



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING**  
**March 4, 2010**  
**3:00 p.m. – SSV 151**

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

- 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
- 2. OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT**
- 3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
- 4. REPORT**
  - a. Program Review – Carol Eastin
  - b. Honors Program – Karen Lubick
- 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - a. February 18, 2010 (attachment)
- 6. ACTION ITEMS**
  - a. Communications Studies equivalency (attachment)

**BREAK from 3:30pm to 3:45 pm to join the student walkout at the library quad.  
We will reconvene no later than 3:50 pm to continue the agenda.**
- 7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**
  - a. SLO assessment/WEAVE training (M. Parker)
  - b. Consensual Amorous Relationship-Board Policy Draft
  - c. Degree Requirements (Response to AB 440)
- 8. SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
  - a. Announcements
    - 2010 Vocational Education Institute – March 11 – 13, 2010 (Napa, CA)
    - 2010 Accreditation Institute – March 19 – 20, 2010 (Newport Beach, CA)
    - Statewide Senate Spring Plenary Session – April 15 – 17, 2010 (Millbrae, CA)
    - 2010 Leadership Institute – June 17 – 19, 2010 (San Diego, CA)
    - 2010 Curriculum Institute – July 8 – 10, 2010 (Santa Clara, CA)
  - b. Academic Ranking
    - Eva Pihlgren – Professor Emeritus
- 9. ADJOURNMENT**

**NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY**

Antelope Valley College prohibits discrimination and harassment based on sex, gender, race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, cancer-related medical condition, or genetic predisposition. Upon request, we will consider reasonable accommodation to permit individuals with protected disabilities to (1) complete the employment or admission process, (b) perform essential job functions, (c) enjoy benefits and privileges of similarly-situated individuals without disabilities, and (d) participate in instruction, programs, services, activities, or events.

*Upon request, this agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with disabilities, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct such request to Mr. Christos Valiotis, Academic Senate President, at (661) 722-6306 (weekdays between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.) at least 48 hours before the meeting, if possible. Public records related to agenda items for open session are available for public inspection 72 hours prior to each regular meeting at the Antelope Valley College Academic Senate's Office, Administration Building, 3041 West Avenue K, Lancaster, California 93536.*



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE  
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING  
March 4, 2010**

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Mr. Christos Valiotis, Senate President, called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

**2. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT**

- Mr. Christos Valiotis stated the Senate will be joining the coordinated campus walk out and attend the student organized demonstration held in the Library quad.
- SPBC update – the district received notification of fiscal recalculation causing the district to incur mid year cuts. A copy of the 2008 – 2009 recalculation corrections and adjustments has been included in the Senate packet for review. Mr. Valiotis reviewed the documents and stated due to the fact that we received larger than originally projected enrollment fees and property taxes, the district will have to reimburse the state by a 1.2 million dollars. The million dollar contingency plan enacted at the beginning of the academic year was justified and will offset some of the state cuts but additional fiscal cuts will be necessary. Currently, the operational budget is 85% salaries. The Unions are set to undergo negotiations where it is likely additional cuts will be addressed and implemented. Mr. Valiotis reported that in speaking with Dr. Fisher, he is still committed to avoiding layoffs at all costs.
- Mr. Valiotis requested for Senators to convey to discipline faculty the deadline to submit 2010 – 2011 Faculty Professional Development proposals is Friday, March 5, 2010.
- The Foundation Office has announced a call for Foundation Grants. Faculty should take advantage of this funding opportunity if they have a project/classroom activity they feel would meet the grant criteria.
- The Faculty Professional Development Adjunct Plan is due on Monday, March 8, 2010. Senators were encouraged to relay the message to discipline faculty.
- Senate email updates have not been distributed in the past couple of weeks due to budgetary information changing on a daily basis. Future Senate updates will be distributed within the upcoming weeks providing budget and possible negotiation updates.
- Enrollment Management update – the Palmdale campus is still in need of 80+ FTES to meet the 1000 FTES requirement for Center status. Currently there are discussions about offering late start Basic Skills courses at the Palmdale campus to make up the FTES deficit. One of the major concerns is how to pay for late start courses being that the budget situation is really tight. One idea is to pay for Blackboard fees with grant money which will free up some district money to pay for additional courses needed to meet 1000 FTES in Palmdale. If the district meets the Center status with 1000 sustained FTES there is a potential of obtaining and additional 958k in revenue. The additional state apportionment is unlikely even if we meet Center status given the current state budget situation, but there is still the need to progress and move into official Center status for future academic years.

**3. OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

None

*Mr. Valiotis requested a motion to amend the agenda to move the Honors Program report up to the first report item and allow Ms. Lubick to arrive at another campus engagement by 3:30 p.m.*

*A motion was made and seconded to amend the agenda to move the Honors Program report up to the first report item of business. Motion carried.*

**4. REPORT**

**a. Program Review – C. Eastin**

Ms. Carol Eastin reported the campus is doing very well with Program Review. Currently, there are a couple of loose ends but all in all the campus is making great progress. She will be attending division meetings to discuss the 2010 – 2011 Program Review cycle as the district moves into reviewing every four years. Some areas/divisions will be reviewing after three years (noted with an asterisks) in efforts to move to a review cycle where 25% of programs are under review each year in efforts to avoid the

backlog that occurred in the 2007 – 2009 academic years where nineteen programs being reviewed in those two years. The Palmdale Center has been added to the Program Review cycle as this area has now hired a Director and should meet center status soon.

