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

Minutes of the 22 Feb. 2011 AS Executive Committee Meeting


Excused: Gregory Brookins, Laura Manson, Jennifer Merlic, Wendy Parise,

Absent: Dianne Berman John Henderson, Steven Kaufman, Esau Tovar.

I. Call to Order 11:22 AM

II. Action Items:

1. Approval of the Minutes for Spring Retreat, February 4, 2011
   a. Minutes for February 4, 2011

      Two names were misspelled.
      Minutes were accepted as amended.

2. Student Success Measures (See below)

Objective: to send forward a recommendation from the Academic Senate. Chairs were asked to take this list back to their departments for discussion. Eric checked off the measures he thinks are essential.

Institutional Research’s original report was based on indicators that were easy to find. IR will put together the final documents.
Suggestion: after this discussion, members will vote; each member will get 5 votes. (See vote results attached.)

Recommended changes:

Students will meet the **goals they set for themselves**. This is the overarching goal.

How can this be assessed?

*Cohort-defined standards means, e.g., what is the transfer rate among students who are C- level students?*

All must be measurable. If it can't be measured it shouldn't be on the list.

Q: How do we measure commitment to lifelong learning?

A: We could work with the alumni association to determine where they are in life.

“Dashboard measures” are stepping stones in a student’s development. Have we moved students from level 1 to level 2 (stepping stones)? We need something that’s simple to help us determine whether we are putting resources in the right areas.

Some items are measurements and some are the bases for the measurements.

**Measures are based on:**

- Student’s goals
- Student’s cohort

Institutional Research might be able to find ways to measure these goals.

The definition of “persistence” is problematic. We can’t track students who move to another community college.

Priorities are

- Transfer, ultimate success, educational plans; all should be cohort based.

Eric will group the items in 3 groups, ranked by number of votes,

Eric will put this on the agenda for the Assembly meeting next Tuesday. Eric would ultimately like approval to send these forward. Input will come from departments. Some items might be good for your department but not important for the college. Eric will draft a recommendation to the District.
III. Information Items:

1. President’s Report - Eric Oifer

a. **Budget**

Has not yet been approved. We don’t know what will happen to the proposed tax measures. SMC has a $5.5 million operating deficit. This is not the same as overspending by $5.5 million. Some was the result of overestimating and of windfalls.

The Board’s recent study session revisited their goals and principles. They want to balance the budget. Our reserve should be at 7.5%; Dr. Tsang thinks it’s not a one year thing problem. He wants big enough reserve to cover more than a year. Board has not voted yet.

Reductions in the schedule so far have only hit faculty.

The DPAC Budget Committee recommended balancing the budget in 3 years instead of 1.

A large reserve works against us with the legislature.

b. **Senate 2010-11 Objectives and Long Term Goals (deferred)**

c. **Committee Reports**

a. **SB 1440, Transfer Model Curricula** - Guido Davis Del Piccolo, Chair

Guido reported that between the CSU and AA degree requirements, students have only 13 elective units available. With the proposed scenario, students will have only 5 or 7 units. Curriculum Committee and the Articulation Officer think these requirements are much too restrictive.

SMC sent our plan to the Transfer Model Curriculum group, and they did not like it. TMC core combines b and c to make it more flexible to achieve 18 units necessary for degree. TMC did not like the openness of our plan. Guido lost and this plan went forward. It does not make sense for our students and our CSU. Other local community colleges have also come to the same conclusion.

What are our options?
A) Fight—but we need to know the end game; this is not necessarily a good tactic; the CA CC Academic Senate would like to implement the TMC.

B) Get our TMC for math and kinesiology on the books and ignore the rest. It would be strategically useful to have kinesiology on the books.

C) Adopt these and make a recommendation to go another direction on the rest.

D) Since Lesley Kawaguchi is on the CA Academic Senate, ask her to work with the Senate and suggest changes in another manner.

Suggestion: build alliances with other colleges.
Eric will contact Michelle and explain that SMC is not happy with the current proposal and contact other community colleges for support in recommending another plan.

IV. Announcements —none

V. Adjournment —meeting adjourned at 12:31 pm.
RESULTS of VOTE:

ACTION ITEM NO. 1 – Approval of the Minutes for Spring Retreat, February 4, 2011

ACTION ITEM NO. 2 – Student Success Measures

Ways to define student success:
- students will successfully meet the 4 ILOs --15
- students who desire to transfer will successfully do so --15
- student who transfer will succeed after transfer --7
- students who acquire the skills they need to succeed --DELETE
- students will achieve the timely completion of their desired degree or certificate or sequence--5
- student accumulation of excess units will be contextualized and more deeply understood --9
- student with the goal of career placement will achieve that --7
- students will take initiative in setting, clarifying and achieving their goals --2
- students will set and meet realistic expectations and goals --4
- students will be aware of services and make use of those that will help them --5
- students will develop education plans --11
- students will persist --14
- students will achieve literacy (e.g. ecological, information, media, cultural, etc.) --MERGE
- students will develop commitments to lifelong learning --MERGE
- students will have satisfaction with their experience at SMC --12
- the number of students on probation will decrease --5
- student success measures will include students’ ultimate success rates --15
- the College will develop cohort based standards to measure student success. --17

Innovative and Responsive Academic Environment

Santa Monica College strives to create an innovative and responsive academic environment by continuously developing curricular programs, learning strategies, and services to meet the evolving needs of students and the community. This area of institutional effectiveness measures how well the college is doing in helping students achieve academic success and meet their educational goals. Performance indicators in the area measure student progress, success in courses, achievement of awards and transfer, and global citizenship.

Supportive Learning Environment

Santa Monica College strives to create a supportive learning environment by providing access to comprehensive student learning resources such as library, tutoring, and technology and by providing access to comprehensive and innovative student support services such as admissions and records, counseling, assessment, outreach and financial aid. This area of institutional effectiveness measures how well the college is doing in serving diverse student populations, responding to community educational needs, and achieving student equity. Performance indicators in the area measure enrollment of in district students from historically underrepresented populations, response to community educational needs, and student equity.

Supportive Collegial Environment

Santa Monica College (SMC) strives to create a supportive collegial environment by improving and enhancing decision making and communication processes in order to respect the diverse needs and goals of the entire college community. This area of institutional effectiveness attempts to measure how well the college is doing in supporting campus stakeholders and other constituents in program improvement, assessment of Student Learning Outcomes, and engaging in a culture of inquiry. In its first edition, the current Institutional Effectiveness Report will report only one performance indicator for supportive collegial environment: comparison of employee demographic profile with the student population. Future reports will expand this area and include additional performance indicators such as the percent of staff who participate in professional development opportunities.