



SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

3375 Camino del Rio South
San Diego, California 92108-3883
619-388-6500

CITY COLLEGE | MESA COLLEGE | MIRAMAR COLLEGE | CONTINUING EDUCATION

Student Services
619-388-6922

Student Services Council
February 22, 2007
9:00 – 10:30 a.m.
Room Z-602
Minutes

APPROVED

PRESENT:

Gail Conrad	Mesa Academic Senate
Dave Evans	Mesa College (For Damon Bell)
Sherran Heitman	CE Academic Senate
Edwin Hiel	City Academic Senate
Lynn Neault	District Student Services
Gerald Ramsey	City College
Kirk Webley	Miramar Academic Senate
Peter White	Miramar College

GUESTS:

Naomi Grisham	Mesa Transfer Center Director
Marilyn Harvey	City Transfer Center Director
Duane Short	Miramar Articulation Officer
Wendy Stewart	Miramar Transfer Center Director

- 1.0 Approval of Minutes
 - February 15, 2007
 - Approved

- 2.0 Transfer (Transfer Center Directors) @ 9:15 a.m.
 - SDSU – TSD's
 - CSU LDTP Articulation Update

 - The Council invited the Transfer Center Directors and Duane Short, Articulation Officer at Miramar to speak with the Council to discuss issues regarding the Transfer Studies Degree with San Diego State University.

 - Lynn Neault shared with the Council that at the request of SDICCCA a Task Force was formed to address policy matters and issues related to transfer. However, the Task Force eventually dealt with implementation issues more so than policy issues.

- The Council discussed the current status of the TSD since the three colleges are operating differently.
- The Council discussed the issue of the lack of a formal agreement and the impact on students. Wendy Stewart agreed and shared that there was never an actual agreement by the colleges to stop writing TSD contracts. It was SDSU who stated they were terminating TSDs after December.
- Peter White stated that a letter should be sent to SDSU contesting the fact that there was never actual agreement on the part of the community colleges to discontinue the TSDs.
- Naomi Grisham stated that she attended the last Task Force meeting and there was no agreement made at that meeting. She further shared that SDSU stated that the campuses could continue to send TSDs; however, they would not be processed as they are being phased out.
- Marilyn Harvey shared that Counselors at City College are encouraging the TSDs to continue. Naomi Grisham shared that Mesa's Counselors are also encouraging the TSDs to continue.
- Duane Short raised the current issue with California State University (CSU) and the community colleges in regards to the LDTP (Lower Division Transfer Plan). The intention of SB1785 was that any California community college student would be able to transfer to any CSU campus, based on common lower-division preparation.
- Duane Short provided an explanation of how the common course identifiers are established and approved for the LDTP. He shared that City, Mesa and Miramar did not submit the list of courses due to concern that it may jeopardize current articulation agreements. Furthermore, currently over 50% of the community college courses submitted for LDTP approval were denied.
- Duane Short stated that the colleges now have approximately 20 courses to submit for approval. He shared that part of the frustration is that the descriptors are not real courses and are not taught anywhere. CSU has invented a series of non-existing courses, which the colleges have now been called upon to articulate.

- The Council had further discussion and agreed that the TSD issue needs to be clarified, as well as the articulation process for LDTPs. Peter White stated that he will add the LDTP issue on the upcoming Region X agenda. It was also agreed that Lynn Neault would bring the LDTP issue to the next Chancellor's Cabinet as an update.
- The Council agreed that the campuses will continue to process TSDs, per usual.

3.0 Late Add Petitions (Revisited)

- At the last meeting the Council, in conjunction with the Directors of Admission, discussed the late add petition process at each campus and agreed to a consistent process, campus-wide. At that meeting, the Council agreed to include the signature of the Vice President of Student Services on the form as it was not previously on the form.
- The Council revisited the issue as there is a request from City's senate executive committee to remove the dean's signature on the late add petition. It is felt that once the instructor signs the form that it is unnecessary for the dean to sign.
- Peter White shared that at Miramar he relies on the fact that the dean has reviewed the petition, provided careful consideration and has given the approval to process. Miramar would like to maintain the dean's signatory line on the form.
- The Council had further discussion and felt that it was important to have the dean's review and approval, as well as the instructor's approval on the form.
- Gerald Ramsey shared that City is also in favor of leaving the dean's signature on the form.
- Edwin Hiel stated that he would communicate the Council's position to City's Academic Senate Executive Committee.

4.0 CalWorks Allocation Task Force (Peter White)

- At the last SSC meeting, Peter White informed the Council that Bob Nadell from Modesto Junior College was the new representative on the Statewide CalWorks Allocation TaskForce. Peter inquired if the Council had suggestions to share with the new representative in relation to the funding formula and restrictions.

- Peter White shared that Joan Thompson provided feedback. She would like to see the restrictions loosened so that the money can be spent and not be sent back to the state.

5.0 Student Representation Fee Guidelines – Revisited

- At the last SSC meeting, the Council was provided with the Student Representation Fee Guidelines that was initiated by Peter White as the district did not have guidelines in place.
- It was shared that the draft guidelines have been reviewed by the AS Deans and are ready for additional review and approval. It was agreed that the draft should also be shared with the AS organizations on campus. The Vice Presidents agreed to have the AS organizations on campus review and bring back the document to the March 15th meeting for finalization.

6.0 Alliant International University Agreement - Revisited

- MOU Process
- At the last meeting, Peter White brought forward a final draft of an MOU with Alliant University. The Council agreed to review the document and discuss further at today's meeting.
- It was reported that the draft MOU has been through the Transfer Center Directors at the colleges. In addition, representatives from Alliant University have met with the Presidents and Lynn Neault.
- It was agreed that the MOU is ready to take through the MOU process at each college.
- The Council agreed to bring the draft MOU back to SSC at the next meeting for further input.

7.0 Academic Senate Reports

8.0 Curriculum Instructional Council Report

9.0 Other

- The Council discussed a process to include the Vice Presidents in the e-mail distribution for all special notices that go out to students.