

Academic Senate SBVC	AD/SS 207 3:00 - 4:30
---------------------------------	----------------------------------

Minutes of October 19, 2011

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
3:05	Call to Order		
	Approval of Minutes from Oct 5		Motion by P Buckley, for approval of the Minutes of Oct 5 with modifications. 2nd by M Kanawati. Voice Vote - Ayes unanimous.
	President's Report	<p>J Stankas read his report (see attachment) consisting of SLOs, Recent Legislative Action, Prerequisites and Content Review. J Stankas also directed attention to the current local processes for curriculum review that have identified the Curriculum Committee, as the entity representing the Academic Senate, that will make recommendations to the Board of Trustees in regards to curricula at Valley College. The description of current curricular processes was an introduction to an assignment of the Senate to develop a process whereby proposed courses can be reviewed for possible enrollment limitation (i.e. basic skills courses or others). This area has substantial overlap with the recent report from the Student Success Task Force.</p> <p>J Stankas reviewed the avenue for feedback on the recommendations of the Task Force as available on the State Chancellors website. J Stankas will be emailing the proposed resolutions from the Area D meeting occurring on Oct 22. These resolutions will be a topic of conversation at the Nov 2 Academic Senate meeting.</p> <p>J Stankas described the results of a study published recently by FACCC on individual CC success (in 3yrs of enrollment did students graduate with a degree or certificate), out of 112 CCs Valley ranked 109.</p> <p>J Stankas also reviewed information from College Council regarding committee structure and the recommendation for two additional committees; 1) Basic Skills (currently a Senate Committee to an institutional committee), 2) Strategic Planning Committee. Some additional conversation was had about the changing of committee times.</p>	

Academic Senate SBVC	AD/SS 207 3:00 - 4:30
---------------------------------	----------------------------------

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
3:22	New Business	<p>Report - RP Group Strengthening Student Success Conference - N Sogomonian stated that many sessions were linked with the findings of the Student Success Task Force. A session she attended also illustrated the study of student success by a mapping exercise as applied to a given discipline to elucidate the required steps in the process as well as the information flow that would need to occur. She also identified a Keynote address that dealt with moving student orientation away from approaching a class with the idea of surviving the class. Some ideas of the function of learning communities were also presented by various CCs. Some of these were proposed by adjunct faculty members. N Sogomonian also indicated that CCs that sent teams of representatives were better able to sample the events at the conference. N Sogomonian also recounted the conversations related to groups of individuals at a CC becoming too insular in their processes and perspectives.</p> <p>Report from Divisions - R Pires distributed a statement from the Social Sciences, Human Development, and Physical Education Division (see attachment) regarding their view that discipline faculty should be the sole determiner of prerequisites for their respective courses, and their opposition to any standardized decision process. R Pires emphasized that the statement represents the unanimous decision of the SSHDPE division.</p>	

Academic Senate SBVC	AD/SS 207 3:00 - 4:30
---------------------------------	----------------------------------

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	Old Business	<p>Pre-requisite Discussion - Activity regarding implementation of the Model Content Review Process. J Stankas introduced the constraints of the activity; that the process be sufficiently robust and flexible to account for the diversity of the courses and programs in the college, and does not require confrontation. The goal of the activity is to chart a path between receiving a new course (or a course undergoing content review) and the course going to the BOT, while following the Model Content Review Process. To guide the process a copy of the report entitled, "Implementing Content Review for Communication and Computation Prerequisites" (see attached) was distributed to Senators. Within the document pages 7, 9, and 27 to 30 were identified as helpful reference material. J Stankas then reviewed the series of Reading and Math courses starting at the lowest level to transfer level as background information (Reading 920 to 950 to Engl 914 to Engl 015 to Engl 101) (Math 942 to 952 to 090 to 095 to 102).</p> <p>R Pires referred to p7 in the ICRCC document above for an explanation of #2 (separate action approve any pre-req or co-req). J Stankas responded that the reason for the action being separate from the course approval is that the pre or co-requisite must be considered separately each time by the Curriculum Committee. J Lamore enquired about the current process of content review already acting under the pre or co-requisite approval process, and the reason(s) for the current exercise. J Stankas responded in describing the confrontational atmosphere in many of the current Curriculum meetings and a search for a process to diffuse this atmosphere by way of a discussion before the meeting of the Curriculum Committee. A Aguilar-Kitibutr asked about the sources of discord in Curriculum Committee meetings. J Stankas responded that rules that were blanket statements (eg all college level course should require this ___ level of basic skills). J Stankas emphasized that the requirement of such processes can be linked to the State Legislative scrutiny of our colleges "success". L Hector identified the change in Title 5 that opened the avenue for course approval through rigorous content review as opening the door for options in these processes.</p> <p>P Buckley - The group began with the premise that not all courses need a pre or co requisite (an example from Law Enforcement was provided where the requirements are a high school diploma or a GED. Can a pre-requisite be required that doesn't reflect the industry standard?). The final decision</p>	

Academic Senate SBVC	AD/SS 207 3:00 - 4:30
---------------------------------	----------------------------------

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	Old Business cont.	<p>Pre-requisite Discussion cont. - determined by the subject level experts. Membership(?) of Tech Committee and Full Curriculum Committee will influence the out come of pre-requisite discussions. Each Division should define the pre or co-requisite process prior to content review. There should be official documented advisory meeting minutes CSU advisory, Basic Skills representatives, other discipline faculty, etc. The Curriculum Committee should defer to the discipline experts.</p> <p>N Sogomonian - 3 Step Process; a) Discipline faculty determine if a course needs pre-req/co-req., b) Discipline faculty seeks consult from Basic Skills area, c) a reasonable pre-req/co-req is collegially agreed upon. Example from Art w/ computational skill level, Math recommended Arithmetic. Example from Spanish req for writing a paragraph, English recommendation Engl 914.</p> <p>J Jackson - Flowchart. 1) Dept discusses requirements for pre-req; if yes, then 1a) stats on success/rationale, 1b) continue with Curriculum process. If no, then 2a) Curriculum Comm can ask relevant questions consistently of each department, 2b) then Dept can decide in favor of Curriculum Comm recommendation (to to 1b) or no. If no then no pre-reqs.</p> <p>A Avelar - Step 1 New course/ course review, 2) Consultation with committee with representatives of Reading, English, and Math, and basic skills (opening meeting once a month), 3) Curriculum Committee - discipline members ultimately decide upon whether a pre-req is required.</p> <p>Prerequisite Discussion: Summary of Activities - Oct 19, 2011 (see attachment) J Stanskas reviewed the summary indicating some additions made since the initial discussion (see bold items). Funding will come from one-time money approved by the Board.</p>	<p>Motion by P Buckley that the Academic Senate adopt this Prerequisite Discussion Summary. 2nd by A Aguilar-Kitibutr Voice Vote - Ayes unanimous</p>

Academic Senate SBVC	AD/SS 207 3:00 - 4:30
---------------------------------	----------------------------------

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	Committees	Ed Policy - no report. Student Services - no report. Personnel Policy - no report Financial Policy - no report. Equity and Diversity - no report. Legislative Policy - no report. Elections - no report. Basic Skills - no report. Curriculum - no report Program Review - no report. Professional Development - no report	
	Additional Reports	College President's Report - no report. SBCCD-CTA - P Buckley noted that there has been mediation set-up between the Board and CTA concerning SLO workload for part-time faculty and Dept Chairs. J Stanskas asked for a time frame for mediation. P Buckley responded that this is not binding arbitration. District Assembly - no reports	
	Public Comments		
	Announcements		
4:29	Adjourned		