

East Los Angeles College  
Academic Senate

Adopted September 26, 2015

May 26, 2015

12:00 to 1:30 p.m. in G1-301A

|                   |   |  |
|-------------------|---|--|
| <b>PRESENT</b>    | <p>Adjunct Rep, Randy Adsit<br/>Admin of Justice, Mel Stevenson<br/>Anthro/Geog/Geol, Julie Bernard<br/>Architecture, Jim Kawahara<br/>Art, Chris Turk<br/>Automotive Tech, Adrian Banuelos<br/>Business Admin, Rod Lipscomb<br/>CAOT, Karen Cross<br/>CF&amp;ES, Alicia Mendiola<br/>Chemistry, James Ross<br/>Chicano Studies, Eddie Flores<br/>Child Development Center, Marcia Cagigas<br/>Curriculum Chair, Steve Wardinski<br/>Dance, Rick Crawford<br/>Engineering &amp; Technologies, Kamy Khashayar<br/>English, Diane Mannone</p> | <p>Journalism, Jean Stapleton<br/>Kinesiology, Sara Alkire<br/>Library, Erika Montenegro<br/>Life Sciences, Kevin Booth<br/><br/>Music, Chie Nagatani<br/>Noncredit, Dennis Villacorte<br/><br/>Nursing, Lurelean Gaines<br/>Philosophy, Ramon Posada<br/>Physics, Marina Papenkova<br/>Photography, Aaron Lyle<br/>President, Alex Immerblum<br/>Psychology, Sherrie Davey<br/>Social Sciences, Jeffrey Hernandez<br/>Speech, Theatre, &amp; Broad, J. Ed Stevenson</p> |
| <b>ABSENT</b>     | <p>Counseling, Lydia Rudametkin<br/>Math, Victoria Kotlyar<br/>Modern Languages, Sara Maga</p>  | <p>Past President, David Beaulieu</p>  |
| <b>ALTERNATES</b> | <p>Architecture, Patricia Combes Brighten<br/>CF&amp;ES, Linda Wilbur<br/>Counseling, Bonnie Sherman<br/>Chicano/a Studies, Mary Romo</p>   | <p>Math, Viviana Castellon<br/>Modern Languages, Robert Liu, 816914<br/>Philosophy, Tim Snead</p>  |
| <b>GUESTS</b>     | <p>Architecture, Alexis Navarro<br/>Business Administration, Babak Khollesi<br/>Chemistry, Ellen Harju<br/>Chemistry, Franklin Ow<br/>Chicano Studies, Beatriz Tapia<br/>Distance Education, Pauletta Daw<br/>English, Luis Orozco<br/>Bernadette Fraser</p>  | <p>OIEA, Ruben Arenas<br/>Psychology, Cathy Cleveland<br/>Psychology, Arpi Festekjian<br/>Social Science, Barbara Dunsheath<br/>Social Science, Marcel Morales<br/>Social Science, Christine Rodriguez<br/>Theatre, L.H. Stone<br/>Theatre, K. Kasnetsis<br/>Writing Center, Maria G. Garcia</p>   |

- I. CALL TO ORDER:** A. Immerblum, President, called the meeting to order at 12:16 p.m.
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: M/S/P (L. Gaines / R. Adsit)** to approve the agenda with the following additions: I. SIS System
- III. APPROVAL OF MAY 12, 2015, DRAFT MINUTES:**  
**M/S/P (R. Adsit / L. Gaines)**  
**M/S/P (L. Gaines / R. Adsit) Call for the question.**

Moved to accept the minutes with the addition of information (shown in quotes) on page 2: B. Dunsheath announced Cultivating Excellence “Spotlight”, Speech Team is “performing”, and the Let’s dance Company will be presenting “the 10<sup>th</sup>” Repertoire “Concert”; and page 5: strike J. Hernandez’ comment.

**IV. PUBLIC FORUM/ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

A. Immerblum announced that an article would be written about L. Rudametkin in *Campus News*. She has been interviewed already and, if anyone wanted to add anything to the article, *Campus News* will be available after the Senate meeting. Senators expressed their thoughts and prayers on cards circulated at the meeting.

