

Student Affairs Committee

Minutes: Wednesday, March 27, 2019

Attendees: Beatriz Magallon, Esau Tovar, Sheila Cordova, Donna Davis-King, Stanley Hecht, Denise Kinsella, Mike Tuitasi, Alicia Villalpando

Guest: Tiffany Inabu

Excused/Absent: Tom Peters, Lucia Aguilar-Cole: Student Rep, Eric Hwang: Student Rep

Call to order: 12:14pm

Introductions:

1. **Public Comments:** None.
2. **Approval of Minutes: March 13, 2019:**
 - The Committee had no changes.

Motion to approve Minutes as is, Esau moves, Denise 2nd, (6) Yes (1) Abstention at 12:16pm

3. **Information Item:**

a) *Status on Preferred/Affirmed Name & Pronoun Policy*

- Info is strictly FYI, will happen over time
- First name only – does not apply to last names
- Tackle pronouns as well
- Presents challenges with WebSIS technology and for MIS
- Program updates expected completion next summer
- WebSIS expected to run until October 2020
- Today's information items have not been vetted by MIS
 - Met with Nate Donahue and Mike
 - Recommendations from students
 - Adapted from other California Community Colleges
- Pronoun issue is more difficult – considering a set selection/designation
- Bea asked if this would be part of the application. Esau responded it would be under the Corsair Connect student profile.
 - It would include integration with Canvas
 - Instructor would see preferred name change on roster and grade roster
 - Roster would include preferred pronoun
- MIS needs to make changes on each task
 - Small group of students would be easier to update manually
 - Only allowing a small group may lead to obtrusive questions, equity concerns
 - Automation would be a big project for MIS
 - Senior Staff has been discussing individual requests vs. automation
 - Senior Staff is committed but it may take time to implement
 - Moving to a new student information system would resolve programming issues
 - Not a small change, impacts multiple areas
- Mike said first change would be on roster. Complaints from students have been faculty using their legal names instead

of preferred names. The second change would be to the student's email. Esau responded the email was deployed as LASTNAME_FIRSTNAME and would be complicated for MIS to update.

- Bea asked when the changes could be completed for this smaller group. Esau responded there is no timeline. There will be a meeting soon with Senior Staff.
- Requires a communication with district because there are a lot of complexities, cannot speculate
- Donna pointed out purposes for preferred name are varied and asked why the onus is on the college if there is a legal process to change one's name.
 - Esau responded that we process name changes for students that have completed a court ordered legal name change
 - Issues occur when a student is in the process
 - Admissions & Records will not change name by request only
- Can update Preferred Name, but it goes nowhere because it is not incorporated into other systems
 - Canvas implementation appears easy, but MIS has challenges
- Donna asked if we suggest students complete name changes
 - Mike responded that name changes are costly, some students are undecided, and it does not address non-binary
- Denise added that some international students face safety concerns. Addressing transgender students by legal name is dangerous for students from intolerant countries.
- Sheila asked if changes will appear in the student profile of Canvas
 - Esau responded we don't have the capacity (only two people) to manually adjust for the entire population. Not addressing the entire population could lead to claims of discrimination.
 - Bea added that it might be more manageable to start updating locations that are safety concerns. Esau responded that if one location is updated, it is expected everywhere.
- Sheila suggested adding a notes feature in Canvas near the student's name. Donna responded that she uses something similar in her gradebook to add notes to her roster. Esau said it may be possible to add a similar feature to mProfessor. This could be implemented sooner than other solutions.
- Alicia asked if CCCApply asks students for this information. Esau responded that it does, but it can only be used for equity and reporting purposes. The school cannot use it to individually identify the student.
- Bea thanked Esau for the thorough study and policy draft of recommendations.

