SMC ACADEMIC SENATE  
Minutes: Tuesday, March 6, 2012  
Business Building Room 144

Present: Adler Eve; Anderson Jamey; Antrim Brenda; Baudel Zeny; Bernstein Teri; Boosheri Sara; Breedlove Karen; Brookins Greg; Campbell Laura; Cavanaugh Jamie; Chandler Fran; Colavito Mary; Davis Del Piccolo Guido; Farber Georgia; Feiger Tina; Gallogly Ethan; Goodfellow Candyce; Graziaidei Keith; Harclerode Janet; Hunt Steve; Jaffe Sharon; Jones Janie; Kawaguchi Lesley; Klineman Michael; Kluckhohn-Jones Lucy; Kraut Deborah; Londe Stephen; Magallon Beatriz; Martin Jim; Merlic Jennifer; Misaghi Angelina; Moassessi Mitra; Morris Peter; Munoz Maria; Nightingale Melody; Oifer Eric; Owens Michael; Pacchioli Jim; Roque Elaine; Rothman Vicki; Schultz Christine; Scott Jacki; Strathearn Michael; Tovar Esau; Trujillo Marc; Von der Ohe Christina; Veas Sal; Villapando Alicia; Zehr David.

Excused: Beardsley Jason; Bober Mary; Burson Patricia; Geddes James; Hotsinpiller Matthew; Jerry Gina; Mazorow Moya; Nestler Andrew; Tilley Rosilynn

Absent: Dalton, Carrie; Douglas Judith; Kravitz Peggy; Lewis Brandon; Manson Laura; Mobasheri Fereshteh; Rogers John; Sterr Susan; Strong Lydia; Szekely-Garcia Claudia

Visitors: Mejia Vanessa; Peters Tom; Womack Carol; Ellis Tracey; LeDonne, Helen; Fria Chris; Rodriguez Teresita; Shimizu Jeff; Lawson Randy; Tsang Chui

I. Call to Order at 11:18 a.m.

II. Public Comments
  ▪ Global citizenship announcements (Peter Morris)
    a) Friday deadline this week for China opportunity this summer.
    b) Vote for next year’s annual theme by email coming up soon.
    c) Students should submit work for research symposium as soon as possible.
  
  ▪ Marc Trujillo has a public art show for one more week at the Barrett gallery at PAC for another week.

III. Action Items
  1. Approval of the Minutes for February 21, 2012  
     Minutes for February 21, 2012—approved unanimously.
  2. Strategic Planning Update and approval of Vision, Mission, and Goals
     ▪ Brought by Strategic Planning Task Force. The order of the items in the title were changed. Other small changes were made. Last complete overhaul was five years ago.
     Moved—Marc Trujillo
     2nd: Brenda Antrim Approved unanimously.

IV. Information Items
  1. Academic Senate Election Timeline and Chair Election Results - Melody Nightingale, Chair of Elections and Rules
     ▪ Results of the chair elections, effective June 1, were presented.
Please talk within your department for nominations for new senators. Nominations accepted March 26-April 6. Elections will take place April 16-20.

2. SLO Assessment and Midterm Accreditation Report Due Spring 2013
   - SLO assessments are due to ACCJC a little later than expected, and at the same time as the midterm report.

3. **Budget**
   - Statewide budget cuts include the $6.2 million expected reduction, plus trigger cuts of $1.4 million due to low tax revenues, plus February surprise cut of $2.85 million, totaling $11.15 million of cuts. This resulted in a 15% cut in the number of students since 2008. And because of the increase in tuition, more BOG waivers given, so revenues have been lower than expected.

