

**Santa Monica College Academic Senate
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2007**

11:15-12:35p.m. Academic Senate Conference Room HSS 261

Executive Committee

Richard Tahvildaran-Jesswein
President
310-434-3541

Toni Randall
Recording Secretary
310-434-4882

Sal Veas
Treasurer
310-434-4617

Eve Adler x 3464

Simon Balm x 8651

Teri Bernstein x4645

Suzanne Borghei x 3536

Mary Colavito x4098

Jose Cue x 8692 or 8198

Guido Davis-Del Piccolo x 3561

Judith Douglas x4856

Tina Feiger x4490

Terry Green x 4728

Nancy Hanson x 3502

Janet Harclerode x 4569

Janie Jones x 4599

Amber Katherine x 3539

Lesley Kawaguchi x 4516

Pete Morris x 8654

Peter Morse x 3182

Melody Nightingale x 4568

Eric Oifer x 8912

Christine Schultz x 4940

Lantz Simpson x 4115

Eleanor Singleton x 4127

Howard Stahl x 8015

James Stramel x 8969

Michael Strathearn x 4927

I. Call to Order

II. Action Items:

1. Approval of the Minutes for November 13, 2007 -
http://homepage.smc.edu/randall_toni/Acad_Sen_Minutes_06_07/EXEC_AS_MTG_11_13_07.doc

III. Information Items:

1. President's Report – Richard Tahvildaran-Jesswein
 - a. DPAC Update
 - b. GASB45 Task Force Update
 - c. End of Semester Report
2. Academic Senate Retention Task Force Report – Fall 2007
Teri Bernstein, Tina Feiger, Janet Harclerode

IV. Old Business Discussion:

1. AR 4320 – Student Affairs

V. New Business Discussion:

1. Senate Dues

VI. Announcements

VII. Adjournment

**Next Scheduled Meeting: Spring Retreat – Feb 7, 2007
9am to 2pm – Tudor House – Santa Monica**

ACTION ITEM NO 1: Approval of the Minutes for November 13, 2007

Minutes of the **13 November 2007** AS Executive Committee Meeting

Present: Eve Adler, Teri Bernstein, Suzanne Borghei, Jose Cue, Guido Davis Del Piccolo, Janet Harclerode, Janie Jones, Amber Katherine, Lesley Kawaguchi, Lucy Kluckhohn Jones, Pete Morris, Peter Morse, Melody Nightingale, Eric Oifer, Toni Randall, Christine Schultz, Lantz Simpson, Eleanor Singleton, Howard Stahl, Michael Strathearn, Richard Tahvildaran-Jesswein

Excused: Simon Balm, Mary Colavito, Gordon Dossett, Judith Douglas, Tina Feiger, James Stramel, Sal Veas, Muriel Walker-Waugh

Absent: Terry Green, Nancy Hanson

I. Call to Order - President Richard Tahvildaran-Jesswein called the meeting to order at 11:22 a.m.

II. Action Items

A. Approval of Minutes of October 16, 2007 and Minutes of October 30, 2007- Unanimously approved

B. **Academic Senate Constitution – Proposed Amendment(s)** -5.4 “Recalls” is newly added to Article V. Amendments, Initiatives, Referendums and Recalls.

(M/S) Bernstein/Stahl to change two weeks (Section 5.4) to four weeks. Vote: unanimously in favor (M/S) Schultz/Borghei to accept the amended changes to Article V., Sections 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4. Vote: 15 in favor; 6 opposed

Article V. Amendments, Initiatives, Referendums and Recalls

Section 5.1. Amendments.

A. Amendments may be proposed by two-thirds majority of the entire membership of the Senate, or by petition signed by eight (8) percent of the total number of faculty having voted in the immediate past Senate election for President.

B. The Academic Senate’s Elections and Rules Committee will validate petitions for amendment.

C. Upon receipt of a valid petition, the Academic Senate President shall order a special election be held within ten (10) days of such proposed amendment by secret ballot provided and counted by the Elections and Rules Committee of the Senate. If such proposal is made within one month of the regular Academic Senate Elections, it shall be placed upon that ballot.

D. A simple majority vote of the full time faculty voting shall be necessary for the adoption of any amendment.

Section 5.2. Initiatives.

