

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

Minutes of April 6, 2011

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
3: 06	Call to Order	J Stankas called the Senate to order.	
	Minutes from March 16	M Ikeda reported that due to circumstances beyond his control no recording of the last meeting was made. He asked for suggestions about proceeding with assembling some suitable substitute. J Stankas suggested that the information that was recorded be a starting point and for Senators who wish to provide additional information contact M Ikeda. This seemed to be accepted by the Senate.	
	President's Report	J Stankas read his report (see attachment) consisting of the following topics; District Budget Plan B, Measure M and Bond Projects, Resolutions for the ASCCC Spring Plenary Session (covered in New Business) . There was no discussion.	

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	New Business	<p>Resolutions for the ASCCC Spring Plenary Session- J Stankas presented a selection of the resolutions for the Spring Plenary Session in order to receive direction from the Senate for voting (see President’s Report for these items). J Stankas provided a synopsis of the history of each resolution and read the resolved statements.</p> <p>Res 5.01 S11 - J Stankas comments relative to the first Resolve statement were that there is some faction of the State AS that favored not participating in discussion of performed based funding. The second resolved statement concerning incentivizing the provision of student support services resulting in some additive bonus to college’s base; some examples were when a certain % of students; completing a FASFA, completing assessment, attempted and completed 15 units, or undergone advisement and have ed plan on file. The origin of this resolution is from SB 540 which required that the BOG call a task force for performance based funding. There was no opposition voiced concerning this resolution.</p> <p>Res 6.06 S11 - Oppose Fee for course offerings. Res 6.07 S11 - Support Fee for course offerings.</p> <p>A Chatterjee, E Millican, C Parish voiced their support of 6.06. There was no other discussion. S Briggs asked if Valley had looked into offering such classes. J Stankas stated that Valley would not be offering such classes. A Chatterjee commented that since a majority of Valley students are using financial aid, creating a two tier system of classes may decrease the number of students who can get financial aid due to their possible choice of higher fee classes.</p> <p>Res 9.01 S11 - CLEP - J Stankas reminded the Senate that Ed Policy reviewed this (last fall) and decided to wait for a decision of the ASCCC before acting. C Parish commented that this resolution was written and supported by CCC articulation officers, and that CSUs have reviewed all of the CLEP exams for appropriate for CSU GE breadth. C Parish also stated that a previous Valley AS resolution was passed supporting any course approved by CSU or UC for CSU GE breadth or IGETC, and that these courses will be automatically approved. These courses already appear in Valley’s Catalog. So Valley is already following this resolution.</p> <p>Res 9.03 S11 through 9.06 S11 - on course repeatability. In regard to Res 9.03, C Huston asked for the definition of activity courses. J Stankas reviewed the other elements of the</p>	

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	New Business cont.	<p>Resolutions for the ASCCC Spring Plenary Session cont. - Res 9.03 - resolution. C Parish stated some problems if this resolution were passed it would require that separate courses be offered that correspond to different levels performance (beginners, intermediate, etc) and voiced her objection to this resolution. J Stankas noted the differential impact on large and small CCs of this resolution.</p> <p>Res 9.04 - 9.07 - J Stankas read the Where As and Resolve statements. J Stankas summarized the origins of these resolutions as linked to the placement of limitations on course repeatability from the Legislature. He went on to review Valley's local action in regards to course repeatability. These resolutions reflect the confusion on some CCC campuses about appropriateness of courses for repeatability and the ASCCC attempt at clarifying this topic. J Gilbert commented that the imposition of state-wide treatment of course repeatability creates complexity locally. S Briggs noted that caution should be applied locally for defining the appropriateness (or inappropriateness) of course repeatability, and that there should be a separation of allowance of repeatability and funding for courses repeated. J Stankas added that these resolutions might be an attempt to cover classes identified in the resolutions from action by the Legislature by demonstrating academic value in repeating these type of courses. Dan Angelo added information provisions concerning auditing classes. J Stankas summarized the Senate sentiment stating there is a academic value in repeatability and in the Physical Education and Performing Arts courses. R Pires cautioned that these courses might be an opening for applying rules of repeatability over a much broader set of courses eventually.</p> <p>Res 15.03 - J Stankas reviewed the resolved statements. He summarized by discussing the conversations, statewide, concerning the definition of college readiness in high school students.</p> <p>Res 18.02 - Drop/Withdrawal Policies - J Stankas read the resolved statements. The sense of the AS seemed to support this resolution. L Hector enquired about the process of changing the withdrawal date. J Stankas outlined the process; Resolution passed by Valley AS, moved to District Assembly, moved through CHC, and a recommendation would be made to BOT to change Board Policy in this regard.</p> <p>Field Trip for Students - Since the publication this agenda</p>	

