

Santa Monica College Student Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes

Date & Time: Wednesday, May 11, 2022
Location: Zoom Session
Chairs: Beatriz Magallon (Chair), Esau Tovar (Chair)
Attendees: Donna Davis-King, Matt Musselman, Press Nicolov, Redelia Shaw, James Thing, Mike Tuitasi, Alicia Villalpando, Dom Prendergast (student rep)

Excused/Absent: Kamiko Greenwood (student rep)

I. Call to Order: 12:04 PM

II. Public Comments:

- a. Bea stated that Kamiko is out of the hospital and is at home recovering.

III. Approval of Minutes: N/A

IV. Old Business:

- a. AR 4100 & AR 4225
 - i. Bea stated that both AR 4100 and AR 4225 went to exec for a second read. She is hoping that they will both go to Academic Senate for a second read. Alicia asked why exec asked for a second read as it is unusual for them to ask for a second read. Bea thought that Jamar made the decision to require documents with any changes come back for a second read. On AR 4100, Bea stated that she received feedback from Bradley Lane for the change made to the Global Citizenship Requirement. Esau stated that the term “institutionally accredited” is not a term that is well known yet. He suggested that when using the term to use a slash with “regionally” to introduce the term (Regionally/institutionally). Bea made this change. Alicia asked if there is a website with the updated language or if the same one will be used using the term “regionally.” Bea stated that Bradley said that the six commissions can also accredit colleges outside of the region and that’s why they are not using “regionally accredited” anymore, but she wasn’t sure if it is new language or if it is just what they prefer. Bea stated that she felt that they would not have an issue with “regionally/institutionally” being used. A vote was taken at 12:10pm.

- ii. On AR 4225, Bea reviewed the changes already made by the committee. Alicia suggested that the instructional faculty members of the committee take a look at the changes to see if they have any questions or would like to modify them. Esau stated that he had concerns about number 1, On Ground Courses, and number 2, Remote Instructional Modalities. On number 1 Esau was concerned about the “drop date” for faculty roster statement. Esau said that it implied that instructors cannot drop students from classes at all, which is not the case. Bea stated that the sentence following clarifies that faculty can drop students up to the 75th percentile of the course. Esau stated that the first sentence is specifically about clearing rosters of non-participating students and he thinks that needs to be specified. Bea went back to the Title 5 language to get clarification so that the language in the AR is appropriate. Bea interjected with a question about where the committee got the rule that students must attend class for one week of the class because that language is not in Title 5. Esau stated that he believed that the one-week rule has been in use since the first time he was the Chair of Student Affairs Committee back in 2004. He stated that it has been a practice because back then SMC had very competitive enrollment and many classes were filling up to capacity and they didn’t want to drop students for not showing up the first day and waiting until the second meeting or the end of the first week. Bea continued reading the Title 5 section 58004 regarding the application of census procedures. Bea asked about the census procedure that is not applied to any term shorter than 10 weeks and what it means. Esau replied that he is unsure which procedure this particular section is referring to and that it could be because of what was previously written in the AR. Bea continued to read the Title 5 references regarding 58004 Application of Census Procedures, 55204 Instructor Contact, 55202 Course Quality Standards, and 55002 Standards and Criteria for Courses. Bea wasn’t sure if the committee should work on it now or wait for Distance Ed. to give their feedback. Redelia stated that she thought it would make more sense to wait until they get feedback from Distance Ed. Alicia stated that she would like to see if the faculty members on the committee who have first-hand experience teaching with multiple modalities and could give their expert opinions. She also agreed that waiting would be ok as well, if that is what the committee feels should be done. Redelia stated that she is currently teaching in all modalities and that she uses all of the methods to communicate with her students.
- iii. Esau asked why there was a change in the title in section 2 from Online and Hybrid Courses to Remote Instructional Modalities. Bea stated that the change was made because of discussion regarding many different types of remote instructional modalities. Esau stated that all classes fall into three categories, online, hybrid, or in person as defined in Title 5. They were adopted because of the pandemic and now Academic Affairs is looking into phasing them out. Alicia asked if it should be changed to Distance Education. Esau agreed with Alicia. Bea stated that she feels the committee should wait until the committee gets feedback to make changes. Redelia agreed and stated that she has a variety of classes that are synchronous and asynchronous and that they will continue to be so in the fall. Bea stated that the committee

