

Student Affairs Committee
Minutes: Wednesday, October 18, 2017

Attendees: Beatriz Magallon, Esau Tovar, Daniel Freeman, Alicia Villalpando, Kayli Weatherford, Donna Davis-King, Stanley Hecht, Deyna Hearn, Edgar Gonzales (student rep), Kathy Pho (student Rep). **Interested Parties (Guests):** Arthur M. Sanchez, Commissioner to Santiago Guerrero

Excused/Absent: Denise Kinsella

1. Call to order 1:04 pm
2. Public Comments: None
3. Minutes from October 10/4/17
Motion to approve the Minutes by Esau, 2nd by Kayli. The committee voted 7 - yes, 1 - abstain,
4. AR's for Consideration
 - a. AR 4111.8 Enrollment Priorities (5055)
 - i. Bea attached information to the committee's packet from the Admissions website regarding enrollment priorities, along with the loss of BOG Fee Waiver Appeal and flow chart from Chancellor's Office.
 - b. General Discussion on what to include in AR 4111.8
 - i. Bea pointed out the red sample text from the league. Kathy asked what the "league" is. Esau answered it is a statewide association of trustees for California Community Colleges. We pay for a subscription service that alerts us whenever a change in law takes effect. These changes are on the templates from the league.
 - ii. Esau mentioned, he thinks it would be best to keep the version of groups consistent with what is used in practice. Not necessarily reproduce exactly what is written on the document from the Admissions website, but to have a summary of it in the AR.
 - iii. Esau pointed out that the consultant only partially pasted title 5 language. Because the current legislation is lengthier. In 2014 it was amended and spells out EOPS and homeless youth etc. It does make reference to 100 units or more, loss of priority. However, locally SMC decided this would be 90 units.
 - iv. Bea mentioned they had a presentation in the counseling department on students placed on probation. There is no notification on loss of enrollment priority, nor of the appeal process for enrollment priority. Bea thinks the District should notify students that are on probation, and how they can appeal.
 - v. When students hit 90 unit mark they lose priority enrollment. Bea thinks students should be given a warning when they reach 70% which would be 63 units. Esau thinks it may be difficult to notify students at the 70% mark. However, Esau will put this on the Production schedule.
 - vi. Kathy Po raises the concern that students are not notified what group they are in. She would like to know if we are able to inform students of what group they belong to? Esau answered he would take this under advisement, but in reality there are more than 7 groups since all units are taken into account. For example, 59 units would be different than 60 units. Therefore, there are more detailed factors that influence an enrollment date and time.
 - c. Editing of AR 4111.8
 - i. Group 1: No change, by law these students have to enroll first.
 - ii. Group 2: Esau suggested a change in language, "in-district" residents and alumni.
 - iii. Suggested language change by Esau, "Student's participating in district designated programs (excluding international students) will have equal priority for enrollment regardless of the number of special programs students' participate in." Alicia would like to edit this, to "F-1 Visa students" the committee agrees.
 - iv. Group 3: Continuing students in good standing who are seeking degree or transfer. Bea thinks it should also include "between units earned and in progress at SMC." From 30-60 units.
 - v. Bea will match the language in the AR to the enrollment priority table available on the Admissions website.
 - vi. Group 4: Continuing students with higher units from 61-89, and exclude "first time students". 4 a) – continuing students, and group b) new and returning students c) returning students in good standing enrolled in less than 90 units.
 - vii. Daniel asked what the difference is between continuing and returning students. Students returning have skipped one or several semesters.

- viii. Discussion about basic skills. According to the state pre-college level courses are basic skills, thus students could exclude these classes. This could help students get a better enrollment date. When students reach 61 units we begin to exclude any non-degree basic skills. Bea thinks this is unfair as students may take advantage, since some basic skills courses still transfer, like the ESL classes. Esau raises the point that outcomes for most students that need to take a lot of basic skills courses are not favorable. Those students often do not end up transferring and/or reaching their goal. Additionally, what course transfers is up to the 4-year Universities. Bea informs that Title 5 language specifically states to exclude non-degree ESL and basic skills courses up to a maximum of 30 units that could be excluded. It is has double benefit for ESL courses as the district applies.
- ix. Group 5: Bea will copy what is on the table.
- x. For Group 6. Bea states how there was a discussion regarding student's with a bachelor's degree, should not have priority over student's that do not yet have an associate's degree. Alicia mentions due to the economic downturn, the argument was to support students coming back to college who may have lost their job.
- xi. Group 7: State law, spells out that student's on probation get the last priority.
- xii. Not only STEM majors may have a lot of units, it could be students who have switched majors.
- xiii. Alicia thinks it should be clear that an Appeal could be filed to receive a better enrollment date. However, there is discussion again on what should be stated, because there is no guarantee to a full restoration of enrollment priority date. Donna and Alicia thinks this should be stated under group 7. Esau thinks there should be a section that stands alone "Students may appeal to improve their enrollment date" and it should not be under a specific group. Because any student, in any group has the right to appeal.
- xiv. Esau thinks the language on the form should be copied and pasted from the Priority Enrollment Appeal form.
- xv. Discussion on edits of paragraph on how to notify students when they are placed on academic probation and/or potential loss of enrollment priority.
- xvi. Esau suggested keeping one paragraph as loss of priority enrollment and notification, and one paragraph for appeal.
- xvii. Regarding the appeal it is important the language reads, improved enrollment date, rather than restored enrollment date. Revisiting the former discussion again on what language to use, Donna would like to use "best available date". Esau does not want to use this language because that would mean 4 am of the first day of their group. This may not always be possible to provide to students.
- xviii. An approved appeal will result in an assigned improved priority enrollment date, within the enrollment priority group.
- xix. Bea will send finalized changes to the committee for review.
- xx. **Motion to approve with recommendations by Kathy, 2nd by Donna, Yes - Unanimous.**
- xxi. Stanley added that "the decision should be final" of the appeals committee and not subject to further appeal.
- xxii. Vote to approve with Stan's edits, **Motion to approve by Donna, 2nd by Kathy, Yes - Unanimous**

5. Announcements (none)

6. Meeting Adjourned 2.55 pm

Respectfully Submitted by Malin Bohman