2008 – 2009

Business Services self-study report due December 5, 2008 but not received.

Eight self-studies and peer reviews completed

2009 – 2010

Human Resources self-study report due October 31, 2009 but not received.

Student Development self-study report due October 31, 2009 but not received.

Six self-studies completed and in peer review.

2010 – 2011

**Programs to be reviewed:**

Enrollment Services\*

Financial Aid Office \*

Instructional Resources/Extended Services\*

Job Placement\*

Math, Science and Engineering\*

Palmdale Center

Physical Education and Athletics

Dr. Susan Lowry inquired if old Program Review reports can be obtained electronically for review.

Ms. Eastin indicated old Program Review documents can be found electronically in two areas:

Institutional Research webpage and the Senate webpage.

**b. Honors Program – K. Lubick**

The Alpha Iota club is adopting the “Pay It Forward” community service theme and has been actively participating in community service opportunities such as: feeding the homeless, participating in the MS Walk, and acquiring blankets to donate to domestic violence victims.

The Alpha Gamma Sigma annual convention has been scheduled for April 15 – 17, 2010. This convention is an opportunity to all community colleges to gather and discuss community service projects. There is a scholarship opportunity for students attending the amounts of \$500 - \$1500. Dr. Jaffe has agreed to attend the convention as an additional chaperone.

The Transfer Alliance Program (TAP) certification has been completed with the assistance of TAP Counselor, Susan Knapp. The college still has TAP agreements with UCLA and UCR. There were twenty-one applicants in total and two did not meet the GPA requirement and several others did not take honors courses.

Karen reported that in collaboration with Ms. Susan Knapp they have developed and proposed four Honors professional development opportunities for Standard #1 credit. If approved, they will provide opportunities to engage in discussion with Honors students and provide an opportunity where faculty can obtain assistance in developing Honors Courses.

Two new faculty have expressed interest in submitting Honors course proposals. Dr. Ron Chapman will be forwarding an Honors Course proposal for Sociology, and Dr. Richard Coffman will be forwarding an Honors Course proposal for Geology. The committee is working with other faculty to offer Honors Option courses.

The following spring semester courses have 18 students or more enrolled:

Biology 101H

English 102H (this course has 23 students enrolled and the demand for this course would suggest that two sections should be offered in the spring semesters based on the demand.)

English 236H – Shakespeare

Math 130H – Hybrid College Algebra

Music 101H  
Political Science 101H

The fall 2010 schedule has been established:

Art 101H – R. Agahari  
English 101H – J. Ahmad and K. Lubick  
English 103H – K. Mitchell  
Geology 101H – R. Coffman  
History 104H – M. Jaffe  
Math 115H – P. Villapando  
Sociology 101H – R. Chapman

The Honors Convocation has been tentatively scheduled for Friday, May 21, 2010 from 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. in the Fine Arts Quad. The date has to be confirmed but everything looks like it is lining up to be scheduled on this date.

The next Honors meeting is schedule for Monday, March 22, 2010 at 2:00 p.m. They will be working on reviewing Honors proposals from Dr. Ron Chapman and Dr. Richard Coffman. In addition, Ms. Lubick reported faculty should be considering students to nominate for the Subject Area Awards, as the memo will be distributed in the near future.

Ms. Knapp stated that Ms. Lubick should be congratulated and acknowledged for her diligent community outreach efforts. Her efforts are a testament of her commitment to the community and the Honors Program. Ms. Knapp congratulated her on a job well done.

## 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### a. February 18, 2010

A motion was made and seconded to approve the February 18, 2010 Academic Senate Meeting minutes. Ms. Sheronda Myers requested corrections be made to the name of the Student Trustee. His name is David not Steve. Motion carried as amended.

*Mr. Valiotis requested a motion to amend the agenda to remove the action item – Communication Studies Equivalency. Inadvertently this item was placed on the agenda without going through the proper procedure process.*

*A motion was made and seconded to amend the agenda to remove the action item – Communication Studies Equivalency. Motion carried.*

## 6. ACTION ITEMS

### a. Communication Studies Equivalency (attachment)

**BREAK from 3:30 p.m. to 3:45 p.m. to join the student walkout at the Library Quad. We will reconvene no later than 3:50 p.m. to continue the agenda.**

## 7. DISCUSSION

### a. SLO Assessment/WEAVE Training – M. Parker

Ms. Melanie Parker stated that on behalf of the SLO Committee she is seeking assistance and support from Senators to include adjunct faculty in the reporting process for SLO Assessments. In addition, there is also a great need to get acquired data into the WEAVE management system. The campus needs to get moving in entering data because currently the district would be classified at a 32% reporting rate which is dismal and places us in a precarious situation being that we are undergoing an Accreditation Self Study. Ms. Parker implored for Senators to convey to discipline faculty all spring semester data should be sent to division faculty SLO data managers and to recognize that the SLO process is not going to vanish but has been established to be an ongoing process. She indicated she will be putting out a list of faculty leads who are responsible for entering course data, so that faculty know where to send their data results. A brief discussion ensued regarding difficulties experienced when entering data, having the Faculty Union to make a statement regarding SLO data reporting being a part of a faculty's workload because some adjunct faculty may feel SLO data collection/reporting are

not part of their job. Ms. Heidi Preschler reported adjuncts can apply for some compensation for data collection/reporting, but the bigger issue is to facilitating an opportunity to engage in dialoging about course requirements and assessments. Mr. Christos Valiotis stated that in his experience in facilitating SLO professional development opportunities, adjunct faculty were actively seeking the opportunity to participate in campus progress and full-time faculty need to take the leadership role in this effort to get adjunct faculty involved in the reporting process as the SLO process is ultimately being performed for the benefit of students.