just changed the title but that it can be changed later. Redelia stated that adjunct faculty in her discipline were very confused as to how it needed to be. Donna stated that the change was made to be more current with language but that it sounds like it is going to phase out. She suggested that it should be titled Distance Education, according to Alicia's input because it has more continuity and focus. Then within the section, follow Redelia's advice to clearly define the definitions for the classes. Esau agreed that the change made sense but that because the document intermingles with laws and regulations from the state and the state has not changed their language it creates confusion to not use the same language. Esau also added the language he felt should be in #1 and #2 for the regulations in the chat. Bea included a reference to Title 5 55204 under #2 regarding regular effective contact between instructors and students and for non-participating and no shows. Matt stated that the committee could check and see what the DE committee thinks should be listed. Matt also stated that he agreed with Redelia about the confusion with the modalities being confusing even as a full-time faculty member. He used the example of his classes and how he misunderstood how the classes were considered "flexible" in the context of holding classes online and administering exams online. Bea agreed and stated that the DE committee is going through some recommendations and adjustments to their vision statements right now to go through Academic Senate to clarify some of these issues. Redelia stated that it should be Synchronous and Asynchronous because of the meanings of each word and how it applies to the conducting of the class meetings. Redelia also stated that Hybrid is not any different as it is just a 50/50 split of synchronous and asynchronous. Matt stated that for his department it was made clear that it was flexible with scheduled exams. However, that meant it was flexible for the students but not for the instructors because they had to be logged on during all class hours regardless of the material being online already, making their class times essentially office hours. Redelia explained how the scheduled exams were explained to her was that your exam times are scheduled and to meet the students in the zoom space to administer the exam and you have zoom lecture classes where you give your lecture and have in the moment discussions as well as recording it to post online for people who missed it. Then there is completely flexible courses where everything is online. Matt agreed with Redelia and stated that he reached out to Jason Beardsley about it and was told that you do need to login and what you do is up to you as long as you follow the COR but it doesn't make sense to him and there were students who registered for classes thinking there would be a class time aside from the exams. Matt stated that he hopes this will get cleared up by the DE committee going forward. Bea stated that she hopes these changes will be made to clarify and thanked everyone for their feedback.

- iv. Bea continued to go over the changes within the AR regarding Title 5 language and the language Esau added to the chat to include in this section. Esau clarified that the language was in the chat and the specific word change. Bea stated that she felt that the committee should not continue with this AR at this time and asked if everyone was in agreement. Donna stated that she agreed.

b. AR 5075 Course Adds, Drops, and Withdrawals

- i. Bea stated that this AR is quite long and has a lot of changes. Bea starts with the first paragraph and Alicia noted that in the first sentence the word adding needed to be changed to adds. Bea suggested changing the sentence word order and the committee agreed. Bea continued to read the paragraph about including provisions for intervention in cases of multiple withdrawals. Alicia stated that the language used here came from language that was recently adopted about mitigation. Esau asked how that is put in practice. Alicia stated that counselors have to be involved in trying to work with these students and that she thinks this should be a broader conversation within counseling department. She also stated that the mention of mitigation needs to be mentioned here because students will petition for EWs and that does not prevent the special considerations committee from approving the EWs. Esau agreed and added that he thinks the mitigation is to try to prevent students from withdrawing. Bea stated that at least the intervention will be there so the student knows their options.
- ii. Bea moved on to the Adding Courses section and asked if there are any changes needed. Esau proposed a change and posted it within the chat as follows: Students must add and drop courses within the regular enrollment cycle directly through their student portal. Once the class starts, students may add only with an authorization code from the instructor. Students must drop courses by the Refund Deadline or prior to the Avoid a W Deadline to receive a full refund and to avoid a W on the transcript, respectively. Dropping a class after the Avoid a W Deadline will result in a W (Withdrawal) grade on the transcript, or another substandard grade as determined by the instructor. Bea thought that there was another area of the AR that stated this already but thought it would be fine. Alicia stated that the committee had talked about keeping a lot of things separate because of the need for clarifying extraordinary and extenuating circumstances and that Esau's proposed language does not include those circumstances. Esau stated that those circumstances are separate. Alicia stated that she understands that but it appears that this statement could be misunderstood by or unclear to students. Esau stated that he thinks there is only one drop period, regardless. Anything else requires a petition so it would not be part of the standard and adding anything different makes it appear more complicated. However, Esau did not oppose adding language regarding extraordinary and extenuating circumstances. Bea proposed just splitting up the paragraph to make it clearer to the reader. Bea checked with Esau about the difference between the refund deadline and the avoid a W deadline. Esau confirmed that it can vary depending on the length of the class. Bea suggested keeping the refund deadline information separate from the adding courses section and Esau agreed. Bea confirmed that other items were also in their own sections to clarify that she was following the structure of the AR by separating the refund date as well. Bea continued reading the AR to make the proposed changes in the document from the discussion. Esau suggested deleting the sentence regarding students being responsible for dropping courses because this section is only about adding courses. Bea then continues reading the AR. Esau suggested removing the sentence regarding adding classes by obtaining

