

Santa Monica College Student Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes

Date & Time: Wednesday, October 28, 2020
Location: Zoom Session
Chairs: Beatriz Magallon (Chair), Esau Tovar (Vice Chair)
Attendees: Donna Davis-King, Pressian Nicolov, James Thing, Mike Tuitasi, Alicia Villalpando, Redelia Shaw, Melissa De La Cruz Student Rep, Hope Ullman Student Rep
Guests: None
Excused/Absent: Matt Musselman

I. Call to Order: 12:02 PM

II. Public Comments: Bea welcomed Pressian Nicolov to the Committee with brief introductions.

III. Approval of Minutes: October 14, 2020

Motion to approve Minutes as is, Esau moved, Alicia seconded, (10) Yes at 12:14 PM.

IV. Updates and Old Business:

- a. AR 5570 Credit Card Marketing
 - i. Bea attended the Academic Senate meeting and reported that half of the meeting was spent discussing AR 5570.
 - ii. Alicia mentioned how most of the discussion was regarding 3e. Faculty were concerned how this would be regulated. Esau responded that this has become far too involved; the SAC is just setting the overall policy. Institutions need to adhere to CA law. However, we will not review each document they provide to students in detail. We have to believe they operate in good faith, and follow the AR.
 - iii. Bea agreed that it went into too much detail. Further, section 5 states that they must follow Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act of 2009. Esau believed this was a federal law but CA also has its own.

- iv. Redelia asked if we should state whether we vet the materials that the institutions provide? Out of concern if the companies give out bad advice/information. However, Esau responded it is not our role as a college to censor. Aspects of financial literacy should be sufficient. Who would vet the materials and where would materials be kept? We do not have the institutional capacity to review all the materials distributed on campus.
- v. Bea asked if we should use the word “shall” on 5e. Press stated how he had a similar experience in New York. There, they worded the requirement using “shall”. Subsequently someone from a committee would visit, and spot-check that institutions indeed adhered to the policy in place.
- vi. Donna asked if this AR addresses the scenario if institutions fail to comply with these requirements, would they as a result be denied returning to campus? Bea responded that number 4 addresses this. Committee decided to change “shall” to “will”.
- vii. No need to vote as the change made was not substantial, Bea will send it back with this edit.

V. New Business:

- a. AR 4235 Credit for Prior Learning
 - i. Bea wanted to know if fees should be specific for each exam, or moved to the top. Esau answered the fees should be in the pertinent section because there will be other sections where fees will be assessed.
 - ii. Bea read several portions of the AR, and Esau confirmed the language was accurate. A few language edits were made
 - iii. Esau pointed out 1b will need to be changed as the CollegeBoard will no longer be sending AP credit to Admissions. However, since we do not know the procedure yet this does not need to be edited now.
 - iv. Bea continued to read portions of the AR, language edits were made
 - v. Brief discussion on whether exams should adhere to multiple-choice format, so those exams could be administered in the assessment center. However, other modalities used are to be administered by the faculty member.
- b. AR 4331 Academic Renewal & AR 4332 Progress Renewal
 - i. Alicia presented an overview of the AR's.
 - ii. The primary reason Alicia wanted to bring attention to these two AR's are that she does not believe they currently allow students to move forward in a timely manner.
 - iii. The biggest change Alicia proposed would be to reduce the one year wait to 6 months, removing the three barriers of the 15 units with a 3.0 GPA, 24 units with a 2.5 GPA, and 36 units with a 2.0 GPA. SMC defines academic success as completing 12 units with a 2.0 GPA; therefore Alicia thinks this would be a more equitable solution.

- iv. Bea mentioned Title 5 does not state a certain period of time or GPA besides a 2.0. So, these requirements could vary from college to college. Bea further concurred that it does take a long time for students to be eligible for academic renewal to remove those substandard grades.
- v. Committee members agreed it would be a good for students.

VI. Announcements:

VII. Adjournment: 2:02 PM

For all documents, visit: <http://www.smc.edu/ACG/AcademicSenate/Committees/Pages/Student-Affairs.aspx>

Next scheduled meeting: November 18, 2020

Respectfully Submitted by Malin Bohman