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	New Business cont.	<p>Field Trip for Students cont. - the issue has been clarified. A District form seemed to imply that in order for students to be allowed on a field trip they need to have their own health insurance. The clarification was that if students have no health insurance they only need to state this on the form.</p> <p>Summer Session - J Stanskas and Pres Daniels announced that there will be a summer session. Pres Daniels underscored the commitment to student access as the foundation for offering summer classes. Pres Daniels also relayed conversations with 6 local legislators, one of whom gave some hope of a change in funding through a deal.</p>	
	Old Business	<p>Program Discontinuance - J Stanskas reported on the final status of the Program Discontinuance process through four memos forwarded to Pres Daniels and others listed in the Program Discontinuance Policy (see attachments). J Stanskas plans on meeting with James Smith to construct a feedback document to survey individuals involved in the process about their impressions of the process. R Pires enquired about the creation and population of the College Task Force specified in the Machine Trades program discontinuance memo. J Stanskas reviewed the advisory nature of the discontinuance committees to the President and suggested that we wait for an announcement from the President. R Pires concerns are the lack of full time faculty might lead to lesser impassioned arguments supporting the program and the absence of a requirement for reporting out by the Task Force to the Senate. J Stanskas suggested that the AS ask the President to report her decision regarding further action on these memos, and at that time, present a motion indicating the Senate's interest in periodic reports from the ad hoc committee. Ben Fierro commented that at the previous Senate meeting individuals from the Tech Division seemed to take a very serious proprietary interest in the Machine Trades Program.</p> <p>District Strategic Plan Update - J Stanskas reviewed the use of this draft document within the Flex Day activities.</p>	

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	Committees	<p>Ed Policy - no report</p> <p>Equity and Diversity - Wait Listing S Briggs opened the discussion from the Enrollment Management committee regarding wait lists. Dan Angelo was invited to talk about the history and possible uses of wait lists in the future. Dan reviewed the history of wait list use on campus. It is currently used by many campuses and is a function of Datatel. Wait listing will work as follows, when a class reaches max enrollment interested students of given the option of placing their name on the wait list. If an opening in the class occurs, students can be added from the wait list into the class. Dan recommended that student be given the option of being added (due to the imposition of liabilities once they are added) rather than automatically being added. Prior to the beginning of the term the wait list activities would cease in order to give time for students to pay their fees. Dan also recommended careful planning of the options to be active in forming and using wait lists so that the operation is consistent with the interests of all parties. L Hector highlighted the advantages of the use of wait lists by instructors. L Hector enquired about circumstances in which students decide to wait list for a class and the impact of locking out the ability to wait list for a different class meeting at the same time. Dan responded that the option of being able to enter more than one wait list (for a given time) may be provided. J Stankas recounted a previous Senate's opposition to wait lists due to it use during the first weeks after the start of classes. R Pires enquired about a response time limit for a student being added into the class from a wait list. Dan replied that 24 to 48 hours seems to be the most frequently used interval. Dan reiterated that all adds would occur through the wait list.</p> <p>Student Services - T Heibel presented the results of the Student Service committees review of Priority Registration (see attached) including the charge of the committee, recommendations relative to changes in priority registration groups. Dan Angelo commented about the Category D, 0 to 14.9 unit count, explaining that during Spring Registration the grades for the previous Fall Semester haven't been posted and so any units completed will not be accessible for registration purposes and therefore have a record of 0 units. C Huston questioned the Middle College & Eisenhower Students proposed registration in Category D without possibility of advancing in Categories with additional units earned. A Aguilar-Kitibutr responded by explaining that Ed Code 76001 E that concurrently enrolled high school students must be in a low</p>	<p>Motion - S Briggs moved that AS support exploring wait listing.</p> <p>2nd - M Kanawati</p> <p>Vote - Ayes majority, 1 abstention.</p>

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

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	Committees	<p>Student Services cont. - priority enrollment (so as to avoid displacing any continuing students). P Ferri-Milligan enquired about whether other CCC might advance concurrently enrolled HS students as a function of unit count. Dan Angelo responded that if other CCC are doing this he would view that action as being at odds with Ed Code policy (mentioned previously). P Ferri-Milligan questioned the benefit of Middle College (in receiving an AA/AS) if students aren't able to progress in their registration priority. J Stankas responded that the current proposal will advance these students from Open Enrollment to Category D, and might therefore provide a greater chance for those student to get classes. Pres Daniels mentioned that the Middle College High School request was for Category C. Past practice at one point did allow Category advancement for Middle College students however discussion with State Chancellor's Office indicated that this was inappropriate. A Aguilar-Kitibutr recounted that the option of moving Middle College to Category C was explored by Student Services Committee but was ultimately voted down.</p> <p>Professional Development - C Hunter distributed a flyer (see attached) concerning faculty flex day activities, April 19. A more detailed schedule of events forthcoming. Reminder sign up for Web Migration Training.</p> <p>Elections - J Stankas reminded the Senators that the Division Senators will be responsible for holding a Division meeting to select Senators.</p> <p>Basic Skills - Update next AS meeting</p> <p>Curriculum - no report Program Review - no report Personnel Policy - no report Career & Tech Ed - no report Financial Policy - no report</p>	<p>Motion - C Huston moved that AS support the recommendations of the Student Services Committee concerning modification to Priority Registration. 2nd - G Mack Vote - Ayes majority, 1 abstention.</p>
	Additional Reports	<p>College President's Report - no report.</p> <p>SBCCD-CTA - no report.</p> <p>District Assembly - report will be made at the next AS meeting</p>	
	Public Comment		