4. Update On:

a) AR 5010 Admissions

- Bea received some questions from Exec and AR returned to the Committee.
- Bea asked if "*high school graduate*" could be eliminated. Esau responded technically under education code high school graduate and 18 years of age is used and suggested changing the "*and*" to an "*or*." Language updated to "*high school graduate or 18 years of age.*"
- Alicia recommended changing "*original*" to "*official*" proof of completion. Esau confirmed proof of completion must be official.
- Bea asked if it is a violation for out of state students taking noncredit courses without fees. Denise said she had been advised by Erica LeBlanc that F-1 students cannot enroll in noncredit courses because of the funding model. Esau responded that the legislature passed a bill concerning residency stating there is no residency determination for students enrolled in noncredit courses. Noncredit has no fees. As an example, B-1 students on tourist visas cannot be admitted for credit courses. Esau added that the college receives noncredit funding based on headcount, not citizenship or residency. Noncredit coursework that leads to a certificate of completion provides more funding. Other colleges have standalone courses but do not receive the same level of funding. At this time all courses are on ground. If online noncredit courses are added, the onus will be on Academic Affairs to work with MIS to limit noncredit to students with California mailing or permanent addresses. Esau said he can see the rationale that out of state students are not paying California taxes, but Admissions & Records is not required to check.
- Bea asked for clarification on if F2 students are always excluded. Denise responded that she will need to follow up with Erica LeBlanc. Bea pointed out that language from Santa Barbara Community College does not have limitations. Denise responded she will need to follow up.
- Bea asked if titles should be adjusted. Esau responded that the titles are specific to SMC. Esau recommended adjusting "*Admissions*" title to "*Admission Eligibility*" for clarification.

- Donna asked if language stating fees are not charged for noncredit courses should be added. Esau responded it is current practice but should not be included in the AR. Sheila responded some courses may have fees for supplies.
- Bea asked if "*Admission of Nonresident*" is confusing. Alicia recommended changing the language. Denise recommended changing it to "*Admission of F-1 and F-2 Status Students.*"
- Denise will clarify F-1 and F-2 student eligibility for noncredit courses.

No motion. Information Item postponed for clarification.

5. Action Items:

a) AR 4226 (4111.7) Enrollment Overlap & Time Conflicts

- Bea mentioned other schools and Title V language refers to multiple and overlapping enrollment. Esau said multiple refers to when students are enrolled in different sections of the same course in the same term, but SMC does not have open entry/open exit courses.
- Sheila said hybrid courses have a lot of the courses online and asked if the on ground portion could be provided through Zoom. Sheila asked for verification that legally the overlap would still exist. Esau confirmed.
- Bea asked if language regarding multiple enrollment should be included. Esau responded it could be copied from Title V. Bea asked if the language should be "*Overlap*" or "*Time Conflict*." Alicia prefers Time Conflict. Denise responded that the regulation uses the language "*overlap*," not "*time conflict*." Bea said Title V uses "*Multiple & Overlapping Enrollments*" and Sheila responded both are descriptive. Title language remains "*Enrollment Overlap and Time Conflicts*."
- Bea said that the 30 minute gap requirement is not included in Title V and asked if it should be adjusted. Esau responded that it is case by case and it depends on details. Unsubstantiated claims are denied. The impacted instructor needs to approve. Admissions & Records is supposed to follow-up with the instructor's logs confirming the time the student was late and when it was made up. Esau mentioned that the current system works for the most part, and suggested changes will lead to strict follow-up procedures with instructors similar to Arranged Hours. With the current system, approval is possible, but it is case by case. The 30 minute minimum between campuses is enforced automatically through Corsair Connect.
- Bea said that it may be affecting the college's enrollment numbers since students are unaware of this process and tracking those that didn't enroll is not possible. Esau responded that he would need to see the evidence of the impact. Esau added that education code is clear that convenience is not a factor in granting an exception. A course that has one section that is taught per year would be handled differently from an English 101 section. Esau said he could see the benefit of automating the process, but it would introduce additional problems. Provided an example of a section with a performance/activity requirement that lacked the required documentation, leading to a loss of FTES. Bea responded that she has received responses from faculty suggesting the 30 minute requirement is excessive. She asked if Senior Staff supported the thirty minute and its impact on enrollment, Esau said yes.
- Sheila said the shuttle service can take time. Alicia added that having a car as a detail for time conflict determination is an equity issue for students without cars.
- Mike added that a 15 minute travel time to the Malibu campus would be unrealistic.
- Bea asked about the difference between a 15 minute overlap 10 minute gap. Esau responded that 10 minutes are required between classes.
- Alicia recommended updating the language to remove "*his/her*" as well as add "*Admissions & Records website*" as the location where the form can be found under number 3.
- Sheila asked if the 30 minute gap is because of Bundy. Esau responded that it has been 30 minutes for as long as he can remember.

