



## **SMC ACADEMIC SENATE**

**Tuesday, October 11, 2011**

**11:15-12:35 p.m. Business Building Room 144**

**Present:** Anderson, Jamey; Antrim, Brenda; Beardsley, Jason; Bernstein, Teri; Bober, Mary; Boosheri, Sara; Breedlove, Karen; Brookins, Greg; Cavanaugh, Jamie; Colavito, Mary; Davis Del Piccolo, Guido; Douglas, Judith; Farber, Georgia; Feiger, Tina; Gallogly, Ethan; Geddes, James; Goodfellow, Candyce; Graziadei, Keith; Harclerode, Janet; Hunt, Steve; Jaffe, Sharon; Jerry, Gina; Jones, Janie; Kawaguchi, Lesley; Klineman, Michael; Kluckhohn-Jones, Lucy; Kraut, Deborah; Kravitz, Peggy; Lewis, Brandon; Londe, Stephen; Magallon, Beatriz; Manson, Laura; Martin, Jim; Mazorow, Moya; Merlic, Jennifer; Misaghi, Angelina; Morris, Peter; Munoz, Maria; Nestler, Andrew; Oifer, Eric; Pacchioli, Jim; Rogers, John; Rothman, Vicki; Schultz, Christine; Scott, Jacki; Strathearn, Michael; Strong, Lydia; Tilley, Rosilynn; Van der Ohe, Christina; Villapando, Alicia; Zehr, David

**Excused:** Burson, Patricia; Campbell, Laura; Dalton, Carrie; Goldenson, Richard; Hotsinpiller, Matthew; Roque, Elaine; Szekely-Garcia Claudia; Trujillo, Marc, Nightingale, Melody

**Absent:** Baudel, Zeny; Chandler, Fran; Henderson, John; Kidd, Jo; Moassessi, Mitra; Mobasheri, Fereshteh; Sterr, Susan; Tahvildaran-Jesswein, Richard; Tovar, Esau; Veas, Sal.

**Guests:** Frisch, Dennis; Mejia, Vanessa; Owens, Michael; Randall, Toni.

### **I. Call to Order: at 11:18am**

### **II. Public Comments**

- Commendation for Transfer/Counseling Center for the ongoing Fall Fair that includes over 140 universities and colleges
- Adjunct Committee organized a successful hike, led by Bill Selby in Topanga State Park
- The Foundation is having a fund-raiser at Bergamont Café and there is a Senate Social today (3:00-5:00pm)
- Suggestion for development of a voluntary system for faculty to discuss issues through an online site on which can one can “subscribe” or “not subscribe”. This system would allow faculty to respond to timely issues while preventing emails from filling mailboxes. Information Services Committee will look into this issue.

### **III. Action Items**

#### **1. Approval of the Minutes for September 27, 2011**

- [Minutes for September 27, 2011](#)
- **Motion Moved**
- **Vote: unanimously passed**

#### **2. Approval of Changes to [Guidelines for Student Relief Funding](#) –**

Peggy Kravitz, Chair of Student Relief Funding

- The guidelines for the Fund were last revised in 2004
- Approximately 50 proposals are received each year.
- While many requests received are for books it is the preferred goal to provide funds for unexpected needs.
- There is normally approximately \$5000/year
- Maximum award is \$500 but is normally between \$200 and \$300
- It is suggested that corrections be made to the language of the guidelines to make the language both more forceful and definitive.

- *In response to specific questions related to the Faculty Relief Fund, a number of points were highlighted:*
- Students are not interviewed but rely on faculty proposals
- The fund is relatively small and it is not a scholarship
- Students with greater needs need to tap into larger resources
- Faculty must make and submit the proposal and the faculty .The committee contacts the faculty to verify.
- It is a two-week process and is available during the fall and spring semesters.
- F-1 students are considered although it is recognized that there should be funding for the first year of their studies.
- “The Award will enable the student to continue with immediate studies.” The committee wants the funds to assist with minor problems that can be solved through the few hundred dollars.
- Suggestion that “student” should be singular versus plural.
- An automatic withdrawal from a check can be used to support the Fund
- **Motion Moved**
- **Vote: Passed**
- **1 opposed**
- **2 abstentions**

### 3. Approval of [Senate Committees](#)

- The Professional Development Committee is not yet fully formed and therefore is not yet listed on the list of Senate Committees
- The Social Committee is also not yet formed
  - **Motion Moved**
  - **Vote: unanimously passed**

## IV. Information Items

### 1. [Strategic Planning Process- Janet Harclerode and Eric Oifer](#)

- The Mission, Vision and Goals of Santa Monica College is reviewed
- Every 5 years strategic initiatives are re-formulated.
- Present strategic initiatives are:  
Career Technical Education  
Sustainable campus  
Global Citizenship  
Basic Skills (Student Success)
- A Steering Committee is being formed to help to develop strategic initiatives
- The Steering Committee Members will be comprised of DPAC and non- DPAC members
- The Steering Committee will hold focus groups on campus to help identify new ideas for strategic initiatives
- Please let us know of your interest or contribution