S. Davey announced that she is working with the Foundation Department to establish a scholarship in L. Rudametkin’s name. The Foundation requires a 10 year commitment, plus a 10% fee. She is working with L. Rudametkin on the criteria for the scholarship. C. Turk asked if there was necessary to go through Foundation. He continued that there is a ceramics scholarship within the Art department and 100% goes to the student. C. Cleveland stated that the main reason to go through Foundation is for tax deduction purposes. Danny Ornelas, Counseling, has also been contacted for input.

J Stevenson announced that for those Transfer Champion faculty that were unable to attend the Transfer Student reception, a medal was waiting for faculty in the Transfer Center.

J Stevenson announced that the Professional Development committee is currently working on refining the Opening Day program. The proposals for breakout sessions are due by June 3<sup>rd</sup> to Patty to Patty Godinez, Professional Development Office.

B. Dunsheath announced that the Cultivating Excellence Spotlight deadline is May 29<sup>th</sup> and next year’s Accreditation meeting schedule.

A. Ryan Romo commented that the Senate Exec. may be under investigation for possibly violating the Brown Act.

**V. ELECTIONS FOR OFFICERS AND DAS REPRESENTATIVES: time certain: 12:30 pm**

E. Flores, Elections Committee member, conducted roll-call for senators to receive ballots for Senate Officers. Elections Committee collected ballots, stepped out of the room to tabulate, and, upon their return, reported the following results\*:

- President: A. Immerblum 20, M. Stevenson 12;
- Vice President: J. Hernandez 22, Pauletta Daw 9;
- Treasurer: S. Davey 16, J. Ross 15;
- Secretary, Marcia Cagigas 29.

\*Actual tally of votes: 31 ballots received from the Election Committee. 29 of 31 ballots were completed by senators. The actual tally of ballots submitted by senators:

President: A. Immerblum 20, M. Stevenson 9; Vice President: J. Hernandez 21, Pauletta Daw, 8;  
Secretary: Marcia Cagigas 29; Treasurer: S. Davey 16, J. Ross 13 mpc 8/31/15.

A. Immerblum thanked the Elections Committee members for their hard work. He continued that he understands that transparency and increasing leadership are important to the Senate and all faculty. M. Stevenson congratulated the Elections Committee for their outstanding leadership in this election process.

A. Immerblum briefly described the role of the District Academic Senate (DAS) representative. Their duties include attending 5-6 meetings annually throughout the District; meetings take place on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday of the specified months from 12-4 pm. Representatives provide input on Board rules, and network with LACCD representatives. Senate Bylaws automatically require the President and Vice President to represent the Senate at DAS and provide for two additional DAS representatives. L. Gaines and J. Stapleton were nominated to continue as the DAS representatives. No other nominate were received.

- DAS Representatives: L. Gaines and J. Stapleton approved by acclamation.

## V. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:

### A. Senate CTE representative for Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC) (previously noticed)

Alexis Navarro and Karen Cross provided statements for senators to review and gave a brief verbal statement to the Senate. A. Ryan Romo volunteered to collect the ballots. The results were as follows:

- Senate CTE representative on HPC: Alexis Navarro 22, Karen Cross 9

### B. Curriculum Recommendations

#### 1. Courses, programs, and changes in clusters

S. Wardinski announced that, due to department restructuring beginning in fall, the Curriculum Committee approved several changes to the cluster groupings for committee membership. In addition, the Curriculum Committee recommends that the Articulation Officer be a voting member of the Curriculum Committee based on expertise in curriculum and in articulation. The current Articulation Officer is a counselor. The recommended cluster membership is as follows:

#### Cluster A

- Add new department name
  - Allied Health

#### Cluster C

- Increase number cluster representatives from 2 to 3
- Remove discontinued departments names
  - Foreign Languages
  - Journalism
  - Theater, Broadcasting, and Communication Studies
- Add new department names
  - Modern Languages
  - Media Arts
  - Theater Arts
  - Communication Studies

#### Cluster D

- Remove discontinued department name
  - Photography

#### Cluster G

- Creation of new cluster
- Add Articulation Officer

#### 2. Program Archival forms (previously noticed)

Presented for final Senate approval are the following Program Archival Forms approved by the Curriculum Committee:

- 1) Notice of Intent to Archive a State-Approved program form
- 2) Notice of Intent to Archive a Campus-Approved Skills Certificate form

#### 3. Course and program curriculum actions.

Discussion: S. Wardinski stated that voting could be taken one at a time or all three together; it was decided to take one vote on all three together. A. Immerblum asked if Cluster A had increased in numbers. S. Wardinski stated that Cluster A remained the same. A. Immerblum clarified that being part of a cluster does not guarantee being represented in the Curriculum committee. Nominations for cluster representatives will be requested in September.

#### **Passed**

#### C. Recommended revisions to SLO process (previously noticed)

On April 28, 2015, the Senate approved the first two of five resolutions from the Learning Assessment Committee (LAC) regarding revisions to the SLO process.

A. Immerblum read the resolves of the LAC Resolution #3 and the Senate Executive Committee alternative motion. R. Crawford made a suggestion to change the first resolve of the LAC Resolution to include: *except in the semester when a comprehensive CLO report is being written on a course.*

**M/SP (R. Adsit / JE Stevenson) to accept the LAC Resolution with the addition to the first resolve: except in the semester when a comprehensive CLO report is being written on a course.**

Discussion: R. Posada stated that the Philosophy Department approved of the resolution proposed by the Senate Exec at the previous Senate meeting. They felt that the language was clear, precise and within boundaries of the SLO process, it was faculty driven, and it allowed wiggle room for development. They felt there was confusion in the wording with LAC Resolution and what is required by outside accrediting agencies, and the inserted language characterized SLO outside the control of faculty. SLO's are faculty driven and should not be driven by outside sources. A. Ryan-Romo's response was that there are a number programs on campus that use outside accrediting agencies.

D. Mannone, representing the English department, agreed with Senate Exec and the Philosophy Department concerning the wording of the resolution and the disaggregation of the information.

J. Hernandez stated that he and his department met with President Martinez after the President's letter on SLO's was sent, and objected to reporting data every semester. J. Hernandez continued that reporting every semester would be a burden and we have relied on discipline experts to

construct SLO's, assess, report and make necessary improvements over several semesters. Reporting each semester is too prescriptive. Some departments may want to report data every semester, but all departments should not have to report every semester. The accreditation standards specify regular and ongoing assessments, not every semester. Another concern is the disaggregation at the student level. More discussion should take place on the disaggregation of data without being rushed into a decision. His suggestion was to vote against the resolution. In addition, J. Hernandez noted we need to focus on ensuring what is learned from SLO data is used as part of the annual process of allocating resources.

J. Stevenson voiced his concern that the LAC resolution, coming out of a committee comprised of faculty with similar concerns, was re-created by the Senate exec in their alternative. To respect the work of the committee, the process calls for the Senate to accept or deny the resolution. If the Senate disagreed with LAC, it should give LAC the chance to revise the recommendations rather than consider a Senate Exec alternative. Coming up with new rules when LAC has already worked on this resolution is inappropriate.

Ruben Arenas, OEIA, stated that the President wants a long term process in place and he will stand by the process agreed on by the senate.

S. Wardinski stated that the LAC resolution is an unfortunate byproduct of decisions made years ago. This work was entrusted to a committee not belonging to the Senate. The process is and should be an academic and professional responsibility to the Academic Senate.

J. Hernandez agreed with J. Stevenson that he made a good point respecting the work of committees. Moreover, since LAC has concerns that the Senate raised, it is in everyone's best interest for LAC to revisit and re-evaluate the proposed resolution. He then moved to table the LAC recommendation so that way LAC could have the opportunity to take into account the concerns that have been voiced and revise their recommendations.