**b. Consensual Amorous Relationship – Board Policy Draft**

Mr. Valiotis reported at the last meeting the Consensual Amorous Relationship Board Policy Draft was distributed. There will very likely be revisions made to the drafted policy and discipline faculty feedback will be obtained at the March 18, 2010 Senate Meeting to take back to CCC. Ms. Heidi Preschler provided a brief historical overview on the matter. The Faculty Union worked on putting language together regarding conflict of interest in 2000 but it was dropped off the radar. The district is looking at putting a board policy together to avoid a potential legal nightmare and protect employees. Mr. Valiotis reiterated that Senators should obtain feedback from division constituents to report at the next Senate meeting.

**c. Degree Requirements (Response to AB 440)**

Mr. Valiotis provided a brief historical context on the efforts taken by state legislatures over the past several years to revise the process instituted for students to obtain an Associates degree. The issue has died and resurfaced several times with the last proposed revision included language to allow students with 60 units eligible to obtain an Associates Degree, regardless of what course work taken by the student. Statewide Senate passed for resolutions to speak against any implementation of a process would eliminate local authority in regards to Associates degree requirements. Currently, Statewide Senate is asking local Senates to vote on this matter so they know how to proceed. One line of thought is in efforts to avoid a total lose of control is to compromise on this issue and support the Transfer Degree. Statewide Senate will then work to change current Title 5 language in efforts to eliminate legislator interfering in local authority. A lengthy discussion ensued amongst Senators. Mr. Valiotis indicated he needed to obtain a general consensus of how the Senate would like to vote on this important matter. Senators expressed their concerns and opposition of any efforts to eliminate local authority in regards to Associate Degree requirements. One of the concerns raised was the loss of control would put specific disciplines in great jeopardy for State Accreditation purposes (i.e. Nursing). Mr. Valiotis reported the timeline is critical and local Senates need to decide whether they want Statewide Senate to fight the legislature as much as possible and move towards a compromise, which then Statewide Senate will then move to change Title 5 language to maintain degree authority. Action on this matter will be taken in the next couple of weeks. Mr. Valiotis indicated the importance of this issue should be conveyed to discipline faculty so they are aware of the efforts being made in the local legislature and Statewide Senate. Senators were in unanimous consensus to vote in support of allowing Statewide Senate to negotiate a compromise and revise Title 5 language to maintain local degree authority.

**8. SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**

**a. Announcements**

- 2010 Vocational Education Institute – March 11 – 13, 2010 (Napa, CA)
- 2010 Accreditation Institute – March 19 – 20, 2010 (Newport Beach, CA)
- Statewide Senate Spring Plenary Session – April 15 – 17, 2010 (Millbrae, CA)
- 2010 Leadership Institute – June 17 – 19, 2010 (San Diego, CA)
- 2010 Curriculum Institute – July 8 – 10, 2010 (Santa Clara, CA)

**b. Academic Ranking**

- Eva Pihlgren – Professor Emeritus

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the Academic Ranking of Professor Emeritus to Eva Pihlgren. Motion carried.*

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the March 4, 2010 Senate meeting at 4:26 p.m. Motion carried.

<b><u>MEMBERS PRESENT</u></b>		
Paul Ahad	MaryAnne Holcomb	Sheronda Myers
Carolyn Burrell	Sandra Hughes	Harish Rao
Debra Feickert	Susan Knapp	Sandra Robinson
Claude Gratton	Jonet Leighton (Proxy)	Justin Shores
Lee Grishman	Susan Lowry	John Taylor
Jack Halliday	Candace Martin	Christos Valiotis
Linda Harmon	Kathy Moore	Alex Webster
<b><u>MEMBERS ABSENT</u></b>		<b><u>GUEST PRESENT</u></b>
Counseling Rep. Vacancy	Terry Rezek	Steve Brown
Glenn Haller	Casey Scudmore	Carol Eastin
Berkeley Price	Ken Shafer	Patricia Márquez
		Heidi Preschler
		Ted Younglove

Antelope Valley College  
 Estimated Apportionment Calculations - Tentative Budget ( FTES Data based on P-2 CCFS 320 - April 2008)  
 Fiscal Year 2008-2009  
 General Fund

<b>BASE</b>				
	Funding		Totals	2008-2009 Recalc
	FTES	Rate		
Credit	10,993.04	4,564.83	50,181,359	50,181,359
Noncredit	71.13	2,744.95	195,248	195,248
<b>I. Total Base Revenue</b>			<b>50,376,607</b>	<b>50,376,607</b>
Foundation Grant - Per Chancellor's Office			4,567,125.00	4,567,125.00
<b>Total Base</b>			<b>54,943,732.08</b>	<b>54,943,732.08</b>

