attended by over 40 part-time faculty.

VP- Finance – Lance Widman (LW)

No report.

VP – Academic Technology – Pete Marcoux (PM)

Since PM was not in attendance at the meeting, no report was given.

VP – Instructional Effectiveness – Janet Young (JY)

JY passed out a handout titled “Information Item – Student Learning Outcomes Report.” The report included the status of student learning outcome assessments by division and courses. It appears that more courses were assessed than reported to the Accrediting Commission in October 2012 due to a malfunction in the CurricUNET database. The actual assessment completion rate is 76 percent rather than the 55 percent reported by the database. We are working with Governet, the software company, to correct the problem. The report includes grids from each division which summarizes all courses that will be assessed in Spring and Fall 13 to get us to 100% assessment. The division SLO websites will also be kept up-to-date. They can be found either on the division’s website or the SLO website. The ACCJC also dinged us on the alignment grids for institution to program to course SLO’s, but that has been all completed now. It is hoped that by another week all eight divisions will be updated. Faculty are asked to use the template and then cut and paste them into CurricUNET. Claudia Striepe asked if there is a template for student services and the answer is no since they report differently. F. Arce asked that faculty make sure their divisions are talking about SLO assessments and that everyone is getting on board. It was noted that this is sometimes hard to do when only part-timers are teaching the class. Kathryn Hall wants to know if at the start of the semester she can know what will be assessed so that she can make sure she teaches to that assessment. J. Nishime has heard that we really should have more than one SLO per course and JY said this is true and suggested that maybe three can be a realistic number. Simone Jackson, ASO representative, asked what English 50RR and 50WW were and was told those are the combined remedial and developmental English courses that are being piloted. She also wondered if for the inactivated courses if the faculty worked with the deans to see if there is a need for that class. JY assured her that they did and that if a class needs to be reactivated, there is a streamline process thru the Curriculum Committee to bring those classes back. A. Ahmadpour was concerned that if the course is inactivated and not in the catalog then how will students even know about the class. JY said Title 5 doesn’t allow for courses to be in the catalog if they are not being taught. C. Wells asked where the process is if a course is being asked to be deactivated even though it is currently being offered, i.e. the Leadership class. L. Kjeseth replied that it has to come from faculty. Chris Mello from Fine Arts and Kaysa Laureano-Ribas from Math were both publicly thanked for helping JY with the collection of all this data.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

Jeanie Nishime – Accreditation Report (JN)

JN reported that the first draft of the accreditation report is due this Thursday, March 21st.

Irene Graff, Institutional Research and Planning – ACCJC Institutional Student Achievement Data (IG)

IG handed out the “El Camino College Proposed Methodology for ACCJC Institution-Set Standards.” She explained that the ACCJC is monitoring this and it is called “Institution-Set Standards” to differentiate between “Accreditation Standards.” These are due to the ACCJC by the end of the month. We are required to combine El Camino Torrance and the Compton Center together since we are considered one district, but Institutional Research (IR) also recorded separate standards for each location.

These standards will still be looked at later by the faculty and administration, but for now we are required to set a floor for each standard which is a number we will not go below. Later we will also be asked to set a goal that we hope to achieve. The successful course completion rate institution-set standard was set at 64% and for Fall 2012 we achieved 68.2%. The set standard is a weighted average between both locations and looked at over the past 10 years. J. Nishime noted that the accrediting team will be asking us how we set these standards, so we will have to have the data to show them. The student retention rate is basically what percent of students are enrolled from one semester to the next. This is more known as persistence rates in California terms, but the federal reporting looks at retention and we reported the numbers from Fall 11 to Fall 12. The institution-set standard is 45% and the actual retained students were 46.1%. The degree/certificate completion and transfer rates are based on a three-year average. The degree completion number was set at 1,662, but we achieved 1,916 in 2011-12 with the higher numbers mostly attributed to the Graduation Initiative. The set certificate completion number was 511 and we awarded 591 certificates. The transfer rate used the numbers received from the National Clearinghouse which sometimes are lower since not all students are reported there, but the institution-set number was 1,408 and we transferred 1,923 students. Carolyn Pineda was given credit for heading this project. A. Ahmadpour asked what it is we can do to actually control a student's retention and persistence since there are so many outside factors that affect this and F. Arce feels a good, honest assessment will tell us if we are doing the best that we can. S. Jackson asked why Compton rates have to be included with ours and the answer was because they are not fully accredited yet. C. Gold announced that a working group will be looking at these numbers tomorrow and finalizing the report due at the end of the month.

C. Gold asked at this time if she could reorder the agenda to make sure we have a quorum and since there were no objections, she moved up Mark Lipe and the repeatability issue.

Mark Lipe, Chair-Elect, College Curriculum committee – Repeatability (ML)

ML referred to pages 28-33 in the packet that includes the tables used by the Chancellor's Office to give preliminary guidance on repeatability regulations. He also provided a handout titled "El Camino College – College Curriculum Committee Repeatability Task Force Committee Report." This document had previously been looked at by the Senate. ML reminded us that basically districts are allowed course repeatability based on four reasons: 1) Repetition necessary for Major requirements for CSU or UC for a bachelor's degree; 2) Intercollegiate athletic competition courses; 3) Intercollegiate athletic specific conditioning courses; 4) Intercollegiate academic or vocational competition courses. Vince Palacios voiced his concerns for Art students who are not able to repeat courses to hone skills for their portfolios and therefore may not be admitted to the four-year universities. C. Gold suggests that possibly when the AA-T degree in Art has been developed and approved that maybe this will help this issue. ML said that districts must validate that courses are intercollegiate in nature. There must be competition involved for academic and vocational courses to allow repeatability. C. Jeffries asked why Number 1 from the four reasons cannot be applied to art courses and it was answered that it must be determined by the CSU/UC campuses. It was suggested that V. Palacios talk to CSULB about moving in that direction. L. Kjeseth said that repeatability rules do not apply to non-credit courses and that could be a possible solution. He also thinks intercollegiate athletic courses should have to justify levels like other areas do. F. Arce responded that legislature is really trying to reduce the FTES for athletics and visual arts courses and put more emphasis on academic courses.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

BP/AP 4260 Prerequisites and Co-requisites

This item was tabled since there was no longer a quorum in the room.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:57pm.

CJ/ECCSpring13