



Action Item: 12 May 2009

TO: ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FROM: RECORDING SECRETARY
PREPARED BY: RECORDING SECRETARY
Action: Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the **28 April 2009** AS Executive Committee Meeting

Present: Eve Adler, Dianne Berman, Teri Bernstein, Suzanne Borghei, Mary Colavito, Gordon Dossett, Judith Douglas, Tina Feiger, Craig Hammond, Nancy Hanson, Janet Harclerode, Janie Jones, Amber Katherine, Lesley Kawaguchi, Lucy Kluckhohn Jones, Walter Meyer, Pete Morris, Eric Oifer, Toni Randall, Christine Schultz, Eleanor Singleton, Howard Stahl, James Stramel, Michael Strathearn, Richard Tahvildaran-Jesswein

Excused: Simon Balm, Melody Nightingale, Kathy Sucher

Absent: Esau Tovar, Sal Veas, David Zehr

I. Call to Order – President Richard Tahvildaran-Jesswein – meeting called to order at 11:20 a.m.

II. Action Items

A. Approval of the Minutes for April 7, 2009; unanimously approved.

B. ASR02-09 – Zero Waste Resolution – Amber Katherine, EAC Co-Chair – This is in line with what the Associate Students have done. Hoping to send this to DPAC and have it institutionalized within a year.

Discussion:

Q about whether or not this would apply to the entire campus. Q about how this will be effectively implemented if it is too general. Resources should be developed to show everyone how to meet this goal. Richard reminds the committee that they will need to write the policy as well.

Zero Waste Resolution

Whereas, Santa Monica College is committed to the following institutional learning outcome: “students will take responsibility for their own impact on the earth by living a sustainable and ethical life style.”

Whereas, the Associated Students have passed a policy stating that all events sponsored by the Associated Students and Inter-Club Council be Zero Waste Events,

Whereas, a Zero Waste Event is one in which no less than 90% of the waste produced by the event is effectively diverted from a landfill by reusing, recycling, and composting,

Whereas, the facilities and grounds departments are equipped and willing to support Zero Waste events,

Whereas, in spring 2009 the Professional Development Committee successfully organized a Zero Waste event,

Be it resolved, the Academic Senate **calls for a campus wide policy on Zero Waste Events.**
[Richard suggests that it state “calls for DPAC to establish a district-wide policy on zero waste events.”]

Unanimously passed by the EAC on April 9, 2009

C. New Sabbatical Matrix – Walter Meyer, Sabbaticals Chair – The major changes are reflected in the bottom portion of the form.

Discussion:

Comment that no credit given to projects that may benefit the college financially. Also, none given to faculty who have been participating on committees and would like to deepen the knowledge they have gained in that area. Meyer reminds us that the membership of the committee itself will always influence the way the matrix is interpreted. He agrees that contribution to finances of the college is significant. Adds that college service should be factored in, but there was no consensus on the cmmt as to how to word such an addition. Comment that 2A addresses this. College service might be tweaked from 1-5 points (Richard agrees). Reminder that this is still a largely subjective process. Emphasis that the makeup of the cmmt is very significant and that members should be representative of disciplines across campus. Richard reminded us that this was originally born from the need for more objectivity and transparency. This included not allowing the Acad Senate Pres to apply until he/she is one year out of the position. Reminder that the matrix is a guideline, not a tally of points. The cmmt has reflected many disciplines to date. Q from Richard about what the change in “college service” has been. Reminder that “college service” has many definitions. Q if we have a short statement that tells us what the goal of a sabbatical is. The number of points per item would be guided by that sort of statement. Meyer focused on what the improvements in the form have been.

(M/S Feiger/Oifer) vote to change college service points from 1-3 to 1-5: 21 in favor, 2 abstentions

Richard made some editing suggestions to the doc as well.