<b>COLA</b>				
<b>II. COLA - 0.00%</b>			<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

<b>RESTORATION</b>				
	Restored FTES	Funding Rate	Totals	
Credit	0	4,367.00	0.00	
Noncredit	0	2,626.00	0.00	
<b>III. Total Restoraton Revenue</b>			<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

<b>GROWTH</b>				
Allowable Growth Rate	3.80% as of 6-22-08			
	Growth FTES	Funding Rate	Totals	
Credit	489.56	4,564.83	2,234,755.78	2,056,773.25 (177,982.53)
Noncredit	(20.84)	2,744.96	(57,204.92)	7,191.79 (50,013.13)
<b>IV. Total Growth Revenue</b>			<b>2,177,550.86</b>	<b>2,063,965.03 (113,585.82)</b>

<b>Total Computational Revenue</b>	<b>57,121,282.93</b>	<b>57,007,697.11</b>	
<b>Deficit Coefficient 0.9851542410 (per Ex. C)</b>	<b>56,273,274.13</b>	<b>56,325,703.52</b>	
Property Taxes	6,216,058.00	7,121,489.00	905,431.00
Student Enrollment Fees	2,124,341.00	2,468,132.00	343,791.00
State General Apportionment	<u>47,932,875.13</u>	<u>46,736,082.52</u>	(1,196,792.61)
	<b>56,273,274.13</b>	<b>56,325,703.52</b>	52,429.39
State Comput. General Apportionment + Growth	<b>58,450,824.99</b>	<b>58,389,668.56</b>	(61,156.43)
State Comput. General Apportionment + Growth no deficit	<b>59,298,833.79</b>	<b>59,071,662.15</b>	(227,171.64)

What does the PY Correction consists of for General Apport.?	(1,196,792.61)	Total District PY Corr
	61,156.43	TCR Deficit Coeff. Diff
	(113,585.82)	Reduction in Growth
	905,431.00	Increase in Prop Tax
	343,791.00	Increase in Enroll Fee
	0.00	

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES  
2008-09 RECALCULATION  
ANTELOPE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

EXHIBIT E

Workload measures:	Base Funding	Marginal Funding	Base FTES	Restored FTES	Funded Growth FTES	Stability FTES	Total Funded FTES	Unfunded FTES	Actual FTES
Credit FTES	4,564,825108	4,564,825100	10,893.04	0.00	450.57	0.00	11,443.61	1,393.41	12,837.02
Noncredit FTES	2,744,857800	2,744,857800	71.13	0.00	2.82	0.00	73.75	8.11	81.86
Noncredit - CDCP FTES	3,232,067600	3,232,067600	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total FTES:</b>			<b>11,064.17</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>453.39</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>11,517.36</b>	<b>1,401.52</b>	<b>12,918.88</b>

**I Base Revenue +/- Restore or Decline**

A Basic Allocation		\$4,567,125
B Base Revenue		\$50,376,554
1 Credit Base Revenue	\$50,181,305	
2 Noncredit Base Revenue	\$195,249	
3 Career Development College NonCr	\$0	
C Current Year Decline		\$0
<b>D Total Base Revenue Less Decline</b>		<b>\$54,843,679</b>

**V Other Revenues Adjustments**

A Audit Adjustment	\$0
B CDCP Rate Adjustment	\$0
<b>Total Revenue Adjustments</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**VI Stability Adjustment**

	\$0
--	-----

**VII Total Computational Revenue**

(sum of II, III, IV, V, & VI)

Deficit Coefficient	0.8880368157	\$-681,393
Adjusted Revenue Entitlement		\$58,325,655

**II Inflation Adjustment**

A Statewide Inflation Adjustment	0%	
B Inflation Adjustment Entitlement		\$0
<b>C Current Year Base Revenue + Inflation Adjustment</b>		<b>\$54,943,679</b>

**III Basic Allocation & Restoration**

Basic Allocation Adjustment		\$0
Basic Allocation Adjustment COLA		\$0
Restoration		\$0
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$0</b>

**IV Growth**

A Unadjusted Growth Rate	13.54%	
B Constrained Growth Rate	3.72%	
C Constrained Growth Cap	\$1,873,468	
D Actual Growth	\$8,446,899	
E Funded Credit Growth Revenue	\$2,058,772	
F Funded Noncredit Growth Revenue	\$7,197	
G Funded Noncredit CDCP Growth Revenue	\$0	
<b>Total Growth Revenue</b>		<b>\$2,063,969</b>

**VIII District Revenue Source**

A1 Property Taxes	\$7,121,488
A2 Less Property Taxes Excess	\$0
B Student Enrollment Fees	\$2,468,132
C State General Apportionment	\$46,736,054
<b>D Total Available General Revenue</b>	<b>\$56,325,655</b>

**IX Other Allowances and Total Apportionments**

A State General Apportionment	\$46,736,054
B Statewide Average Replacement Cost	\$80,289
Number of Faculty Not Hired Full-time Faculty Adjustment	\$0.00
<b>C Net State General Apportionment</b>	<b>\$46,736,054</b>

**X Remaining Unrestored Decline (Informational)**  
(as of the most recent apportionment)

A 1st Year	\$0
B 2nd Year	\$0
C 3rd Year	\$0
<b>D Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Regular Growth Caps adjusted by a factor of 1.10168474 to match funding.

