Santa Monica College Academic Senate
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2012
11:15 am to 12:35 pm
HSS 261

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

Excused: Eve Adler, Mary Bober, Carrie Dalton, Steve Hunt, Angelina Misaghi, Mitra Moassessi, Christine Schultz

Absent: Judith Douglas

I. Call to Order at 11:20 a.m.

II. Action Items

1. Approval of the Minutes for February 14, 2012

Approved by consent with the point of clarification:

In AR 4321 as to whether admissions or faculty should verify documents: Title V gives the duty to the instructor. This seems reasonable since faculty know the situation better than the admissions office.

• Further discussion of AR 4321: This issue may not matter as much now, due to student success modifications with repeatable coursework.
• Having just fewer policies/procedures for withdrawal during a semester might make more sense—i.e. omitting the time period for instructor discretion might make sense.
• If we want instructor/department discretion, then language should be clarified that withdrawal between 50-75% is merely at the instructor discretion vs. making it sound like a firm issue of verifiable student injury/illness, etc.

2. College of the Future: Contract Ed

• SMC Plus—Dr. Tsang wants to establish a non-profit organization (or foundation) for contract education and has presented such a proposal to the Board of Trustees. Students would pay higher costs to take these separate sections of classes already offered at SMC. It has no impact on accreditation. It is proposed as a way to improve the problem of excess capacity on campus.
• Board of Trustees chair was opposed to this, while board overall seemed to be in favor of the proposal. They asked Dr. Tsang for some guiding principles that would govern the program. For example, the program can’t reduce our overall class offerings, wouldn’t take away from apportionment, would be self-supporting, and would have the same application of faculty contract, curriculum etc. as current classes. The
faculty leadership has been brought into the discussion of these principles, in light of the ad-hoc College of the Future committee’s recommendations in 2010.

• Discussion points: How would this affect departments and who gets assigned to do these courses?

• Cost would still be less than if students went to CSU. Students can get financial aid to attend these courses.

• A College of the Future ad-hoc committee proposal was approved by the senate in 2010. The senate agreed to pursue this for international and high school students to keep within Title V. The senate supported these ideas in principle, but does the current proposal, which would be open to all students, change things somewhat?

• Is this program an attempt to carry out our mission in these rough budget times? Would the state actually try to legally stop us from fulfilling our mission over interpretation of state law? This program may be construed to be legally parallel to K-12 summer school fees.

• It would give some students a way to take a class once they have been locked out due to repeatability.

• BOG vs. Pell grants paying for these courses—might set up an inconsistent standard there. In addition, the students’ Pell grants would likely be used up paying for their other coursework.

• Issues of transcripts and grades and repeatability—can students replace grades or will transcripts be separate?

• Issues of services—a proportion of the monies will be allocated to support the services needed for the extra students, with the excess going back to regular programs. Departments would love to participate in this if they get monies back to benefit those departments directly.

• Concerns are expressed that this erodes the open-access part of our mission. The state budget situation has been eroding this already. It remains to be seen what the effect on access would be, in practice, with arguments on both sides of the issue.

• Courses would open to enrollment after regular courses already announced and enrolled, similar to current contract education.

• Relationship back to the defunct AB 515—what does “open-access” mean in the current environment? It would be more forward-looking use this opportunity to attempt to increase access in ways available to us now, rather than looking to elected state-wide officials to re-create the original Master Plan budget and policy environment. Currently, we can’t continue to serve students above our apportionment but we are also currently resisting the idea of sending students away.

• It would be helpful and reassuring if the guiding principles were to come back in a report to faculty after implementation of the proposal, in order to examine whether or not the program is working as intended and agreed upon.
• Is the proposal really to help serve more students, or is it merely to help address our financial bottom line?

• Will this make the “haves” move faster through the system than the “have-nots” due to enrollment priorities accrued by paying the extra money to get into SMC Plus?

• Does this proposal let the legislature off-the-hook in making the hard decisions needed to make the 1960’s ideal of the Master Plan work again? Or are we past the point-of-no-return on this already?

3. Full-time Faculty Hiring Process – Jamey Anderson, Chair of Personnel Policies

   Don’t give up reference check language for now. If departments want to use that language, they can deal with HR, but for the time being, most are not using the reference check language.

4. Elections – Melody Nightingale, Chair of Elections and Rules

   • Nominations for department senators and curriculum representatives will be taken through April 6 and elections starting April 16.

5. Update on Strategic Planning Task Force

   • There will be focus groups on Flex Day on two ideas related to updating the Mission, Vision, and Goals: 1) Resiliency/Grit and 2) Rethinking/Re-imagining Education.

6. EAC Updates – Eric Oifer, Chair of Environmental Affairs

   • The committee is working on an Ecological Literacy quiz given after classes on voluntary basis—different versions for different disciplines. They are also working on a field studies course in relationship to the campus garden.

7. Integrity in Action Brochure – Teri Berstein, Chair of Ethics and Professional Responsibility

   • This is a pamphlet recently distributed, involving an outside company that is contracted for anonymous, online reporting of ethics/behavior violations. Is HR using this service? What does it mean that this hasn't been brought to the Senate’s personnel policies or to DPAC HR committee?

III. Information Items

   None

IV. Announcements

   None.

V. Adjournment at 12:32 p.m.