### 2. Curriculum Committee Information/[CurricUNet](#) – Guido Davis Del Piccolo

- CurricUNet is not yet ready to launch and further training will be offered

### 3. [Student Success Task Force Draft Report](#) – Janet Harclerode

- The draft document recommendations from the California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success has possible far reaching effects especially in areas that take away independent control; therefore it is necessary to discuss the report as a Senate.
- The Task Force is requesting feedback by November 9<sup>th</sup> . The Task Force will then reconvene and the document will be sent to the Board of Governors (BOG).
- Although there are some good recommendations in the report (e.g., encouraging student success classes and ed plans, there are some ideas that have not been suggested such as the Welcome Day organized at SMC.
- The document does not address how students may learn from failure
- The report ties Student Success and Professional development activities that would possibly be directed or mandated by the Chancellor's Office.
- Part-1 entitled: *Refocusing California Community Colleges on Student Success* of the draft document states: "Yet by any measure community college completion rates are too low and must increase." (page-6)
- Although the report focuses on graduation and transfer, many people are not necessarily attending the community college for a degree. There is also "swirling" which refers to a student who moves between campuses and thus we may lose track of this type of student and cannot always account for their successes.
- Degree/transfer and completion of the educational plan are how the document defines student success.
- A topic worthy of further discussion is on page-7 states: "*This plan calls on the state to end both the fragmentation between K-12 and community colleges and between the colleges themselves. A reformed community college system will be more responsive to the needs of their students.*" (see page-7) What form would this take?
- The draft document recommends an end to the fragmentation between K-12 and CC. "*The colleges while retaining their local character will function as a system with common practices, where practicable, to best serve students.*" Again, the question arises: what form would this take?
- SMC cannot coordinate systematically with K-12, due to large number of districts, charter schools. We develop transfer requirements to meet the needs of our students.
- Concern exists also regarding the State Academic Senate's response; we know for example that SB 1440, being strongly supported by the statewide Academic Senate has centralized power for degrees and alternative visions are not encouraged.
- Local control is critical. Our student population is unique to SMC; furthermore faculty and our curriculum vary between community college campuses.
- Community colleges are diverse environments; therefore local control is critical. There are 112 community colleges and tremendous diversity exists from community to community and college to college.
- Another item worth discussion: "*The community college in this plan rewards successful student behavior and makes students responsible for developing individual education plans; colleges, in turn, will use those plans to rebalance course offerings and schedules based on students' needs.*" and "*Student progress toward meeting individual education goals will be rewarded with priority enrollment and continued lack of progress will result in limits on access to courses and to financial aid.*" (see page-8)
- It is concerning that continued lack of student progress will result in student limits on courses and financial aid. This is likely to affect the neediest students.
- Development of educational plans for each student requires more resources for counseling and also creates a model that is similar to high schools. Furthermore this places an extreme demand on technology. Educational Plans would be developed online without faculty involvement; coupled with limits on counseling resources, this could be quite pernicious.
- One of the strengths of the community college is flexibility, which affords the student many opportunities to change goals. Thus, it is not necessarily a predictor of student success to track whether a student's initial goals upon entering the community college are also their goals when they transfer or leave the college.
- If educational plans are linked to funding there are inherent challenges since even if a student establishes an educational plan, the courses that help meet their goals may not be available to the student that then could spiral to loss of financial aid.

