

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, NOVEMBER 1, 2011
11:15 am to 12:35 pm
HSS 261**

Present: Jamey Anderson, Jason Beardsley, Teri Bernstein, Mary Bober, Patricia Burson, Jamie Cavanaugh, Mary Colavito, Guido Davis Del Piccolo, Janet Harclerode, Lesley Kawaguchi, Lucy Kluckhohn-Jones; Beatriz Magallon, Jennifer Merlic, Pete Morris, Melody Nightingale, Eric Oifer, Elaine Roque, Vicki Rothman, Christine Schultz, Sal Veas.

Excused: Laura Campbell, Carrie Dalton, Steve Hunt, Angelina Misaghi, Esau Tovar.

Absent: Judith Douglas, Mitra Moassessi.

Guests: Vanessa Mejia

I. Call to Order 11:20

II. Action Items

1. Approval of the Minutes for October 18, 2011

[Minutes for October 18, 2011](#)

2. Recommendation for Defining Sustainability and Globally Related Focused Courses – Eric Oifer, Chair of EAC & Pete Morris, Chair of IEC

- We have talked about defining Sustainability focus courses for climate neutrality.
- Three parts of our plan:
 - Transportation (Task Force)
 - Energy (Task Force)
 - Environmental Affairs Committee (EAC) is working on Educational Component using the STARS: the sustainability, tracking, assessment and rating system as a guide <https://stars.aashe.org/> . The key is to define Sustainability in the curriculum.
- Definitions of SMC Sustainability Related and Sustainability Focused courses were discussed.
 - Sustainability Related courses are all courses included in the Environmental Science, Environmental Studies, Solar Photovoltaic Installation, Energy Efficiency and Resource and Recycling Management Associate Degrees and Certificates of Achievement except for those courses within the degrees that include a SLO mapped to ILO #4 which will be defined as Sustainability Focused courses.

- SMC's definitions of Globally Related and Focused courses are modeled to the sustainability definitions:
 - Globally Related courses are all courses included in the Global Studies and the Ethnic Studies Degrees and certificates except those courses within the degrees that include a SLO mapped to ILO #3, which will be defined as Globally Focused courses.
- Courses not included in the Global Studies and the Ethnic Studies degrees and certificates that have a SLO mapped to ILO #3 will be defined as Globally Related courses.
- Under each ILO there is a series of competencies. Physical Science did not think competencies of ILO-4 are appropriate to their courses. For example, Chemistry 10 *should* be either a Sustainability Related or Sustainability Focused course that can be accomplished by adding competencies to ILO #4; learning technologies addressing sustainability. This brought up questions about whether *all* sections would have to give examples related to the environment and whether faculty might be concerned about academic freedom if they do not want to relate the course to the environment. It was thought that this would lead to a healthy discussion within the department among faculty members teaching the course.
 - It was suggested that a visual representation with flow chart be made so that faculty understand their responsibilities. The recommendations will not change but the presentation can be made visual.
 - It was noted that this is not an issue of people being "forced" or infringement of academic freedoms rather faculty are not able to account for what that they do in their courses and that impact many students. Instructors need a platform so that these concerns and the accomplishments can be documented.
- At the next Curriculum Committee meeting there will be a discussion of the recommendations that SLOs be on official course outline record. (Mentioned in the context of this discussion re: SLOs)

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

- *Taking these recommendations in reverse order:*
- **Item: 7: reference checks:**
- These reference checks currently take place after the screening committee interviews but before forwarding the names to the President. But this is contrary to the current AR language, which states that they should take place in the presence of the Chair of committee and a Human Resources representative, and the results should be forwarded to the screening committee. This language comes from an ASCCC 1989 document, outlining hiring best practices. The reference checks are being done without the involvement of the committee. There is concern that these checks may limit size of the pool.
- It is important to have a system of checks and balances. While there are concerns that screening committee members would be exposed to legal liability, it was suggested that instead the EEO representative, a non-voting member of the committee, could be a faculty representative to validate the process.
- Reference checks should ideally be done until before the final interview. Sometimes it is not exclusively Human Resources that does reference checks, as the superintendent/president is often involved directly. Would it be helpful and useful to have Chairs involved in reference checks?
- An option may be to have the screening committee to meet again if needed. However since the reference checks are not always completed before the final interview, this may not work.

- The question was raised as to what is the goal for the Personnel Policies Committee since there is hiring upcoming this academic year. Should the Personnel Committee continue to discuss these recommendations? A suggestion is made to “hammer out” what they can at the committee level and then bring back the recommendations. If possible, this should get completed in time for new hiring.
- Some problems could be solved by asking the screening committee to submit an alternate list, and if there are no a good alternate candidates, stating that explicitly.
- The question was asked if we do have a fourth candidate could the fourth candidate be included? It was expressed that it is an ongoing problem that we don’t rank candidates. However, language in the AR is being clarified that the screening committee can forward more than three candidates by obtaining clearance from the President’s office, likely through an administrative member of the screening committee.
- On the issue of complete applications (Item 4), HR confirms there is something in every online application “field” but there could be “false positives” or a “false negatives” and how should this be handled by Human Resources?
- It is easy to put something in the wrong field (for example upload two letters at once or upload a letter in the resume porta). TIt may be important to be more flexible when evaluating if an application is “incomplete”.
- Are there possible indicators for the applicant to inform them that the application has been submitted properly and that all fields have been successfully completed? The applicant is not necessarily notified that their application is incomplete. A further complication is that the failure of an application to be complete may exist at many different levels, for example the recommender, the secretary or the applicant may have failed to upload a document properly. Possibly the software could prevent submission if the “online folders” are incomplete. Can the personnel policies committee review the software?
- At present “Incomplete” faculty applications cannot be reviewed. Perhaps we should be more flexible about letters of recommendation and say that at least one letter is required but 2 or 3 would be preferred. (This could avoid the problem of having an application deemed incomplete when all the letters are uploaded as one document.

4. Faculty Member Of The Year Award –Elaine Roque, Chair of Sabbatical Committee

- Handout on rubric for evaluating ASCCC Hayward Award, modified it to be used for the SMC Faculty Member of the year award.
- “The Hayward Award is conferred upon four faculty members annually who have been nominated by peers from their college. Named for former California Community College Chancellor Gerald C. Hayward, the award honors outstanding community college faculty who have a track record of excellence both in teaching and in professional activities and have demonstrated commitment to their students, profession, and college.” <http://asccc.org/awards/hayward>
- Part-time faculty and full time can be nominated and nominations are due November 4th, 2011.
- The question was raised whether the deadline should be extended.
- The Sabbatical Committee’s recommendations must be approved by the Senate and the nominated faculty must write a proposal, so the deadline cannot be extended.
- The “Faculty Member of the Year” automatically becomes nominated for the Hayward Award.
- If we have two outstanding nominees can there be two faculty members for the Faculty Member of the Year Award and then only move one faculty member forward for the Hayward Award?

- It was suggested that it was probably better to maintain one faculty member for the Faculty Member of the Year Award.

III. Information Items

Time did not permit discussion of the following:

1. Spring Flex – Patricia Burson, Co-Chair of Professional Development
2. Discussion of Strategic Initiatives
3. Response to the [Student Success Task Force Report](#)
4. Other Committee Reports

IV. Adjournment at 12:30