and add authorization code because it is already stated prior to this section in the AR. Bea continues reading and stops at 20% or 30% because there was a previous discussion about the percentage. Alicia stated that she is ok with the 30% because she feels it gives students ample time to determine if the class is a good fit. Donna expressed that she would rather limit the percentage time, leaning more towards 20% for switches. Esau expressed that he felt the same way as Donna because it creates a disadvantage to the students, and it results in fewer students being adversely affected. However, Esau does not object to moving to the 30% when it comes to showing a W on the transcript. Bea stated that she agrees with Alicia, Donna, and Esau and she thinks that there may be two separate things being discussed and wants to clarify. Bea asked if this section is regarding students to be reinstated. Esau said it is not and that students can be reinstated up through the 75th percentile. Donna confirmed with Esau that this is not about how long into the semester students can reinstate. Finally, Alicia clarified that the #2 statement was regarding drops to avoid a W. Bea decided it needed to be moved to the drop area of the document with the agreement of the committee. Bea asked when the deadline is for instructors to no longer be able to issue reinstatement codes. Esau stated that he would look it up. Redelia stated that it is in mProfessor and then asked for clarification on whether census day is 20%. Esau explained that currently that is correct. However, the committee is deciding on whether to change it to 30%. Redelia also asked about the refund date and Esau stated that it is at 10%. Esau also found the information for the last date for professors to issue reinstatement codes and it is through the 89th percentile of the class. Members of the committee were surprised at this and Redelia mentioned that she knows students will try to reinstate up until that time and hopefully be able to follow through. Bea asked what should be included for this section now that the percentage was determined. Esau noted that the section right below pertains to reinstatement and it may need to be moved there. Esau suggested removing the sentence completely since it is covered in the following section. Bea asked about the paragraph pertaining to students who miss the last date to add deadline due to extenuating circumstances and Esau stated that there can be confusion because instructors do not always keep track of the students who are actually enrolled in the course. Alicia mentioned that a long time ago professors had to provide proof of attendance grades. Esau stated that it is still the case but only if grades have not been processed and that the district no longer gets proof of attendance after grades have been posted. As for the extenuating circumstances, Esau stated that he is still unsure about how the committee can specify this in the document other than just looking at them on a case by case basis. Bea wanted to make sure that the instructors are aware of the different add/reinstatement codes and Redelia confirmed that, as an instructor, she is aware of them. Bea asked for input on how to rephrase the section. Bea asked what Admissions and Records need for the explanation of the circumstances. Esau stated that students need the signature of the instructor and a written explanation to be added to their special consideration petition. Alicia mentioned that the special considerations form can be used for many reasons. She was concerned that students could become confused when filling