A. Initiatives may be proposed by at least six (6) percent of the total number of faculty having voted in the immediate past Senate election for President.

B. The Academic Senate’s Elections and Rules Committee will validate initiative petitions.

C. Upon receipt of a valid petition, the Academic Senate President shall carry the proposal forward to the Senate at its next regular meeting for consideration.

D. If the initiative is rejected or postponed for more than thirty (30) days by the Academic Senate, the President shall order a vote by the total membership of the faculty within ten (10) days of such modification, rejection, or postponement.

E. A simple majority vote of those members voting shall be necessary for the adoption of any initiative.

Section 5.3. Referendums.

A. A referendum may be proposed by at least six (6) percent of the total number of faculty having voted in the immediate past Senate election for President and within thirty (30) days of the official Senate action in question.

B. A referendum petition to reverse any Senate action will be validated by the Academic Senate’s Elections and Rules Committee.

- C. Upon receipt of a valid petition, the Senate action in question shall be suspended until a vote of the full faculty is held.
- D. Upon receipt of a valid petition, the Academic Senate President shall order a special election be held within ten (10) days of such proposed referendum by secret ballot provided and counted by the Elections and Rules Committee of the Senate. If such proposal is made within one month of the regular Academic Senate Elections, it shall be placed upon that ballot.
- E. A simple majority vote of those members voting shall be necessary for the adoption of any initiative.

Section 5.4. Recalls.

- A. An officer of the Senate may be recalled upon the receipt of a petition signed by one-third of the full Senate membership. Such a petition should be delivered to the Election and Rules Committee. The officer shall be removed by a majority vote of the full time faculty. If the recall succeeds, the Senate shall hold a new election to fill the vacancy within ~~two (2)~~ four (4) weeks.

Discussion:

Section 5.1: Item D also has new language to clarify procedure. Q about why FT faculty is mentioned but not PT. Rationale is that PTers are not as aware of college-wide issues as FTers are. Also “permanent” employees have a larger stake in college affairs than others. Clarification of the threshold being as low as it is and rationale for the %’s. Constitution hasn’t been amended since 2003. Stahl requests that the election period of 2 weeks (Section 5.4) be relaxed. Comment that a short period of time presents a hurdle which may in turn cause people to be more focused and serious when they decide to recall an officer. Clarification that if the AS President were recalled, the past president would assume his/her responsibilities. Suggestion that PTers are being relegated to “second-class” citizenship. Comment that there already exist differences in voting regulations for a variety of positions on campus (chairs, part-time senators, etc.). Clarification about whether or not PTER can be AS Senate. Response is yes. Comment that population of adjunct fac changes, in some departments significantly. Comment from Stahl that emails (1/3 or 1/2) sent to PTers (delivering a ballot) are returned so that delivering a timely ballot is impossible for a significant # of PTers. Suggestion that differentiating Associate from non-Associate PT faculty is possible. Stahl responds that there are practical problems with that as well. Comment that having only FTers voting is that it is modeled on the British “land-holder” system. Comment that this will be divisive when presented to the general assembly.

C. Administrative Regulations Proposed Amendments/Corrections – Richard reports that he is hoping to have a list of administrative regulations to be considered for the two last AS general meetings (11/27, 12/4). Richard will carry these forward to the AS for a first read on the 27th. Editing the regs for typos and updates. Q about URL for finding these on the web. You can go to the new web and type in “AR’s,” but the postings are not current. Richard will meet with Shimizu and email the corrected versions out to senators. Substantive changes will go through PPC. This is an objective from last year and Richard would like to get started on them, expecting work on them to continue through the spring. We agreed to stay away from hardcopy versions as much as possible. Suggested that these be sent as an attachment so senators won’t automatically print them out with the agenda.