**Basic Allocation Calculation**  
College/Center Base Funding Rates:

Single College District Funding Rates: Total FTES			Multi-College District Funding Rate: Total FTES			
>20,000	>10,000	<=10,000	Rural	>20,000	>10,000	<=10,000
\$5,635,999	\$4,428,727	\$3,321,545	\$553,591	\$4,428,727	\$3,875,136	\$3,321,545
Single College District - College FTES			Multi-College District - College FTES:			Total Colleges
>20,000	>10,000	<=10,000	Rural	>20,000	>10,000	<=10,000
0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue:						Total Colleges
>20,000	>10,000	<=10,000	Rural	>20,000	>10,000	<=10,000
\$0	\$4,428,727	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
						\$4,428,727
State Approved Center: Funding Rates			Total State Approved Centers	Total State Approved Centers Revenue		
0	\$1,107,182		0			\$0
Grandfathered or Previously Approved Center: Funding Rates @ FTES Levels						
>1,000	>750	>500	>250	<=250		
\$1,107,182	\$830,386	\$553,591	\$276,786	\$138,398		
Number of Grandfathered or Previously Approved Centers: @ Total FTES						
>1,000	>750	>500	>250	<=250	Total Grandfathered or Previously Approved Centers	Total Basic Allocation Revenue
0	0	0	0	1	1	\$4,687,125
Grandfathered or Previously Approved Center Revenue:						
>1,000	>750	>500	>250	<=250	Total Grandfathered or Approved Center	
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$138,398	\$138,398	

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES  
MONTHLY PAYMENT SCHEDULE  
2008-09 RECALCULATION CORRECTIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS**

**EXHIBIT D**

**ANTELOPE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY**

<b>PROGRAM</b>	<b>P2 + Deferral Repayments</b>	<b>RECAL</b>	<b>ADJUSTMENT</b>
GENERAL APPORTIONMENT	47,932,822	46,738,054	-1,198,788
ENROLL FEE ADMIN (2%)	58,087	58,087	0
APPRENTICE ALLOWANCE	0	0	0
BASIC SKILLS	489,665	495,155	5,490
S. F. A. A.	485,971	485,971	0
E. O. P. S.	1,006,531	1,005,691	-840
C. A. R. E.	328,459	328,167	-272
D. S. P. S.	940,898	942,868	1,970
STATE HOSPITALS	0	0	0
CALWORKS	921,622	924,857	3,235
MATRICULATION (CREDIT)	790,780	790,780	0
MATRICULATION (NONCREDIT)	18,489	18,476	-13
FAC. & STAFF DIVERSITY	14,858	14,858	0
PART-TIME FACULTY ALLOCATION	489,882	489,882	0
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	36,038	36,038	0
INST. EQUIPMENT & LIBRARY	120,822	120,822	0
SCHOL. MAINT. & REPAIRS	120,633	120,633	0
TANF	282,097	282,722	625
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	255,697	341,401	85,704
NURSING EDUCATION	313,244	313,244	0
OTHER ADJUSTMENTS	0	0	0
STATE CAREER TECH. EDUCATION 07-08	369,700	369,700	0
STATE CAREER TECH. EDUCATION 06-07	0	0	0
CHILDCARE TAXBAILOUT	0	0	0
TRANSFER & ARTICULATION	4,000	4,000	0
FUNDING OBLIGATION SETTLEMENT(SB1133)	91,852	91,852	0
STATE CAREER TECH. EDUCATION 08-09	400,000	400,000	0
PART-TIME FAC OFFICE HOURS	97,612	79,118	-18,494
PART-TIME FAC INS.	25,252	14,235	-11,017
RETURN TO TITLE IV	0	0	0
MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCE	0	0	0
GENERAL APPORTIONMENT BACKFILLS	646,037	646,037	0
<b>TOTAL PRIOR YEAR ADJUSTMENT TO BE MADE ON 2008-09 APPORTIONMENT</b>			<b>-1,130,380</b>

## **Consensual Amorous Relationships**

### **Summary**

Antelope Valley College promotes an atmosphere of professionalism based on mutual trust and respect. The integrity of interaction among faculty, staff and students must not be compromised. Consensual amorous relationships are prohibited in certain instances as outlined below.

### **Conduct**

Consensual amorous relationships between members of the College community are prohibited when one participant has direct evaluative or supervisory authority over the other because such relationships create an inherent conflict of interest. Examples of such relationships that are prohibited include, but are not limited to, employee (faculty, staff or student)/student and supervisor (faculty, staff or student)/subordinate, when those relationships involve direct evaluative or supervisory authority. In such cases, the individual in the evaluative or supervisory position has an obligation to disclose the consensual amorous relationship to his or her administrative superior and to cooperate with the administrative superior in removing himself or herself from any such evaluative or supervisory activity in order to eliminate the existing or potential conflict of interest.

### **Definition**

For purposes of this policy, consensual amorous relationships exist when two individuals mutually and consensually understand a relationship to be romantic and/or sexual in nature except when those two individuals are married to each other. Direct evaluative or supervisory authority exists when one participant is personally involved in evaluating, assessing, grading, or otherwise determining the other participant's academic or employment performance, progress or potential.

