

Executive Committee

Janet Harclerode
President
310-434-4569

Eric Oifer
Past President
310-434-8912

Mary Bober
Recording Secretary
310-434-3140

Judith Douglas
Treasurer
310-434-4856

Jamey Anderson x 3180

Jason Beardsley x 8054

Teri Bernstein x 4645

Patricia Burson x 4691

Laura Campbell x 8626

Jamie Cavanaugh x 3767

Mary Colavito x 4710

Carrie Dalton x

Guido Davis Del Piccolo x 3561

Steve Hunt x 4689

Lesley Kawaguchi x 4516

Peggy Kravitz x 4131

Beatriz Magallon x 4275

Jennifer Merlic x 4616

Angelina Misaghi x 8855

Mitra Moassessi x 4057

Pete Morris x 8654

Melody Nightingale x 4568

Elaine Roque x 4859

Vicki Rothman x 4048

Christine Schultz x 4940

Esau Tovar x 4012

Sal Veas x 4617

**Santa Monica College Academic Senate
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES**

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2011

11:15 am to 12:35 pm

HSS 261

Committee Member Attendees: Jamey Anderson, Jason Beardsley, Teri Bernstein, Mary Bober, Patricia Burson, Laura Campbell, Jamie Cavanaugh, Mary Colavito, Judith Douglas; Guido Davis Del Piccolo, Janet Harclerode, Lesley Kawaguchi, Lucy Kluckhohn-Jones; Beatriz Magallon, Jennifer Merlic, Pete Morris, Eric Oifer; Elaine Roque, Christine Schultz, Esau Tovar.

Guest: Vanessa Mejia

Excused: Steve Hunt, Vicki Rothman

Absent: Carrie Dalton, Angelina Misaghi, Mitra Moassessi, Melody Nightingale, Sal Veas.

I. Call to Order

II. Action Items

1. Approval of the Minutes for October 4, 2011
[Minutes for October 4, 2011](#)

Vote: unanimously passed

Approved

2. Traffic School for Cheaters- Tim Cramer and Dana Del George

- A discussion about the concept of a "Traffic School for Cheaters" was presented. The idea was motivated by a discouraging experience in which multiple (10) students were involved in a cheating episode and was followed by a series of difficult circumstances.
- A very specific concern was that a student who drops a course due to cheating has the opportunity to re-enroll into the course in another semester without any repercussions.
- *Four Characteristics of the cheater were outlined as:*
 - Poor skills
 - High expectations
 - Often are rushed and hurried to achieve their educational goals
 - Lack respect and appreciation for general education

- Traffic School for Cheaters has possible values:
- *Redemptive value:* it would give students the benefit of the doubt if they didn't understand the basis for what is cheating.
- *Reflection value:* If they did understand the possible outcomes from cheating, then "traffic school" can cause a pause for reflection.
- *Financial value:* These programs may save money and offer assistance to the faculty.
- *Implementation versatility:* The proposed "Traffic School could be natural fit with the English Department. The E-college online platform could be implemented (hybridized) with other aspects of the integrity "learning".
- Since academic integrity is also an important issue to the Senate the idea of a "Traffic School for Cheaters" the Senate may want to approach this as an academic versus disciplinarian concern.
- It was noted that schools in both Arizona and Minnesota have similar programs.
- The "Traffic School for Cheaters" would provide training in integrity prior to the student re-enrolling. The Traffic School could be assigned after three issues of academic dishonestly.
- Inquiries were made as to *how* would the "Traffic School for Cheaters" differ from our current "Honor Council and *how* would the Traffic School work on campus?
- It was explained that the Honor Council cannot handle the growing volume of integrity issues and the "Traffic School for Cheaters" would be an additional resource for students to gain a better understanding of academic integrity. Also the Honor Council was not established to address every act of academic dishonesty. The hearings occur to deal with students who have engaged in a serious offense. Also, the Honor Council spends a significant amount of time in Counseling-11 to educate students in integrity.
- It was asked if it would be possible to assign "Traffic School for Cheaters" from a single offense.
- It was noted that some schools require students to attend an integrity type of class before handing in an assignment.
- A number of comments were made that highlighted our campus values. One was that it is important that the Honor Council imbeds in the campus culture that *not* cheating is the norm. Integrity is a value that we as a college support and it is important to build a structure that supports this goal of integrity in a holistic way and view education as a virtue. There is a hurdle for us to manage and that is to have our students care about what we are teaching.
- Cheating often is under-reported and it was noted that students who are reported for lack of academic integrity that each situation requires a different intervention. A more hands-on approach may be necessary to help students who are reported for plagiarism.
- There is a concern whether a "Traffic School for Cheaters" is the best approach to dealing with integrity. An alternative may be a seminar on academic integrity. There are limitations regarding what we can do to prevent students from students from repeating a class. While letters of reprimand can be used, student expulsion is not commonly done. Traffic School for Cheaters may need to be re-framed and re-worded so that it is connected to the larger ideals of the college.
- It was asked if academic honesty and/or integrity should be a strategic initiative. The value to understand the value of learning is important to convey from beginning of the student's education however for the

“professional” cheater this will always be a difficult to reach. It is those students who seem to lose their way that we ideally want to inspire.

