



Districtwide Coordinating Educational Council

Anticipate and serve the educational needs of the students in the District by reviewing, facilitating, and recommending educational initiatives and programs districtwide, consistent with existing District and College planning processes and Board Policies 2410 and 2510.

Meeting Notes February 15, 2007

10:30 p.m. District Office South Conference Room

Present: J. Al-Amin, C. Chiriboga, D. Colli, J. Colson, J. Ford, B. Hertel, J. Marron, B. Schmiede (for C. Hill), B. Smith, M. Wangler, P. Wright

Absent: B. Hash, C. Hill, G. Perri, S. Seevers, Vice President Academic Affairs, Grossmont College (Vacant position)

Recorder: L. Davidson

I. Additions to the Agenda

J. Ford requested the addition of BP 4225 Course Repetition. Copies of the current policy were distributed.

II. Board Policy BP 5016 Probation, Disqualification, Readmission

Copies of BP 5016 draft III (6 units with second page), and BP 5016 draft IV (J. Colson revision) were distributed to members. J. Colson began discussion presenting his draft with the following changes:

- Deletion to Academic Probation paragraph as follows: ~~Appropriate interventions will be designed and implemented at each site to notify students before academic probation is reached.~~ (previous addition to draft III)
- Addition and deletion to the Disqualification paragraph as follows: at the conclusion of spring semester may not attend any college within the District during the next consecutive fall semester except by petition. The student may, however, attend enroll the next consecutive summer term or spring intersession.
- Addition to Academic Disqualification paragraph as follows: whose spring semester grade

J. Ford shared the response from the Cuyamaca Academic Senate meeting on BP 5016 draft III she presented on February 8. Consensus was the minimum of 6 units attempted with GPA below 2.0 is too low for student placement on probation. She met with B. Appenzeller who stated the “*Appropriate interventions*” sentence would work better in the

Administrative Procedures rather than in the board policy as this would make intervention mandatory.

B. Schmiege reported she met in smaller group meetings at Grossmont College where faculty suggested a need for strong evidence from research data before a change is made. She stated the 12 units in the current policy was a mistake, and suggested we make the correction back to zero units to match the current practice. She asked that we wait to make changes to BP 5016 until Colleague is implemented, as there may be more changes need. She suggested a pilot study with probation of students at different units.

B. Hertel stated we would not have a different policy for different students because of legal implications.

B. Smith stated she would not take BP 5016 to the Grossmont Academic Senate until there is a finished product. She would not present changes to current practice (zero units) without research data to back up the change (current policy is 12 units).

J. Ford stated that with accreditation coming, the purpose of DCEC is to ensure the board policy, college catalogs, and actual practice match. Cuyamaca College faculty does not agree with Grossmont College faculty. If the current BP 5016 is 12 units, we must change our practice and catalogs to match.

D. Colli suggested that if we are close to resolution between colleges, we define our policy at 6 units versus 12 units, and then define a research request to learn what is most effective. He stated continued discussion might not change the colleges' position at this time.

J. Al-Amin stated board policy should apply to both colleges to avoid confusion for students. Do we want probation at one school and disqualification at both colleges? Other multi-college districts are consistent with one policy.

B. Smith stated we were talking about probation. She asked if we are now talking about disqualification too. She stated the design has flaws and she was not confident in changes. Our students are human beings, and we cannot make changes without data to support them. She suggested we go back to zero units and continue with current practice at each college.

C. Chiriboga stated it is confusing to students to leave practice and policy ambiguous. Legally the catalog should match policy and practice.

B. Schmiege stated it does not matter what the board policy states, the students only look at the catalog.

M. Wangler stated we should change the policy to 6 units as previously agreed with the appropriate intervention statement. The colleges could determine what that intervention is. Cuyamaca College originally wanted 12 units. The 6 units was a compromise both colleges and the Cuyamaca Academic Senate agreed to. We should stick with our previous agreement.

B. Smith stated we need intervention at zero units. If a student is disqualified, there is more weight with the student when they must stay out for a semester. She suggested we do a study on the past five years before making a decision, but does not want us to look for data to match our decision.

B. Hertel stated intervention might occur at anytime as defined by the school. This is formal versus informal.

J. Ford suggested we go with the previously agreed compromise of 6 units. Grossmont can intervene at 6 units. We can then study the effect. Waiting to looking back to what was done in the past is not an option.

D. Colli stated it would be helpful to know how many students would be disqualified based on a joint college GPA disqualification process by going back five years to look at how zero, six, and twelve units would affect disqualification numbers.

P. Wright asked what we are looking for. Do you want counts?

B. Smith stated she wanted counts.

P. Wright stated there is a need to define our purpose. Are we looking at student persistence, or student movement to other colleges? Gathering data in itself is not useful without a defined purpose.

B. Schmiege stated she wanted to know what students do when they receive the probation letter. Have student actions been consistent?

C. Chiriboga stated there is a down side of not coming to agreement. The legal side comes in when there is a problem. Practice and policy must match.

J. Al-Amin stated the April governing board meeting is the drop-dead date for the printing of catalogs.

D. Colli stated it would behoove us to come to an agreement.

B. Smith asked how we came up with 6 units. She stated she wanted a study to back up any changes before taking this issue to Grossmont Academic Senate.

M. Wangler held up the Brad Tiffany October 30, 2006 letter to DCEC. The letter included Brad's table showing the number and percentage of 1149 students, who earned probation at Grossmont College in spring 2006, and who would have been on probation if the policy changed from 3 to 12 units. The percentage ranged from 6.2% at 3 units to 60% at 12 units.

J. Marron suggested we compromise and go forward with 6 units.

D. Colli stated we must resolve this issue and call for another meeting.

B. Hertel stated he would work with P. Wright to develop research options, and L. Davidson would contact members to set up a special meeting time to continue discussion.

BP 4225 Course Repetition will be moved to the next meeting because of time constraints.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

The next regularly scheduled meeting is on March 16 at 1:00 p.m. in the Heritage of the Americas Museum.

:ld