- A concern was expressed that the draft document has the inference that the community colleges are attempting to “keep students” at the college.
- A concern was raised that suggestions for student success may result in the more needy student being forced out of the community college.
- The document seems to suggest that the “tech savvy” student would not have the same access to counseling and therefore the resources would be directed towards students who may not tech savvy.
- The document does not address the hiring of full-time faculty.
- The document addresses issues related to basic skills so as to improve student success. For example: “*A primary curricular goal is to increase the effectiveness of basic skills instruction, compress the time it takes for students to complete basic skills and increase students’ readiness for college-level work.*” (see page-8)
- The Task Force calls for common diagnostic assessment tools across colleges: “*for the development and implementation of a common diagnostic assessment tool to better determine the skill levels of entering students.*” (see page-9)
- While student assessment is worthwhile and the Statewide Senate recognizes that student assessments provide a greater understanding of our students strengths and weaknesses, however these assessments should NOT be viewed as a tool to force students into a certain pathway. Thus, the question was raised whether there is flexibility on how to interpret the document.
- Since the student populations between “community colleges are very different and their needs will also be different, a common assessment tool would have to bridge these differences and be validated with the differing populations.
- Another concern is that life-long learning is missing from this document and therefore it seems to “miss” our own college’s Mission. For example, the Emeritus College would have to be privately funded.
- A discussion followed about how the goals of policymakers and the goals of educators can be at odds. Policymakers and the public may define student success as a path to cost savings and employment rather than education for the sake of learning and personal development.
- The task force recommendations targets Title 5 changes. Title-5 changes must through the Board of Governors (BOG). This can be a slow process.
- Dr. Tsang requested that EVP Randy Lawson organize a committee to respond to the report. It will consist of 8 faculty members and 4 administrators.  
[http://totalcapitol.com/?bill\\_id=200920100SB1143](http://totalcapitol.com/?bill_id=200920100SB1143)
- The Task Force reflects on how best to use our financial resources. However a concern was raised that asked: “What happens when the economy grows back but we are left without local control?”
- The report will move onto the BOG, but the area of conflict will be in its implementation phase. It was expressed that the contents and core of the report will not be changed and that public forums are not well advertised to bring to these the Task Force recommendations to a larger audience. However the implementation phase is critical and when the BOG approves of the documents, then the public and media attention will grow.
- It was also noted that we should recognize that our own strategic planning initiatives are not value neutral and that it is important to obtain an education only for a “job”. If we think of how people can creatively connect to education, this can be so helpful.
- Two possible paths for our input and recommendations are:
  - 1) Weighing in at Plenary (in San Diego) in which there will be two break out sessions on this topic are planned (<http://asccc.org/session/program-events>) and
  - 2) College-Wide Meeting. However it was noted that there are obstacles to the participation of the Plenary including issues surrounding travel, time and cost.
- The Task Force also outlines in their draft document specific requirements for students to receive BOG fee waivers. These requirement would include the need for the student to identify a degree, certificate, transfer or career advancement goal, meet institutional satisfactory progress and limit the number of units covered under a BOG fee waiver to 110 units. (see page-31)

- The Task Force discusses the advantages for full-time enrollment. The draft document for student success states: *“Students benefit from full-time attendance by increasing their earning potential sooner while colleges benefit from the greater efficiency of serving one full time student versus two or more part time students for the same funding.”* (see page section 3.3, page 33)
- Concern was expressed that the Task Force may not recognize that the success associated with full-time enrollment may be linked to multiple factors that are independent of full-time enrollment. Thus, full-time enrollment may be an indirect outcome of other factors that are the more immediate source of student success. Furthermore, the very nature of the community college may not be well-understood since community colleges serve the working student who does not necessarily have the time and/or resources for full time enrollment.
- Recommendations are also directed towards the development of alternatives for the basic skill curriculum. Recommendation 5.1 states that: *“Community Colleges will support the development of alternative to traditional basic skills curriculum and incentivize colleges to take to scale model programs for delivering basic skills instruction.”* (see 5.1, page 41)
- Concern was expressed that faculty role was minimized and that faculty contributions have not been represented in many of the Task Force’s recommendations.
- Recommendation 7.1 describes: *“the development a “strong community college system office with commensurate authority, appropriate staffing and adequate resources to provide leadership, oversight, technical assistance and dissemination of best practices. Further, the state should grant the Community College Chancellor’s Office the authority to implement policy, consistent with state law.” Chancellor would like to have more power recommendation.”* (see page 54).
- A suggestion was made that every department schedule a study section on this document so that faculty are well informed by the March deadline when the document will move to the legislature after approval by the BOG.
- The SMC discussion should include why our current model for student success does not need to follow the model outline by the Task Force. We need to offer an alternative since voters will see benefits to many of the recommendations outlined by the Task Force. Our online forum could be very useful to bring to the committees and everyone could weigh-in. Discussion of this document may serve as an excellent pilot for our online forum.
- This document may also serve as a useful topic for a flex day activity.
- Student involvement would also be an important component. Student involvement may include student testimonials. Statewide student senate and our students will be attending a general assembly that will discuss this issue as well.

## V. Announcements

- [Andrew Revkin Talk October 27, 2011](#) will give two talks 11:00am and 5:00pm at the Main Stage. Andrew Revkin is a prize winning *New York Times* writer. The talk will launch SMC’s Climate Action Plan to reduce the Colleges carbon footprint.  
<http://www.smc.edu/ACG/Marketing/Events/Pages/Special-Events.aspx>
- Arne Duncan, Secretary of Education, will be presenting Tuesday night, October 11<sup>th</sup> at a town hall meeting at El Rancho High School in Pico Rivera. Arne Duncan will present on the American Jobs Act and answer questions from the audience.
- SMC’s Global Motion World Dance Company will present Pursuit of Happiness October 27<sup>th</sup> at the Broad Theater. <http://www.smmirror.com/?ajax#mode=single&view=33201>

## VI. Adjournment

- 12:31

**To Report Absences Click [HERE](#)**  
**Next Scheduled Meeting: October 25<sup>th</sup>, 2011**