- We may have an opportunity to have a hybrid format to address academic integrity.
- Questions were raised as to how would this format be applied to our online students and would it be possible that we have a face-to-face that is not local? Is there a good assessment tool so that we can know what a student understands as it relates to academic integrity.
- It would not be allowed according to FERPA restrictions to have students who have been identified for academic dishonesty to meet for group instruction.
- Professional Development Committee would like to have some open discussion or panelists on this topic due to the level of interest. Students must see a value in their education and tied to the larger “ethical life”.
- Another alternative would be for the Curriculum Committee to design a course that deals with this the issue of intellectual integrity and make it UC transferability. ILO-4 and Global citizenship may be fulfilled with this newly designed course.
- No decision was reached at this time.

3. AR 3211.1 Procedure for Hiring Full-Time Faculty – Jamey Anderson, Chair of Personnel Policies

- **Please refer to the following link for the working draft 10/13/2011**
<http://www.smc.edu/ACG/AcademicSenate/Pages/Personnel-Policies.aspx>
- We now have an online process from Human Resources and therefore there is much that is no longer a fit with the current online process. There is a need for further clarification. Please refer to the Personnel Policies link to identify the corrections listed below.
- 2-E: Applications shall be accepted and maintained online by the Office of Human Resources. (~~Applications shall be distributed by and returned to the Office Human Resources.~~)
- 3-B: Two designated administrators shall also be members of the committee; one shall serve as Secretary (responsible for recording results of paper screening votes and preparing lists of questions and information for candidates ~~and checking lists of candidates for accuracy~~), and the other as Human Resources representative to the committee (responsible for ensuring compliance with the District’s personnel policies and procedures, and preparing ~~lists of candidates~~ the list of candidates to forward to the Office of Human Resources ~~bringing applications to and from committee meetings~~).
- Human Resources deem an application complete but the hiring committee can sometimes identify “incomplete” applications. There are concerns over errors that may be made in the process of online applications and online recommendations which may be misidentified as “incomplete” or on the other hand the application may appear complete but it is not complete.
- There is a concern that Human Resources do not have the resources for evaluation of applications.

4A. The Office of Human Resources ~~shall will~~ release ~~forward online~~-applications ~~designated as complete~~ to the screening committee ~~via an electronic process~~. All screening committee members shall review the applications in a timely manner and shall select those applicants for an interview who best meet the

qualifications listed on the job description, as measured by evidence of professional qualifications, including experience and educational background. All relevant academic information shall be submitted to the screening committee.

- The question was raised whether we could review incomplete applications and not make this item a requirement to review the application. The previous Academic Regulations allowed committees to review incomplete applications.
 - It was noted that committees can determine what is “complete” or what is an “incomplete” application. However, for each committee to decide what criteria to follow is not being consistent.
 - What is a complete application? If a complete application resolves around letters of application then 1 letter of recommendation makes the application complete and this may help to get around the issue of completion.
 - There were concerns that Equal Opportunity requires that we treat applications/applicants equally.
 - A question was raised that in the past often applicants were allowed to submit older letters, but if the applicant’s letters of recommendation must be submitted by third party would this develop into a problem?
 - The online system of applications allowed applicants to post their letters of recommendation but we must allow the individuals who are writing letters of recommendation that we have a secure system.
 - The online system submission of transcripts can also be a problem. The applicant’s CV and cover letter sare sometimes in two different places. Transcripts are an issue and not just letters of recommendation.
 - 6-A. The screening committee shall recommend no more than three and not less than two candidates per position to the Superintendent/President for final consideration, ~~unless specifically approved by the Superintendent/President. Reference checks on the final candidates shall be conducted by the Human Resources administrator or designee and the screening committee chair and shared with the screening committee before names are forwarded to the Superintendent/President. Reference checks shall include academic background, professional experience, and personal qualities relevant to performance in the faculty position.~~
 - The item crossed out does not occur as stated. Some aspects of contacts with references may occur just before the meeting and the screening committee normally does not hear about any issue that may arise from reference checks since this can become a liability to the committee. Thus, the screening committee being notified is removed.
 - The Personnel Policies Committee had a lengthy discussion about what occurs when there is a limited pool of applicants for an advertised position; therefore alternates and everyone should be sent forward. The Personnel Policies Committee seeks clarification in the hiring process and 8-A (Special Circumstances in the Hiring Process).
 - The Personnel Policies Committee will continue to work on AR 3211.1 Procedure for Hiring Full-Time Faculty.
- 4. Response to the [Student Success Task Force Report](#)**
- The College will formulate a response, should we as a Senate provide a response to the Task Force Response?

- While we are fully dedicated and committed to student success, two issues we should consider are that:
 - a) Faculty are not fully involved except at a token level but not at a contributory level.
 - b) Faculty want to be careful not to “paint ourselves” in a corner and that we should not adopt policies that would ultimately diminish the ability of the colleges to respond to the needs, goals and values of the local communities.
- The Task Force does not understand the needs of community college student and community college student success; they did not rely on community college faculty for this report.
- We should provide time for a larger discussion and since there are some things that are good in the report. What are recommending: *status quo*?
- Since the Task Force Report was prepared so quickly there really is not ample time for an adequate response. We should take time to reflect before providing a response.
- How do we define student success? This has never really been adequately addressed.
- The senate will not send its own response though individuals are encouraged respond at the Chancellor’s office website.

5. [Resolutions for consideration at Plenary](#)

- (Time did not permit discussion of these additional topics.)

III. Information Items

1. Spring Flex – Patricia Burson, Co-Chair of Professional Development
2. Discussion of Strategic Initiatives
3. Other Committee Reports

IV. Announcements

V. Adjournment