### **Violations**

A violation of this policy, regardless of the manner in which it is brought to the attention of the College, may lead to disciplinary action as appropriate, up to and including termination of employment in the most serious circumstances, following appropriate processes for such discipline.

## **Resolutions about degree requirements at California Community Colleges**

### **(In response to the proposed State Assembly Bill 440)**

On Feb 23, 2010, at 5:24 PM, Julie wrote:

Dear Local Senate President:

The Academic Senate Executive Committee is in need of direction from the field relating to resolutions referred to the Executive Committee at the Fall 2009 Plenary. One resolution (4.02 and its amendment 4.02.01) directed us to actively avoid the introduction of a California community college degree options in legislation. A second resolution (4.03 and its amendment 4.03.01) had, as its goal, the same intent as 4.02 and 4.02.01– it defined an action that sought to prevent our degrees from being legislated. It called for Title 5 language to be drafted that would accomplish the same thing as the proposed legislation, effectively making the legislation moot and delineating a degree option in Title 5 that colleges currently can offer. A third resolution, 4.04 and its amendment 4.04.01 also addressed this topic.

Due to the legislative cycle, if we wait until Spring 2010 to reconsider resolution 4.03, any action we might take would be too late to prevent legislation from being passed. Senate Bill 1440 has been introduced by Senator Padilla and is comparable to the bill discussed at the Fall 2009 Plenary. The current text of the bill (as of February 23, 2010) has been provided to you as an attachment and its status can be checked at any time by going to [http://www.aroundthecapitol.com/Bills/SB\\_1440/](http://www.aroundthecapitol.com/Bills/SB_1440/). If we are to take effective action, we need to act soon, as the bill is already moving through the legislative process. Therefore, the Executive Committee tasked a subcommittee to develop materials informing the field about the issues surrounding the idea of a transfer degree and to provide an opportunity for field discussions and, ultimately, direction to the Executive Committee. We encourage you to read the attached information and invite you and/or your delegate to join us on one of the following calls:

Monday, March 1, 1:30 – 3:00pm

Tuesday, March 2, 9:00 – 10:30am / Tuesday, March 2, 3:00 – 4:30pm

Wednesday, March 3, 12:30 – 2:00pm / Wednesday, March 3, 4:00 – 5:30pm

Thursday, March 4, 10:00 – 11:30am

**CCCConfer Call-in number: (888) 886-3951**

**Pass Code: 932646**

Following these informational meetings, the Executive Committee will distribute a short survey to determine the will of the field. Please expect to receive the survey no later than March 8. We will need your response by March 12. You are encouraged to discuss this topic with your local senate in order to arrive at a consensus as to how you believe the Academic Senate should proceed.

We look forward to exploring this topic with you further,

Academic Senate Executive Committee

**4.02 F09 Response to AB 440: “Transfer Degree”  
Stephanie Dumont, Golden West College, Executive Committee**

**The resolution was referred to state senate exec for further study**

Whereas, Assembly Bill 440 (Beall) as of July 2, 2009 would authorize a community college to award an associate degree in a major or area of emphasis designated “for transfer” to students who complete a minimum of 60 transferable semester units consisting of an approved transfer general education program (e.g., IGETC or CSU GE) and a major or area of emphasis as locally defined and requires colleges that do so to refrain from requiring additional local requirements that are not included in the GE package or the major/area of emphasis;

Whereas, AB440 (as of July 2, 2009) maintained that a degree must consist of both a major/area of emphasis and the completion of general education – a vast improvement over earlier versions that would have reduced the requirements for associate degrees to the "minimum required for transfer", with no requirement for completion of general education and a major/area of emphasis, which would have resulted in a two-tiered system of degrees, with degrees designated “for transfer” having externally defined standards that would require less than the degrees for students not intending to transfer, thereby seriously weakening the meaning of an associate degree;

Whereas, There is a great deal of support for the concept of a “transfer degree” in the legislature and public, and it is very likely that a bill will move forward that would put our degrees in statute rather than in Title 5, and such a bill could require degree standards that could be inconsistent with the Academic Senate positions; and

Whereas, Placing any degree in statute is inappropriate and could effectively lead to legislative curriculum dictates, but making a change in Title 5 regulations would retain control of degrees within the California Community Colleges, and codify degrees that many colleges are already awarding;

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor’s Office to change Title 5 regulations such that colleges would be permitted to offer associate degrees in a major or area of emphasis designated for transfer to students who complete GE (IGETC or CSU GE) and 60 transferable semester units with a minimum of 18 semester units in a major or area of emphasis and require the colleges that do so to refrain from requiring additional local requirements that are not included in the GE package or the major/area of emphasis.

See Appendix D for background information.

**4.02.01 F09 Amend Resolution 4.02 F09  
Elizabeth Atondo, Los Angeles Pierce College, Area C**

Strike the second whereas.

