Academic Senate **SBVC**		ADSS 207 3:00 - 4:30	

Minutes of November 16, 2011

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
3:06	**Call to Order**		
	Approval of Minutes from Nov 2		**Motion** by J Lamore, for approval of the **Minutes of Nov 2 2011**. **2nd** by J Hill. **Voice Vote** - Ayes unanimous.
	President's Report	J Stanskas read his report (see attachment) consisting of **Plenary Session Resolutions related to Student Success and Repeatability conveyed to the State Student Success Task Force and ASCCC adopted positions (see attachment).**	

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	New Business	**HACU Grant -** Marc Donnhauser and Denise McCrary(?), representatives from the Valley Bound Program, reported on their trip to the Community College of Denver (CCD) to observe the implementation of learning communities (LC) entitled Fast Start Program. They reported on LCs based upon the pairing of two different subject classes (e.g. Math and Literature) in terms of student and faculty interactions. Enhanced understanding of individual students by faculty and the facilitation of student support by multi-layered support services. Participating faculty members also benefitted by the interweaving of subject matter being presented to students in these 3 hour sessions. The teaching components were constructed using existing curriculum outlines. The LCs seem to foster extended student discussions outside of the class as well as changing student perspectives of education towards a process orientation. A higher level of student engagement was also observed in the four classes sampled. A professional development activity occurring on Thurs, Dec 1 (10a session for administrators, 2p session for faculty) will be offered to faculty to facilitate a more in-depth conversation about CCD with Lisa Silverstein, Director of CCD's program. An event flyer will be forthcoming. **Substantive Change Document** - J Jackson presented an summary of the proposal. J Jackson highlighted the link between the proposal from the Online Program Committee and accreditation. J Stanskas enquired about language indicating that Valley offers degrees through classes that are 100% online. J Jackson corrected that statement to 100% DE (Distance Ed) delivered. AS thanked and recognized J Jackson for his work associated with authoring this document. **Report from Divisions** - no reports.	**Motion** by C Huston, that the San Bernardino Valley College Academic Senate recommends that the Academic Vice President propose the latest draft of the Substantive Change Proposal to the College Council and Board of Trustees for their approval. **2nd** by J Gilbert. **Voice Vote** - Ayes unanimous with one abstention.

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
		Academic Senate SBVC — ADSS 207, 3:00 - 4:30	

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	Old Business	**Repeatability recommendations -** J Stanskas reported that there are currently some courses listed in the catalog that will be needed to be changed. There is no current deadline that has been identified by the CCC BOG. J Stanskas recommended that disciplines with such courses plan a course of action for implementing modifications associated with changes of repeatability, or even to start submitting curriculum changes. L Hector reported that discussions have already commenced within the Curriculum Committee and that there are currently some courses in the cue that will be subject to change (due to changes in repeatability) but only those courses NOT currently in the cue will be required to be modified appropriately before submission to the Curriculum Committee. J Lamore enquired about the numbering of leveled courses. L Hector recommended that faculty contact Corinna about the appropriate number or letter designation. **Model Content Review Processes** - J Stanskas drew Senator's attention to two documents (see attached); first on the Model Content Review Process (MCRP), and second on Curriculum Outcomes for Basic Skills through Transfer Level Courses and conducted a general review of these documents. After reviewing the MCRP, J Stanskas noted that at a breakout session (during Plenary?) it was noted that the content review process should be pedagogically driven, transparent process. Further J Stanskas emphasized that changes to Title 5 (in this process) involve modifications to step 3 (formerly statistical validation only) to rigorous content review for exploring the requirement of prerequisites. J Gilbert posed the hypothetical of a course whose requisite skills seem to require some prerequisites, but was brought before curriculum with none. He enquired about the role of the Curriculum Committee in this case. J Stanskas stated that the Curriculum Comm should feel should question the Dept rep about any step in the MCRP. The Curriculum Comm then has the authority to approve the course, change the course (appropriately) and approve it, or deny approval and return it to the Dept. J Stanskas noted that some problems seem to arise from Departments deviating from the order of the MCRP steps. It was noted by J Gilbert and J Stanskas the challenges associated with performing the requisite analysis. J Stanskas and L Hector then noted the Outcomes for Basic Skills through Transfer Level document organization. L Hector then noted the during the MCRP the full Curriculum Comm may not be present at any step before step 9, and at step 9 there maybe new questions voiced about a course even at this late stage. R Pires noted that the application of the MCRP (previously) was uneven among different representatives. Her second concern was the	