out the form. Esau stated that the online form is more detailed than it has been in the past with bullet points to assist the student when filling it out. Bea read the new language to the committee. Bea noticed that there is not a section regarding late adds but asked if they are no longer using that term. Esau stated that the late add is a bit complicated as for when they are considered late because of the type of class. Esau recommended it be stated with less details because the details for late adding is nuanced and a special consideration form would be the best way to address this need. Esau shared what is in the schedule of classes to give the committee guidance as to how to word this in the document. He stated that the last few years the faculty has been negotiating over this. Bea asked the faculty on the committee what they thought about changing the language based on what Esau presented. Esau and Bea rewrote the sentence to more clearly define when students are able to add classes. Alicia and Donna added their advice on how to simplify the language. Esau added that additional information can be found on the “enrollment” section of the class schedule. Then Bea removed a section with the approval of everyone. Bea removed the notes she made about Late Adds.

- iii. Bea moved on to Reinstatements. Bea changed the heading for the entire section to Adding/Reinstatement of Courses. Bea read through the section and Esau suggested that Bea make some adjustments to the language to clarify and to move a sentence to a previous section.
- iv. Bea read through the section on switching classes. She asked the committee what they think the percentage should be for when to allow switching of classes. Esau stated that he wants it to be very clear that there are specific restrictions regarding switching classes. Donna asked Esau to specify that when a student switches they have to have permission from both instructors to switch. Esau gave examples of how switching can be cumbersome but did not answer the question until Donna asked again. He stated that he does think there is specific permission that has to be given but there has to be a willingness on the part of both instructors to share information and accept work from another class. Bea stated that based on previous meetings that the instructor for the second class would have to decide what they deem acceptable for a student to switch to their class. Donna suggested that the committee make a requirement list for this section to give students specifics for how they can switch classes. Esau stated that he pasted something like this in the chat and that Donna elaborated on his suggestion. Donna stated that the first 2 bullets are “AND” and the 3rd bullet is “OR” for the requirements. Alicia stated that being so specific about the bullets as there are many differing opinions about how to handle this type of situation. Bea suggested looking at the regulations for Santa Barbara City College as it is a model school for SMC. Alicia stated that there only need to be 2 bullet points since the first 2 bullets are really just one requirement. Donna asked Esau his thoughts and he stated that he is concerned that this will cause difficulty between students and instructors and the grades. Esau stated that there needs to be language that removes the original instructor from grade disputes at the end of the course. Bea stated that she is going ask Santa Barbara City College about their regulations to get a better understanding of how they

handle these switches. Bea wondered if there is a difference because of the lack of needing a refund for the student versus charging tuition. Bea mentioned that they do not have to issue a refund with their regulation nor charge a separate tuition fee. Esau stated that this section of the regulation is covering up to 30% of the class, unlike just 10%, where refunds are not an issue. This also covers the students and receiving a W on their transcripts. Alicia, Donna, and Esau helped by adding language that is more specific for what the instructors expect from switching students. The committee discussed the requirements and regulations by the state when it involves these types of class switches. Donna stated that she wanted to make some small changes to the first bullet point. Esau and Alicia spoke to the grade appeal process and how it affects the instructors from both classes. Matt asked if the grades were going to be transferred over that the student needs to sign an acceptance of the grades from instructor 1 to prevent them from being involved in an appeal. Esau agreed with this type of form. Esau stated that he felt that Bea was not following his language from the chat and asked her to go back and add it. Bea stated that she believed that it was discussed that most instructors are not going to do the first bullet and that it might be a waste of time to go into this further. She agreed to copy the language from the chat and that it might be good to come back to this at the next meeting on May 25th.

- v. Switching Levels for courses: Esau stated that the district does not want to allow this type of switching of classes. He checked with Bradley and Jason, and they are also not amenable to what the section states. The district feels that switching after the refund date is not a switch, but a completely different class. Alicia asked if a student gets into a class that they find is too difficult, are they allowed to enroll in a lower-level class as long as it is before the refund deadline. Esau stated that is a good idea to include. Bea thanked everyone.

Adjournment: 2:01 PM

For all documents, visit: <http://www.smc.edu/ACG/AcademicSenate/Committees/Pages/Student-Affairs.aspx>
Next scheduled meeting: May 25, 2022

Respectfully Submitted by Angela Bice