

Ventura County Community College District

Minutes of the District Council on Student Learning (DCSL) Committee

November 29, 2007

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Present: David Bransky (VC), Susan Bricker (VC), Susan Cabral (OC), Kathy Colborn (MC), Pam Eddinger (MC), David Farris (VC), Glenda Gardner (VC), Lyn MacConnaire (VC), Rene Maciel (VC), Letrisha Mai (MC), Kathryn Schoenrock (VC)

Absent: Jeff Baker (MC), Robin Calote (VC), P. Scott Corbett (OC), Mayo de la Rocha (VC), Patricia Ewins (MC), Jeannette Redding (OC), Ramiro Sanchez (VC), Margaret Tennant (MC)

Recorder: Lynn-Marie Glaze

Minutes:

Agenda Item	Summary of Discussion	Action (If Required)	Completion Timeline	Assigned to:
Approval of Minutes from 10/25/07		The minutes were approved as distributed, with a minor correction.		
Banner Prospect Module / Luminus	Tabled to the next session, as Dave Fuhrmann was unable to attend this meeting.	Include this item on the next meeting agenda		R Calote / L-M Glaze
Credit by Examination Fee	Tabled to the next session.	Include this item on the next meeting agenda		R Calote / L-M Glaze
AP, CLEP and IB Units	<p>Continuation of discussion of AP, CLEP, and IB policies regarding awarding of units and fees:</p> <p>CLEP is currently allowed for veterans only (active military or veteran).</p> <p>There was formerly an issue with variations in AP, etc. between campuses. There has been no historical opposition, but discussions were never completed on this issue.</p> <p>The team held a discussion about granting course credit. There was some questions as to whether this should be a district-wide policy and if standardized units should be established</p>			

to be awarded for each course. Each college would then determine how credits are applied to their specific programs. This is not intended to be a discussion regarding course equivalency, only in the awarding of units.

Attachment: Draft proposal 2/10/03

There seem to be many inconsistencies in the application of units between institutions, where the awards given are a local decision. The California State Universities give minimum standards of awards.

Suggestion: Have the District set the policy for the number of units awarded; how they are applied to specific programs is up to the local college.

The driving force for the need to set policy is the current inconsistencies throughout the District.

In the past, the faculty felt that enrollment would erode with these unit-award programs, but that is not true. AP students are usually transfer students, which does not affect local enrollment numbers.

Q: How will units be awarded, if not tied to course equivalency?

A: It is up to the individual program requirements as to the application of units to each program.

Next step: The team will take the award of CLEP and IB units to the Curriculum Committees, then return to the DCSL team for an implementation discussion.

The team consensus is that standardization should be district-wide, with the application of units up to colleges. It is not appropriate for this matter to be part of the Board policy.

David Farris to meet with the three Curriculum Committees to present the proposal to uniformly apply Advanced Placement, CLEP and

		International Baccalaureate units.		
Student Services Procedures	<p>This discussion item is regarding the Board policy that requires certain administrative procedures; some of the procedures are not yet in place.</p> <p>The DCSL team may take on this task. Team members will have access to CCLC templates regarding procedures, however they are currently being updated for Title V changes and will available soon.</p> <p>It was suggested that the DCSL have workgroups to devise procedures based on CCLC templates.</p> <p>Handout: Sample CCLC template for enrollment priorities, Susan Bricker's draft of similar procedures as currently practiced.</p> <p>No changes are currently planned for procedures regarding repeatability and withdrawals; even though the new policies were effective as of August 16, no implementation instructions have been received.</p>	Table this issue until after the CCLC has completed the templates and provided procedures for implementation.		
Discussion of Issues to Calendar for upcoming meeting	<p>The following items were proposed for discussion at the January meeting. The disposition for each item follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Student difficulty in using webSTAR There has been much improvement seen lately, so the team will not need to revisit this subject. - FERPA issues / threshold of perceived threat to break privacy ▪ Tracking of students experiencing mental health crisis / connected behavioral intervention teams. Moorpark College has implemented a notification system for students who appear to be in crisis. The system is designed to tie individual incidents together 	<p>Remove webSTAR issue from the agenda.</p> <p>Reschedule the discussion of FERPA issues to the February meeting.</p> <p>Reschedule discussion of tracking issue to February</p>		

	<p>which may indicate an escalating pattern of behavior</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When to upgrade Pass/No Pass This policy must be implemented by Fall '09. Some colleges have SIG modifications, which coordinates with the Banner program. However, there are some issues with the new version of Banner. ▪Article 55041: recency prerequisites ▪Second part of Title V changes Keep this item on the January agenda. 	<p>meeting.</p> <p>Keep the discussion of Pass/No Pass on the January agenda.</p> <p>Keep the discussion of Article 55041 on the January agenda.</p> <p>Keep the discussion of the second part of Title V changes on the January agenda.</p> <p>Additional agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Statute of limitations on grade changes Schedule for February meeting. ▪ CLEP/IB changes Schedule for February meeting. 		
Next Meeting	The next meeting will be held Thursday, January 24 from 3:00 – 4:30 pm in the DAC multipurpose room.			