**4.02.02 F09 Amend Resolution 4.02 F09**  
**Paul Setziol, Cuesta College**

Amend the resolve:

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to change Title 5 regulations such that colleges would be permitted to offer associate degrees in a major or area of emphasis designated for transfer to students who complete GE (IGETC or CSU GE) and 60 transferable semester units with a minimum of 18 semester units in a major or area of emphasis ~~and require the colleges that do so to refrain from requiring additional local requirements that are not included in the GE package or the major/area of emphasis.~~

**4.02.03 F09 Amend Resolution 4.02 F09**  
**Stephanie Dumont, Golden West College**

Amend the resolve:

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to change Title 5 regulations such that colleges would be permitted to offer associate degrees in a major or area of emphasis designated for transfer to students who complete GE (IGETC or CSU GE) and 60 transferable semester units with a minimum of 18 semester units in a major or area of emphasis ~~and require the colleges that do so to refrain from requiring additional local requirements that are not included in the GE package or the major/area of emphasis~~ that meets the requirements of transfer institutions, and require the colleges that choose to offer such a degree do not impose any additional local graduation requirements.

**4.03 F09 Transfer Degree**  
**Paul Setziol, DeAnza College**

**The resolution was referred to state senate exec for further study**

Whereas, State legislators have proposed statewide transfer degrees;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges maintains that the purview of degree definitions in legislation goes against basic higher education principles embedded in past practice;

Whereas, The faculty should maintain the right and responsibility to determine graduation degree requirements as specified in Title 5; and

Whereas, Title 5 currently makes no reference to transfer associate degrees;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Chancellor's Office to seek a change to Title 5 requiring the colleges to offer a transfer associate degree; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges include in Title 5 language the provision that any local requirements for the degree are to be governed by existing Title 5 language on graduation requirements.

**4.04 F09 Maintain Local Autonomy over Degree Requirements  
Chris Hill, Grossmont College**

**The resolution was passed**

Whereas, Assembly Bill 440 (Beall), in an attempt to remove perceived barriers to transfer for community college students, recently proposed legislation that would remove local autonomy for degrees by placing degree requirements into statute and could effectively lead to legislative curriculum dictates,

Whereas, Placing any degree requirements in statute is in direct contradiction to Education Code §70902(b)(7), which clearly puts responsibility for curriculum and academic standards under the joint responsibility of the local board and the academic senates of a district;

Whereas, Title 5 already grants community colleges the right to develop degrees with a minimum of 60 transferable semester units consisting of an approved transfer general education program (e.g., IGETC or CSU GE) and a major or area of emphasis as locally defined, and allows local colleges the ability to create degree variations that best serve their students' ability to transfer; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges previously affirmed its support for local autonomy in several of the 10+1 areas, including curriculum (Resolution 6.02 F03 and 18.03 F07);

Resolved, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges oppose any legislation that seeks to alter its curriculum, degree, and certificate requirements and reaffirm its support of local autonomy and faculty primacy over the same.

## Background for Resolution 4.02 F09 Response to AB 440: “Transfer Degree” (FAQs)

This resolution calls for the Academic Senate to “... work with the Chancellor’s Office to change Title 5 regulations such that colleges would be permitted to offer associate degrees in a major or area of emphasis designated for transfer to students who complete GE (IGETC or CSU GE) and 60 transferable semester units with a minimum of 18 semester units in a major or area of emphasis, and require the colleges that do so to refrain from requiring additional local requirements that are not included in the GE package or the major/area of emphasis.”

1. Why/how is this resolution a response to AB 440?

AB 440, a bill being considered today, seeks to put a community college degree into law. It intends to introduce a degree option for community colleges through legislation. However, legislation is often not the best way to improve higher education. Although the proposed language of AB440 is **permissive**, meaning that it would not mandate us to change, the idea of placing a degree into **law** could set a dangerous precedent. It could lead to all of our degrees being legislated, removing faculty control of our degrees. No other segment of higher education has their degrees legislated. In contrast, resolution 4.02 recommends placing the language in Title 5 regulation rather than in law--- so the community colleges may *elect* to make this change. Note that the language is **permissive** in nature and does not mandate that local degrees be modified in any way – it merely states explicitly that this is an option that colleges have.

2. I thought we opposed AB 440 – what happened?

The ASCCC took a strong oppose position to AB 440 early on in the process because the bill had many flaws. It was only in the final hours that AB 440 took its current form –and reflected our degree structure (i.e., general education and a major or area of emphasis). Even though the final form of the language (July 2009) was far less problematic than early versions and the original intent language, it still sought to put a degree into law, which is what remains problematic.

3. How does this resolution differ from what AB 440 proposed? Why do we need to take any action?

Keeping degrees out of law is the goal. The momentum behind AB 440 has not waned and its sponsor is not only well-funded, but has hired experienced professionals to assist in moving this legislation forward. If this resolution is adopted, we would be able to “pre empt” legislation and make Title 5 changes that would make legislation unnecessary.

4. Can't we already offer these kinds of degrees?

We certainly can. There is nothing to preclude colleges from not imposing local graduation requirements on students who complete a transfer general education pattern and major or area of emphasis.

5. Don't colleges already do this?

Yes. In the past few years, as colleges sought to modify existing non-compliant degrees and expand the options for students, some colleges integrated their local requirements into their local general education pattern and established degrees that achieve just what this resolution suggests.

6. Is this kind of degree good for students?

It appears that when colleges offer degrees that are expressly designed for the transfer-bound student and do not impose additional requirements, the number of degrees awarded increases, and most would agree that earning a degree is a good thing, as long as the students complete the appropriate requirements.