III. Information Items

A. President's Report – Richard Tahvildaran-Jesswein

1. **Ranking Committee Update** – Dr. Tsang should be getting back to us today about the exact number of new hires. Richard will send out a FAC_ALL email as soon as he has news.
2. **DPAC Update** – meets tomorrow. Facilities are on the agenda. Greg Brown will give a presentation to DPAC. There is a debate amongst faculty about the remaining amounts of \$ from Measure S (that there won’t be any left over for the Phys Ed Bldg). The Administration intends to use all the \$ for Student Services instead. The BOT still needs to approve it. There are several meetings to discuss this over the next month. Underground parking in the Student Services bldg would eat up the \$. It is estimated that about \$15-20,000 is needed per parking spot. Also on tomorrow’s agenda is the Global Citizenship definition. Richard will be out of town for a few days, so Kawaguchi and Schultz

will represent him in the DPAC discussions. Dr. Tsang has agreed to improve his written responses to DPAC in terms of content and timeliness.

Discussion:

Comment that the proposed underground parking is a troubling issue. With limited funds, it seems unbalanced to prioritize parking over a Phys Ed building. Irony of such a tradeoff was remarked upon. Comment that transportation is an ongoing and highly visible problem. “Selby solution” is to adopt a parking program on campus like UCLA’s – if you live 1-3 miles of campus, you can’t get a parking pass, so there are ways to move forward on this. Katherine suggests that if Exec supports EAC, they will come forward with a position paper. Mentioned that Selby’s estimate is \$77,000 per parking space. EAC could call for an investigation into the \$ for space issue. Comment that Phys Ed hasn’t actually done program review and needs to document their need for space, etc. Question about whether citizens of SM are going to ever trust us again if we spend \$ on parking that they thought would be spent on Phys Ed. Apparently the decision has already been made on this particular issue, but Richard reminds us that this sort of predicament demonstrates the serious need for faculty to be a part of facilities discussions and decisions. Report that the Facilities Cmmt doesn’t, in fact, make decisions. Reminder that SM citizens are also interested in parking. Also, that it’s better for long distance people to not be driving rather than those within 1-3 miles of campus. Suggestion that it isn’t an either/or decision. DPAC has the possibility at tomorrow’s meeting to take a stand against the tradeoff of parking spaces for the Phys Ed facility. Reminder that students’ voices should be included here. Added that students should have complete information. Suggestion that different scenarios need to be worked out and presented by Brown.

3. Update on Request for Increase in FA’s Contribution to the Senate – Stahl reported from the recent FA/AS meeting that no decision was made. The suggestion was that the AS should ask for a dues deduction from faculty paychecks to add to AS funds. Another discussion was for FA to reduce its fees, allowing AS to ask for some. Q if the possibility of 10% of FA dues to be directed to AS should be voted upon by faculty. Reminder that FA knows how important it is to tie dues to salary and that one hopes FA would extend the same possibility to AS.

4. Board of Trustees Report – Richard updated BOT about the parking vs. Phys Ed Facility – international students are angry about the changes in the ESL Intensive program. The issue is that they’re paying a lot of money and getting very little service in return for it. The departure of Daryl-Keith Ogata has been very unpopular with international students. Richard has been assured that the problem will be dealt with immediately.

5. Faculty Senate/Faculty Association Leadership Meeting Report – Richard reports that his attendance at these meetings is sometimes counterproductive. He has decided not to talk with FA leadership immediately before AS meetings. Richard asks, with Stahl and Morse’s help, that another time/venue be arranged. Suggestion that Richard assess the “gains and losses” of those meetings. Suggests that perhaps participation in those meetings should be stopped at least for now. Comment that it is important to keep the line of communication open. Richard says that he will attend the meetings, but would like a different meeting time. Stahl concurs that the mtgs are difficult because there’s a “deep distrust between various parties.” Q about whether a mediator would be helpful. Q about who the attendees of these meetings are.

B. Committee Reports

1. Sabbaticals – Hayward Teaching Nomination – Eric Oifer announces that Christine Schultz is this year’s nominee.

IV. Old Business Discussion

V. New Business Discussion

A. Faculty Association Vote on Work to Contract – Reviewed the recent proposal of work to contract in view of current stalemate of contract negotiations. “No adds” in winter and spring 2008. Agreement to agendize the work-to-contract discussion in trade for agendizing the FA dues contribution discussion. Also FA

suggested that students who are added by late enrollment be dropped by faculty. This is not an easy practice to “sell” to the AS.