4. **Little Hoover Report** – Lesley Kawaguchi, Legislative Committee Chair
   - This report is produced by an independent state oversight commission with bipartisan membership, assessing statewide public policy.
   - The California CC Chancellor Jack Scott is retiring as of September 2012, in midst of lots of changes happening statewide.
   - Five major recommendations made by the commission, all based on the idea that community colleges are not doing what they are supposed to be—not conferring degrees, transferring, etc.
   - At the same time, studies are showing that students are returning to CC’s after leaving four-year institutions, due to monetary concerns and for more opportunities.
   - The commission interviewed Jane Patton, statewide community college senate president, in cursory manner, indicating the lack of meaningful faculty input at statewide level. Faculty are seen as a problem.
   - Some recommendations: 1) Revise funding mechanism for CC’s, raising the specter of performance based funding; 2) Establish alternate enrollment fees, and a plan to steadily increase fees.
   - Comments: There is some alignment with SSTF goals and this report. This report may be more cognizant of colleges’ efforts to ameliorate the problems, more so than SSTF.
   - With respect to funding, are there other measures besides growth for allocation of funds? Performance-based is an idea advocated by these statewide commissions. No other ideas are on the horizon.

5. **Enrollment Priority** – Teresita Rodriguez, VP of Enrollment Management
   - Our current enrollment priority policies may be trumped by Student Success Taskforce guidelines in the near future. We have a local taskforce that hasn’t yet met.
   - Teresita gave an overview of the current state of enrollment policy at SMC: no sweeping changes being made for the next enrollment cycle. We want to finish implementing the SSTF recommendations first.
   - Changes to current policy that will be implemented this year: new students won’t be in a queue based on date of application; instead they will be categorized into three groups based on the SSTF recommendations: those with orientation and assessment completed,
those with only one of those items completed, or none of those items completed.

- Foster youth program group will be added to application for the purpose of enrollment priority. And a pilot program with the SMMUSD for their juniors/seniors who complete counseling 11 and 12 for priority enrollment.
- Students will be notified by email of these changes and when they will be implemented.
- Currently some special programs have priority enrollment: group 1 – state mandated (EOPS, veterans, DSPS etc.); Group 2 – Trio, scholars students; Groups 3—athletes. After that, students are prioritized based on the number of units they have achieved.
- A statewide workgroup is going to meet soon to discuss statewide enrollment priority changes mandated by SSTF; Teresita Rodriguez and Randy Lawson are members of this workgroup. It is likely that a proposal for future guidelines will be under discussion. Many types of changes are likely upcoming.

Comments and Questions:

- Do students with prior degrees have lower priority? They are not excluded or given low priority currently and may have low ‘local’ units compared to our continuing students and can actually have higher priority than they do.

A: We don’t have a statewide mechanism to filter this information to reflect their “true” number of units. There is also a similar situation with repeatability across CC campuses.

- None of these special groups are currently ‘written down’ in schedules, catalog, etc. but ought to be. In addition, we need to address the needs of our continuing students, and possibly other groups who currently are disadvantaged by our enrollment system.

A: We don’t want to change too much ahead of the statewide mandated changes. There may be removal of certain group priorities based on lack of student progress or achievement. Also, our enrollment priority policy is on the admissions website, but the priority groups are not enumerated.

- There are students who take classes only because of their need to defer student loans.

A: SSTF guidelines may take care of this issue due to not following a education plan or path.

- Order of priorities currently: Matric1—here to transfer/obtain degree have higher priority; Matric2—not sure how/why they are here; Matric3—concurrent high school enrollment.

6. Proposed Agreement with Cal Arts and Proposed New Contract Ed Arrangement - Chui Tsang, College President

- The college of the future ad hoc committee (COTF) was set up in 2010 to look at ways to continue to financially survive and at the same time fully serve our student population. Partnerships with other colleges/universities were suggested by COTF as one acceptable way to do this. The Cal Arts proposal fits into this category.
The senate-approved COTF resolution (Aug 31, 2010) enumerated some principles to be used going forward with any plans.

Recently, SMC has entered into agreements with AC college for international students to enroll in classes that were scheduled only after our regular offerings were full.

Dr. Tsang is presenting a proposal along these lines to the BOT tonight. MOU is under discussion with the Calarts Graphic Design Department to provide a path to a bachelors degree.