(M/S Borghai/Feiger) vote to adopt as modified: 20 in favor, 3 abstentions

Sabbatical Evaluation Criteria and Matrix

<u>Evaluation Criteria and Potential Points</u>	<u>Points Received*</u>
1. Quality of Project Design	
a. proposal constitutes a full semester's work load (15 points)	
b. proposed goals and outcomes are feasible (15 points)	

c. proposal is clear, organized and specific (5 points)	
d. proposed activities and procedures support project's objectives (5 points)	
e. methods of documentation are appropriate to the proposed project (5 points)	
f. applicant establishes a realistic timeline for accomplishing activities and objectives (5 points)	
2. Benefits of Sabbatical	
a. proposed project contributes to professional development/increased competence of sabbatical recipient (20 points)	
b. proposed project contributes to student success (15 points)	
c. proposal aligns with current College goals, program SLO's and/or ILO's (10)	
d. proposed project contributes to colleagues, department, and/or college at-large (5 points)	
TOTAL POINTS	

*points are awarded based on how well the potential project satisfies each criterion

Supplemental categories:

- innovative (1-5 points) _____
- college service (1-3 points) _____
- potential first-time recipient (2 points) _____

TOTAL POINTS _____

D. Resolution on Library Department Chair –Richard asks for more discussion and suggestions. AS voted to go forward with this. Eleanor Singleton has been voted the new faculty leader of the library. She reports that the library fac voted unanimously to have a chair.

Discussion:

Q about what the arguments in opposition are. Richard responds that the library is not exactly like a department but like a business as well encompassing the operations of this large facility. This could be addressed by having a Dean who oversees the business operations and a Chair who oversees duties that are more in line with those of other chairs. Q about how Counseling handles this as it appears to be the same setup. The difference is that the Chair of Counseling is voted in. This is not the case for the library. This might be handled outside of collective bargaining. The Q is how involved the AS should be. Proposed *whereas* that brings the fac-leader relationship in the library into conformity with that of the larger institution. Clarification that the contract names “faculty leader of library” who “assists the Dean,” so the contract would need to be changed. Suggestion that the doc

read: “whereas the library fac have voted unanimously to create a chair position” and “whereas the SMC faculty norm is that we are legally allowed that a fac peer chairs the department,” and “be it resolved that Acad Sen employ all its resources and influence (as this is an academic and faculty matter) in support of the faculty leader position in the library being replaced by a faculty chair.” Another *whereas* could be that the library used to have a chair rather than faculty leader. Q if it is assumed that a department is being established as well. Add that it is to be carried forward to DPAC and the BOT. “Creating a department” should be added to the *whereas* regarding the library’s unanimous vote to have a chair. Perhaps “seek to reorganize as a department and elect a faculty peer as department chair.” Richard will pen the document incorporating the above suggestions.

III. Information Items

A. President’s Report – Richard Tahvildaran-Jesswein

1. Senate Dues – Burns is working on getting these ready to send out to all fac, hopefully by this Friday.
2. Department Websites and Best Practices – recommendation made that there be best practices followed on all dept websites. This will be brought up before the Chairs mtg this Friday.
3. Faculty Leader Positions – BSI Update – Oifer updated status. He got feedback from the BSI Cmmt and the job description has been revised for clarification and clearer focus. The leader will serve as a liaison between various college constituencies and the individual will address basic skills needs and will be a resource for college constituencies. This is supported by Administration and statewide practices.
4. Senate PT Cmmt asks for a re-examination of the appointment of the pending chair. Richard sends it to incoming pres and receives it.

B. Committee Reports

1. I/SLO – Nancy Hanson and Suzanne Borghei – two more Exec Cmmt meetings and 3 Senate meetings left. Richard asks if the SLO/ILO cmmt will make a recommendation. They respond they will.
2. Personnel Policies – AR Department Chairs – Dianne Berman - distributed a hardcopy of the revised resolution, which reflects the concerns raised at the last senate meeting. It is going forward to Dept Chairs this Friday. Mutual agreement with the District has been met. Schultz will send an electronic version to chairs before the meeting.

Vote to send forward to the Senate: 23 in favor.

IV. Old Business Discussion

A. Statewide Initiatives – May 19, Howard Stahl, ERC – Q about whether we want to carry forward our resolution in light of the opposition to the props. Q about what our campus leadership feels. Richard responds that the Pres of College wrote this resolution and he is in support of our bringing it forward to the Senate. Suggestion that a forum be held at a senate meeting (12:15-12:35) to allow for a more thorough discussion of the issues. The opposing arguments need to be addressed as well.

V. New Business Discussion

VI. Announcements - Jones is throwing a “farewell” party for Richard, Saturday, 6/13. All senators are invited. There will be more info forthcoming.

VII. Adjournment – (M/S Katherine/Morris) 12:35p.m.