Discussion:

Dropping students who have taken advantage of dynamic enrollment doesn't seem fair to those students. Suggestion that the general AS be allowed to consider this issue. Reminder that “work to contract” didn't necessarily work towards speeding up contract negotiations the last time. FTE Cmmt felt that general fac should have more info about this. This Friday is next round of negotiations and we are hopeful for progress. FA is currently “getting its weapons in line,” nothing more than that. No one is asking fac to drop students who've been “correctly” enrolled. There is a “bizarre” situation in that Administration says students must attend the first day, but may also enroll late, and may or may not be dropped by faculty. Students who do not attend the first day can be dropped because there is an AR to this effect. Suggestion that it is irresponsible to drop students who have enrolled dynamically because it hurts our students and hurts the college (by not recovering FTES). Comment that any position that hurts students is not defensible. Mention that it is unenforceable; the ombudsperson's office will be fielding lots of students complaints if they are dropped from a class they have legitimately enrolled in. Reminder that this is a “student access” issue. For a chair trying to fill classes and build the program this is anathema. For international students, this would be a severe problem as they must have 12 units. FA point of view is that work-to-contract offers the greatest leverage to FA during negotiations.

We voted on dynamic enrollment in the Senate (19 opposed -18 in favor). Richard had suggested that we, as fac, give it a try, but his side was defeated. Richard thinks we need to have the discussion once again. The vote taken on the FA assembly floor was taken before reps could talk with their peers, and Richard would like the discussion to be held in the AS, giving senators the opportunity to return to their peers for a wider discussion. Request that we ask Moassessi to make clear what FA is asking for. Suggestion that it be an information/discussion item. Suggestion that AS tie the funding and work-to-contract discussions together. Comment that the goodwill of FA contributing more \$ to the AS would go a long way towards getting AS support FA. Comment that Administration reads our minutes and that we need to choose words carefully and show solidarity with the FA. There is also an argument for not saying anything at all. There is the potential for us to “defect” from the FA and the Q is whether we're willing to risk that. If the AS stands with the FA, that gives both bodies strength. Q if FA has asked that it be put on our agenda. Until an announcement comes from FA saying that their membership has voted to do this, it doesn't need to be discussed on the Senate floor. Those with reps in FA did receive this recommendation. Simpson says there was a vote (unanimous – with quorum) but will not campaign for this until after the bargaining session this Friday. Consensus is that this should be brought forward for discussion only, not for a vote. Job Action Task Force may be reconstituted to organize and disseminate info to campus constituencies. All FA reps got an email with the “talking points,” but depts./programs w/o reps did not.

VI. Announcements –

A. Recipients for sabbaticals will be given to Richard from Sabs Cmmt this Thursday. He will send it out to FAC_ALL and it will be on the agenda the next meeting. This year, Oifer says, the cmmt will send out letters giving feedback to non-recipients.

VII. Adjournment - Meeting adjourned (M/S Bernstein/Kawaguchi) at 12:40 p.m.

Academic Senate Retention Task Force Report, Fall 2007

This fall, we have continued our exploration of the SMC faculty's relationship to enrollment, retention, success, and semester-to-semester student progress. We have gathered information, identified challenges, and planned additional activities.

The opening day Retention and Success Strategies Salon revealed some basic needs with respect to these issues:

1. Faculty have a need to talk about Enrollment issues, faculty-to-faculty. Faculty want both to share successes and to understand the issues.
2. One faculty concern: maintaining high standards in transfer courses, while being mindful of the issues of retention and success statistics.
3. A second concern: addressing the success issues for basic skills students.
4. The challenge that arises from these concerns: Some retention strategies seem to be more effective for developmental students, and other strategies are more appropriate for transfer level students. Which strategies overlap for all students, and which ones work better for one population or another?
5. Another issue: balancing compassion for students' personal circumstances and challenges, with the need to maintain timelines regarding course requirements.

Information from other sources: On the bright side, enrollment is up, so efforts toward enrollment recovery are effective.

Our primary area of enrollment increase is in Distance Education courses.

Our challenges as a College continue in the following areas:

Strategic Planning: How effective are our enrollment projections? Is our student mix (basic skills/ distance education/ transfer/ vocational etc.) changing and are we planning for these changes? Have we reached out to all populations?