**M/S/P (M. Stevenson / J. Hernandez) (Abstain: L. Gaines, A. Lyle; Opposed: J. Ross, R. Adsit, K. Khashayar, JE Stevenson, J. Kawahara, R. Crawford) to table this item and send concerns back to LAC for further discussion.**

After the item was tabled, R. Posada asked if this item would be tabled until fall 2015. M. Stevenson commented that this decision would affect the accreditation visit. B. Dunsheath stated the struggle with SLO's was that faculty were still not on the same page. A. Immerblum stated that we need time to submit the best potential motion and direction for the faculty. S. Davey stated that the SLO process was synonymous with data collection. She asked what the purpose for sending the resolution back to LAC. She continued that there was a need for guidance and closing the loop. B. Dunsheath stated that it was likely that possible sanctions would be on SLO's. She continued that pressure must be maintained for faculty to continue working on SLO's and that the Senate leadership should keep pressure. If there are sanctions, the time clock for corrections will be shortened. Amanda Ryan-Romo recommended that LAC be presented at an all faculty Senate meeting.

A. Immerblum recommended sending suggestions or concerns to A. Ryan-Romo to forward for future LAC discussions.

D. Revisions to Annual Update Plan (AUP) for Academic Departments (Motion Postponed to 5/26/15)

A. Immerblum stated that the AUP packet has been through the vetting process. Two weeks ago, the concern was that it had not been reviewed by the Chairs Council and Career Technology Education (CTE) committees.

Discussion: K. Kasnetsis stated, though it had been brought to the Chairs Council, concerns raised had not been included into the AUP under consideration. The revised AUP asks for a lot of data, such as changes or trends in the labor market. He did not understand the information being requested. He was not a research analyst and could not imagine where to get the data being requested. He recommended training for the AUP on how to gather the data.

J. Hernandez stated that he had not received any suggested revisions to this suggested AUP, which is why there were no revisions. At the Department Chairs meeting, Laura M. Ramirez had indicated that training would be provided to assist the chairs in completing the AUP. J. Hernandez explained that the AUP questions could be answered using the data packet that would be provided for each department. He continued that in lieu of the Perkins grant application form, which were several pages long, questions pertaining to data were being embedded into the revised AUP. These changes were intended to make the process easier, streamlined. However, if the senate so choses, we could use last year's version.

J. Stevenson questioned whether non-CTE departments like the Communications department, would have to answer Perkins sections. Ruben Arenas, OIEA, stated that his office was always open to answer questions and a data packet would be provided with the AUP. B. Sherman commented that there is a website, [www.bls.gov](http://www.bls.gov) (Business Labor Statistics) that can be used to assist in collecting data on career projections or trends in the labor market for the AUP, and for careers that are available based on disciplines in relation to employment opportunities. Although data is two years old, it is a good place to get data.

A. Lyle stated that as a practical matter, finding data for a free-lance photographer would be difficult. He agreed with K. Kasnetsis, that training was needed. M. Romo stated that a glossary of terms would be attached to the AUP.

K. Kasnetsis addressed the issue of Perkins. He has two different understandings. He suggested that although J. Hernandez feels that this current AUP eases the Perkins process, he does not believe this to be true. His understanding is that CTE departments will list resources needed, some organization will happen, and those requests will be processed in any number of budget sources. There is no place to list those resources. The old Perkins process was specifically Perkins and it had a purpose. The idea is good, and having multiple resources, the Departments were often duplicating the process. Although the concept is a good idea, the suggestion solution is not in the revised AUP.

**M/S (J. Hernandez / J. Stevenson) (Approved: J. Hernandez, S. Davey, B. Sherman, E. Montenegro, J. Bernard, D. Villacorte, M. Cagigas) to accept the revision of the Annual Update Plan (AUP).**

B. Dunsheath asked what would replace the revised AUP since the Senate voted it down. J. Hernandez stated that last year's AUP would be used, changing the dates on the AUP.

**M/S/P (J. Hernandez / K. Booth) to extend the meeting 10 minutes**

E. Senate Executive Committee recommendation regarding PRVC (previously tabled)

J. Hernandez gave a brief overview of the PRVC, and the request from staff collective bargaining units to be added to the PRVC because on the AUP affects resource allocations. The Senate Exec's concern is that increasing non-faculty representation will diminish the faculty voice on the committee. However, only academic programs are required by the State law to go through program review and program viability and only academic programs can be discontinued as a result of viability. If that is the case that non-faculty will be added to the committee, more faculty should also be added to the committee. This explains why the 3<sup>rd</sup> column in the proposal suggests increasing faculty from 6 to 8 with senate appointment of two department chairs, one from Liberal Studies and one from CTE, in consultation with Chairs council. Since program viability is truly an academic function committee, though we have AFT Classified employees in our programs, the second recommendation is to split the program review and program viability functions into two committees. In this way, only those associated with academic programs can be on the committee that will initiate program viability.