Chris Fria, Chair of Design Technology, spoke about the agreement, which has yet to take shape. The classes would likely be in the area of interactive design, an interdisciplinary area that would be a new offering for both SMC and Cal Arts. This would open up a high-tech career path for our students by enabling them to “transfer” into a 4-year program that would be located at SMC. No inter-faculty discussions between SMC and Cal Arts have begun yet, and no details have yet been determined. However, many departments would be involved because of the interdisciplinary nature of the potential program.

Comment: The Academic Senate’s control of curriculum should be maintained.

The second proposal regarding a new contract ed. arrangement would open enrollment in contract ed classes open to both resident and nonresident students. We have excess capacity available and this program would utilize this capacity to serve more students. We have a set of guiding principles that has been proposed to the BOT.

Dr. Tsang addressed the senate about this proposal. This proposal is an effort to continue our mission of education. State has been paying attention only to budget issues, essentially abandoning the goal of public education. This new proposal would afford students the opportunity to educationally advance in a difficult budget environment at SMC where we have a high reputation and high quality programs.

The set of principles presented to the board includes the principle that this program is only to continue our mission, not to pursue other projects.

Comments and Questions:

This proposal is not only addressing issues of lack of access but also for our financial benefit. We should be clear on that point. What is meant by excess capacity? Is it more than just rooms and faculty?

A: Since 2008, we have offered 1000 fewer sections per year, so there are fewer seats available at SMC and statewide. Our facility (buildings, equipment, etc.) can clearly handle more than we currently offer. We are a nonprofit organization. We are paying for education costs only, not for any extra items.

Local taxpayers want their bond money that built our facilities to be used for educational purposes, so this is a favorable proposal from that standpoint. How will this program look 7-10 years from now? Will adjunct faculty be hired to fulfill the increase in students? Or will we hire new full-time faculty to meet the demand? What proportion of students will be paying high vs. low fees?
A: We will use only our own funds to run this program, not state funds. Integration of program into the campus environment is important, even though there will not be a large difference in the number of sections from our current apportionment. And we will charge less per unit than Cal-State or UC.

- There have been problems with low enrollment for some previous contract ed. Is this problem anticipated in this new program?

A: This program, unlike previous programs, will be open to all students, not just international students. Students will be able to plan in advance how to allocate their funds across their schedules in order to get through their program in a timely fashion.

- We need to adopt a principle not to set up a parallel, two-track SMC, but to make it integrated.

A: The BOT also expressed this concern. It will be a better experience for students if this program is fully integrated. We also want to be careful not to have an appearance of economically segregating of our students. But we have to balance this concern with the problem of inappropriately mixing funds from this program and state allocation.

- Is a lawsuit anticipated for this? Will the senate still be involved for curriculum/program development?

A: Although any individual could sue, based on legal counsel, this is a legally sound proposal. And yes, there will be no change in senate involvement for curriculum and program development.

- Services should be offered to these contract ed students. Will additional employees hired?

A: Money will be put back into programs to help cover the additional services needed, without hiring new staff for all these services.

- Could we make a clear distinction for summer/winter contract classes vs. fall/spring for state-funded classes?

A: Currently we have no winter availability for state-funded courses. But summer will be mixed between contract and state-funded courses.

- How do we account for categorical funding issues (like DSPS, etc.) for students with some classes of each type?

A: This will have to be figured out with input from all the parties.

- Down the road, does this program continue regardless of state budget situation?

A: By pushing forward, we can create a commodity for ourselves and for our institutional longevity. Ultimately, we can stabilize our future with this initiative.

Q: Will these be the same courses as currently offered? Does that mean we have two tracks for our students?

A: In development of the schedule, additional sections will be added.

Q: Does this not create two tiers for our students? Where is the financial aid coming from for these classes? What about low-income students?
A: The current sources of aid can still be used. State law doesn’t restrict how they spend their aid dollars.

V. Announcements
1. Early Childhood Education Department Curriculum Alignment Certificate of Achievement- Laura Manson-Weingarten, ECE Chair
   - ECE department has received this statewide award.
2. Spring FLEX March 15- Steve Hunt and Patricia Burson, PDC Co-Chairs
   - Flex day next week, with a schedule coming online soon for faculty to pick their sessions.

VI. Adjournment at 12:42 p.m.