Distance Education Issues: Retention and success rates in distance education classes are, overall, lower than retention and success rates in on-ground classes. We need plans to address this, which might include more support and outreach for professional development in online instruction techniques, and maintaining and improving the quality and effectiveness of the content and operation of distance education classes. We need to encourage the use of FAC 101, an eCompanion course shell with ideas for teaching improvements. Distance Education Best Practices tools are being developed. Other resources include: @ONE, CCC Confer, Christine Miller, Julie Yarrish, and mentors.

Communication with Department Chairs regarding Distance Education: Chairs are the conduit through which first time and continuing Distance Education faculty are hired, trained and evaluated. They are the gatekeepers of quality and effective student contact for this growing segment of our student population. They can direct faculty to online and campus resources and monitor student retention and success over time.

Communication with Department Chairs regarding policies, course offerings, class size and retention as departmental and college-wide values: Students are often in the dark about when courses will be offered, and schedules can reflect faculty preferences over student need. Maximizing resources, and creating retention and success as department values can create an

environment where scheduling is student-centered.

Different classes or student skill sets need different strategies: Faculty with transfer-ready student populations are concerned with maintaining rigorous standards. They may not know how retention and success strategies might support this goal. Are we training our students for the rigors of a sink-or-swim process that they may encounter at a transfer institution, or are we ensuring that they have a mastery of the sequence of skills that will allow them to succeed in the continuing courses? Other faculty, with students who lack study skills, language skills, or a realistic assessment of their own efforts and abilities may need an entirely different set of strategies to educate those students with respect to both process and content.

How the Retention Task Force can help:

1. Continue salons on flex days
2. Set up faculty-to-faculty support that addresses the needs of different populations
2. Develop a course in eCompanion or set up a web page on the Academic Senate site to showcase documents and strategies that can help. A “student success strategy” web page, or some other title that would not have the possibly negative connotation of being administration-driven, and focused on the FTE dollars.
3. Continue to communicate with faculty groups to brainstorm ideas about enrollment expansion, and student semester-to-semester retention as well as in-class retention.
4. Develop a plan for supporting Department chairs and Distance Education committee efforts.
5. Speak up with respect to the possible effects on student retention when proposals are being discussed.
6. Work with the Professional Ethics Committee to include retention strategies in their Best Practices document.

Respectfully submitted,
Tina Feiger
Janet Harclerode
Teri Bernstein

INFORMATION ITEM NO 3: 1-10 ITEMS

1. The highest risk students are the ones affected by the no-add policies. Students who have a long string of English or Math classes to take to get to college-level need to take these classes in sequential semesters. These students are often students who have fewer planning skills and enroll late. (Janet will elaborate)
2. Economically disadvantaged students cannot get their grants if they are enrolled in fewer units than required. The inability to add a class may jeopardize their entire financial situation.
3. International students are another group at risk for enrollment in fewer units than required to maintain their F-1 visa status.
4. Incoming freshmen, unfamiliar with college policies and with late enrollment priority, may find their first enrollment efforts are unsuccessful.
5. Any student with a late enrollment date, who may have relied upon the opportunity to crash a class to meet their educational progress needs, will also have an unsuccessful experience with the College.
6. The “open access” mission of the community college system seems to be at odds with a no-add policy.
7. The non-student-centered and cognitively dissonant experience of being refused admittance to a class that has several open seats sets a tone of mistrust and undercuts student/faculty relationships from day one.
8. No-add policies will prolong the chaos at the beginning of the semester, increasing parking problems and tensions as students remain on campus and go from class to class trying to find an instructor to add them.
9. “Work-to-contract” has two sides: the administration can also choose to work to contract, and to demand that faculty work to their interpretation of the contract. Our contract sets class maximums, so transferring students to meet those maximums may be within the contractual rights of administration. Ultimate responsibilities for assignments are the purview of administrators. We request, and department chairs recommend, but the contractual right to assignment is administrations. Do we want to jeopardize the mutual respect that has built up over the years in this area?
10. No-add policies hurt adjunct faculty disproportionately. They often teach sections that are added late and have lower enrollment. Lower enrollment classes that slip below 18 as of the census date can be cancelled and a relied-upon income stream can be lost. Adjunct faculty are put in the awkward position of supporting a no-add policy vs. ensuring their financial well-being by adding students to make sure that their class “makes.” In addition, a full timer that loses a class can bump a part time faculty member.