**M/S/P (R. Adsit / S. Wardinski) to approve the PRVC recommendation to change and increase membership, and Senate Executive recommendations to separate Program Review from Viability.**

F. Revisions to ELAC's Strategic Planning Committee membership/purpose (previously noticed)

**M/S/P (J. Hernandez / K. Booth) to accept revisions to ELAC's Strategic Planning Committee membership and purpose.**

Discussion:

J. Hernandez stated that the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) that had been in place was based on a representation model. Due to that model, the SPC had not achieved quorum for some time, and East has been operating without a functioning committee overseeing strategic planning. Fortunately, through B. Dunsheath's efforts with the Accreditation committee, the college has completed the revision of the SPC's mission statement to meet the accreditation standards. However, the responsibility of revising the mission statement belongs to the Strategic Planning Committee. The Shared Governance Council created a taskforce to look into the Strategic Planning Committee's purpose and representation. The Shared Governance Council approved the taskforce recommendation for a smaller, more functional SPC, which emphasizes its work coordinating college planning.

S. Wardinski commented that it was disquieting that students, classified staff and bargaining units were considered advisory, not members of the SPC. A. Ryan-Romo stated that critical voices, like LAC and Accreditation, were missing from this committee. More buy-in was needed if there was an issue with attendance. R. Adsit asked if this motion was approved today, could it be revisited in fall 2015. J. Hernandez stated that, with a caveat, it could be handled that way. The motion can be approved with conditions. B. Dunsheath stated that with Accreditation visits looming, some committee is better than no committee. S. Wardinski reminded that once a policy or process is approved it is difficult to undo or change.

**M/S/P (J. Hernandez / J. Bernard) (Opposed: M. Stevenson, S. Alkire, S. Wardinski, A. Banuelos, A. Lyle) to amend the motion to approve the Shared Governance recommendation with the understanding that the Senate will revisit representation in the fall semester.**

**M/S/P (S. Wardinski / K. Booth) to extend meeting 5 minutes.**

G. Revisions to Governance Policy Handbook

B. Dunsheath asked for volunteers to review the document for grammar and spelling errors.

**M/S/P (M. Stevenson / R. Adsit) to approve the Governance Policy Handbook 4<sup>th</sup> edition to support the self-study with minor edits to be developed by a Handbook Review sub-committee.**

Discussion: J. Hernandez stated that he would argue in favor of the sub-committee. Not only does he feel it is needed for Accreditation, but he has been on various committees that have been revising the content and believes the revisions are consistent with actual practices and what is in the current edition. He asked Senators to be cognizant of knowing what the Senate is approving is content revisions that will be the basis for evidence in the accreditation self-study. Any editing should be minor in nature.

A. Immerblum asked who would be guiding the process. B. Dunsheath needs of three people to assist her in reviewing the handbook.

H. SIS System

A request was made for \$38,000 to upgrade the matriculation assessment tool within the SIS System to have real-time processing for students.

**M/S/P (J. Hernandez / M. Stevenson) to support the Districts SIS System.**

I. Information Technology Faculty Advisor Committee (ITFAC) Bylaw (previously noticed) (tabled)

**VII. Reports/Updates:**

- A. President: tabled
- B. Vice President: tabled
- C. Secretary: tabled
- D. Treasurer: tabled
- E. Accreditation: tabled
- F. Conference/Tuition Committee: tabled

**VIII. Items from the floor**

**IX. Meeting adjourned at 1:52 pm**

Respectfully submitted by Marcia Cagigas, Secretary.

*Our MISSION*

*East Los Angeles College empowers students to achieve their educational goals, to expand their individual potential, and to successfully pursue their aspirations for a better future for themselves, their community, and the world.*