Motion to approve this AR with the changes, Denise moves, Esau 2nd, (8) Yes at 1:32pm

b) AR 4340 Credit Course Enrollment Limitation

- Bea said under the League it was titled Course Repetition. Alicia said this AR used to be titled Course Repetition but the Committee changed the title during the changes to the multiple repeats and grouping of families.
- Donna suggested naming it "Credit Course Repetition. Esau said "Credit" should be added because noncredit may develop different rules.
- Alicia said there are some differences between the League's template and the old AR. Esau asked why the League's

template should be used over the old AR. Bea responded that legal language needs to be added. Esau responded that the language is already included.

- Alicia asked if the League's language pertaining to CSU/UC (bullet points) was included in the old AR. Sheila responded it can be found under number 6, and Esau added that the language addressing activity courses (paragraph after the League's bullet points) can be found under number 5.
- Bea asked about the petition for requesting permission to repeat a course. Esau responded first repeat is automatic, and the second requires a counselor's permission. Esau recommended revising composition from "a review" to "the Special Considerations Committee." Sheila asked if the petition was different for different coursework. Esau responded that the petition process is the same, but different program leaders may make the decision. Sheila suggested reducing the language repeating the petition process. Alicia suggested stating the petition process once in the AR and then referring to that section.
- Alicia introduced practices from other colleges as an addition to section 3:
 - Alicia said Los Angeles City College will keep the student's highest grade, regardless of order taken. For example, if a student first receives a "D" in a course and receives an "F" after repeating the course, LACC policy will slash the "F" and SMC would slash the "D" because the "F" is the most recent grade. Esau said he believes that practice is inconsistent with Title V, and the college already allows forgiveness for 30 units of withdrawal and 30 units of academic for a total of 60 units and allowing another type of forgiveness seems inappropriate and inconsistent with Ed Code. Alicia responded that Ed Code says the first two substandard grades are slashed.
 - Alicia said Pasadena City College and El Camino College has a petition process for courses that were repeated for a "C" or better at a different college and it is annotated as a course repeat on the student's transcript. Alicia said while the UCs will always use the highest grade for GPA, the CSUs may average if it is not annotated. Esau responded that the CSU policy is to use the highest grade. Alicia responded that a chart exists that shows some CSU campuses do average repeated courses. Esau responded that Janet from the Transfer Center should reach out to the different schools. Esau added that SMC uses the higher grade, and the student could potentially qualify for academic and/or progress renewal. Alicia responded that Title V's section on academic renewal is titled "Academic Renewal Not Course Repetition." Esau responded that the college as an institution is different than the college as a system. Alicia added that a lot of students transfer to CSUs and are at a disadvantage with the current process. Esau agreed that there could be oversights and provided an example of an evaluator for the College that came from CSU Fullerton who said the practice at Fullerton is that if the transcript does not indicate the student is certified, Fullerton does not look at any enclosures with the transcript.
- Section pertaining to earning more than two substandard grades under 4b
- Section pertaining to Disability under 2d
- Bea said she will annotate the overlapping language between the League and the former AR, and the Committee can address the missing portions at the next meeting

No motion. Action Item postponed for revisions.

6. Announcements:

- Next meeting April 17th, 2019. Reviewed possible AR's.
- Mike said Bob indicated a lot of work was needed on AR. Mike will forward a template on freedom of speech reviewed by the legal group in the event that Bob does not respond. Esau responded that the Committee has not heard back from Bob regarding concerns on the DSPS AR nor from Senior Staff on language for religious accommodations.
- Bea added that she might be able to get a hold of Greg to see if he is ready for the 17th if Student Life is not ready.
- Esau recommended, for improving enrollment, reviewing the research study that Laurie Guglielmo requested regarding students on probation regarding unit limitations.
- Bea said next meeting will focus on Associated Students in an effort to finalize the Student Life AR's by the end of the semester. The Committee will then try to finish AR 4340. In May, the Committee will try to finish the Code of Academic Conduct, Honor Code, and Honor Council. Bea said we should try to first finish the AR's up for review under the 5 year cycle that have priority.

Meeting Adjourned: 2:03pm

Respectfully Submitted by Nicholas Chambers