Academic Senate SBVC	ADSS 207 3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
		Model Content Review Processes cont. - unintended consequences of the addition of prerequisites on students. A third concern was that the process articulated in the Model District Policy (CCC BOG 9/93 document) seems to suggest that there are two separate votes specified (first voting on the course, second vote on the prereq/coreq) whereas our MCRP seems to have only a single vote encompassing both course and prereq/coreq. R Pires paraphrased from p5? of the MDP document a concern that the implementation of prerequisites should not unreasonably impede student progress. R Pires also noted, from this document, after the institution of prerequisites on a course, data on student success must be tracked. J Stanskas pointed to the data being currently available in the 3 year efficacy document as a part of program review. R Pires question the time at which this analysis would occur during the current MCRP. The issue of consistency of application of the MCRP was also reinforced. L Hector enquired about the purpose of two separate votes for a course. J Stanskas speculated that it is an attempt to make the MCRP deliberative and that having separate votes on; a) the course, b) the prerequiste(s), and c) the package of the two, is one version of a deliberative process. A general conversation ensued concerning the exclusive nature of applying a prerequisite on students, not meeting the prereq, that hypothetically could pass the course without the prereq. J Stanskas announced that the question that is to be taken up by the Senate, on Dec 7th, is whether or not the MCRP should move to rigorous content review in proposing prereq, or should maintain usage of statistical validation. It would also be beneficial to for the appropriate sections of BP and AP to be streamlined.	

		Academic Senate **SBVC**	ADSS 207 3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	Committees	**Ed Policy** - R Pires reported on the committees review of the withdrawal policy and moving the final date of withdrawal to earlier than the 75th percentile. She presented a document that reviews the relevant information (see attached). R Pires was concerned about the tracking of data linked to the reason(s) for student withdrawal. She also reported on some consequences (as reported on in an article about the CPCC experience). Another study (College Freshmen at Risk) provided info about the reasons for dropping classes. R Pires summarized the views expressed in Ed Policy, institute a withdrawal data at the 50th percentile of the semester, or more data needed. R Pires recommended that a change be implemented to the withdrawal date, and data be collected on students after the change in withdrawal date is implemented, and that after two years a conversation in the Senate be had concerning the implications of the data on the new withdrawal date. Conversation about State level discussions on this topic were mentioned. J Stanskas recommended that this information be discussed within Divisions and that recommendations about changes in withdrawal dates be brought back to the AS on Dec 7 for a vote. **Student Services** - A Aguilar-Kitibutr reported on her committees discussion concerning wait lists which was summarized in some recommendations (see attached). Members of the committee were A Avelar, M Kanawati, M Klingstrand, S Meyer and A Aguilar-Kitibutr. The information that was used in constructing the recommendations were from other, Region 9 CCs, interviews with key persons at these CCs as well as LACC and El Camino College. A & R Dept and DCS were also involved in the conversations. The recommendations were then reviewed by A Aguilar-Kitibutr. An addition was made on step #3 indicating that a student may enlist on the wait list during open registration (in addition to their opportunity to do so during their designated priority registration dates). Implementation is anticipated for the fall of 2012. W Chatfield enquired about the reason for limiting a student to only wait list for one class section. A Avelar stated that without limits a small group of students could occupy all the wait lists for all sections of that class. It was also noted that a current snapshot of the number of students wait listed for any class would be available to those students registering. Some discussion on this point ensued. R Pires enquired about a hypothetical student registering on Sat, would their fees be due 24hrs. D Angelo stated that fees should be payed in 24 hrs but there is a grace period of 3 business days given. A Aguilar-Kitibutr also noted that after implementation there will be opportunities to fine tune the process if the process is not functioning as anticipated.	**Motion** by K Kafela to adopt the **recommendations of the Student Services subcommittee in regards to their recommendations governing the wait list process.** **2nd** by R Pires. **Voice Vote** - Ayes majority. Nays minority.

		Academic Senate **SBVC**	ADSS 207 3:00 - 4:30

Time	Topic	Discussion	Further Action
	Committees cont.	**Personnel Policy - Committee Selection Process -** A Au reviewed a recommended committee selection process to be used in organizing committee selection for members of a Division (see attachment). A summary sheet of current SBVC committees and their meeting times beginning in the Fall of 2012 was also provided (see attached). There were some notations made concerning agreed upon meeting times. J Stanskas will be providing a summary sheet with the updated meeting times. These selections are due Dec 21. **Career & Tech Ed - no report** **Financial Policy - no report** **Equity/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 -** Pres Daniels reported in regards to Professional Development, a call will be announced during the Spring Semester for faculty members serving as full time reassigned Professional Development Coordinator for Spring Semester. An internal application and interview process will follow. A search for a permanent full time replacement will be conducted in the Spring Semester as well. Pres Daniels also followed up on the Chancellor's announcement (during an open forum) that due to the State Budget shortfall, the budget cutting triggers will be pulled but the amount and timing of these announcements are unknown. However the anticipated shortfall was budgeted for to take Valley through the current year. **SBCCD-CTA - no report** **District Assembly - no report**	
	Public Comments		
	Announce-ments	N Sogomonian reminded Senators to look for the announcement of the Great Teachers Retreat	
4:40	**Adjourned**		