7. Would this resolution **require** local changes?

No. The language is permissive. Colleges may choose to offer these kinds of degrees as one option among their degrees - or not.

8. What would such a degree be called?

It would be, for example, an "A.A. in history for transfer" or an "A.S. in natural sciences for transfer." Such a degree would satisfy those who call for a "transfer degree" but would not compromise the Title 5 and Academic Senate requirement for a major or area of emphasis.

9. But many colleges just removed the word "transfer" from their degree titles. What's up?

This proposed degree title is different because it indicates the major or area of emphasis where the student focused his or her study. That is very different from a degree with no major/area of emphasis. Students don't major in "transfer" but rather they study one or more *disciplines*. As long as the discipline is in the title, designating that it was designed with transfer in mind would be very different from a holding an "A.A. in transfer". Never the less, this is inconsistent with the position established by ASCCC resolution 9.02 in Fall 2006 that called for the removal of the word "transfer" in all degree titles. One justification for that position, however, would be removed here if all courses for the degree were transferable.

10. What is lost if we pass this resolution?

If this resolution is passed and the language is added to Title 5, it may lead to local pressure to reconsider local graduation requirements. It may have the effect of increasing local pressure to waive such requirements for students completing transfer general education patterns.

11. What is gained if we pass this resolution?

If this resolution is passed and the language is added to Title 5, there would be no need or reason for AB 440 to move forward in its current form.

12. What do we lose if we don't pass this resolution?

It is very likely AB 440 will pass; it has a great deal of support. If our degrees are set in law, we lose the autonomy of community college faculty determining their degrees. It gives over control of community college degrees to the legislators.

Nov 2009

### **Other opinions about the same issue.**

Dear Academic Senate Colleagues,

I have a few questions and concerns that I'd like to express regarding the email below. First, I'd like some clarification on each of the 3 resolutions referenced below. According to my notes from the Fall Plenary, 4.02 (Response to AB 440: "Transfer Degree") and 4.03 (Transfer Degrees) were referred back to the Executive Committee, while 4.04 (Maintain Local Autonomy over Degree Requirements) was approved by the body. Resolutions 4.02 & 4.03 had amendments, but 4.04 did not. In the document "Fall 2009 Adopted Resolutions," Resolution 4.04 was renumbered as 4.02 (I'm assuming it's standard practice to renumber all of the adopted resolutions once those that were defeated or referred are removed). I'm also assuming this resulted in the original 4.02 & 4.03, being renumbered as 4.03 & 4.04, which are referenced below.

Thus, the 4.02 referenced below is the original 4.04- Maintain Local Autonomy over Degree Requirements (*without amendments*), which was adopted by the body, and 4.03 referenced below is the original 4.02- Response to AB 440: "Transfer Degrees" (*with amendments*), which was referred to the Executive Committee. Please confirm that I am understanding this correctly.

If this is the case, then I find it somewhat confusing to state that the *Response to AB 440: "Transfer Degree"* resolution that was referred to the Executive Committee had, as its goal, the same intent as the *Maintain Local Autonomy over Degree Requirements* resolution that was adopted by the body.

The resolved of the *Maintain Local Autonomy over Degree Requirements* resolution states very clearly that: **"ASCCC oppose any legislation that seeks to alter its curriculum, degree, and certificate requirements and reaffirm its support of local autonomy and faculty primacy over the same."**

Whereas, the resolved of the *Response to AB 440: "Transfer Degrees"* resolution states that ***"ASCCC work with the Chancellor's Office to change Title 5 regulations such that colleges would be permitted to offer associate degrees in a major or area of emphasis designated for transfer to students who complete GE (IGETC or CSU GE) and 60 transferable semester units with a minimum of 18 semester units in a major or area of emphasis, and require the colleges that do so to refrain from requiring additional local requirements that are not included in the GE package or the major/area of emphasis."***

Although the resolution that was adopted by the body does not make the other resolution moot, in my mind, they do not have the same goal. The resolution adopted by the body very clearly states that ASCCC will oppose legislation such as AB 440 and SB 1440, whereas, the referred resolution calls on the body to work with the Chancellor's Office to add language to Title 5 that has the same net effect of AB 440/SB 1440. The only difference is that it will be self-imposed rather than legislated. Thus, as I see it, the real question here is will we, as a body, oppose all such legislation; or will we, instead, seek to avoid such legislation by self-imposing it through a Title 5 change. In my mind this is a significant difference, and should be pointed out as such.

Given this discrepancy, I'm not sure if a series of information sessions followed by a survey will allow for sufficient debate on this topic. I understand the urgency of the situation, but it would be unfortunate if this body were to rush to a decision on this without the opportunity for a proper debate. I would prefer that we continue to oppose this legislation (as the adopted resolution states), and have the required debate at the Spring Plenary. However, if the Executive Committee chooses to move forward with action on this item, then I would hope that all of the information, including the very significant differences between these two resolutions, is provided to all local Senates in order to facilitate an informed discussion at the local level.

I look forward to hearing what others think about this.

***Michael Wangler***

*Academic Senate President*

*Cuyamaca College*

*El Cajon, CA 92019*

*Voice: 619-660-4252 Fax: 619-660-4399*

*Email: [michael.wangler@gcccd.edu](mailto:michael.wangler@gcccd.edu)*