I. Minutes were corrected and approved

II. Discussion and review of feedback from constituency groups regarding the four calendar options.

Diane presented an email from Vicki Reed regarding her objection to the current placement of the spring break. She suggested that a survey should be taken by SRJC staff members.

Diane reminded the committee that the placement of spring break should be determined based on what is pedagogically best for SRJC students. Attempting to align the spring break with local high schools should be given the lowest priority.

Robin Fautley stated that surveys taken reflect personal reasons for where the spring break should be placed. She commented that people who disagree with the placement tend to have a louder voice in the community. She further expressed that some felt the placement of spring break in the current year’s calendar was too early for students, faculty and staff.

Diane asked the committee if option B allowed for the spring break to be late enough in the semester. She also asked the committee if a spring break placed after midterms is good from an academic standpoint.

The group responded with the fact that many of their constituents do not like option A. The group agreed that option A and A1 will no longer be considered for future options.

Diane asked the group if moving the spring break a week later (beginning on March 28th) would affect eight week classes.

Cheri Winter stated that this placement might have an affect on many eight weeks classes such a culinary and APTECH classes.

Diane expressed concern with the attrition rate for students if Spring break was placed on the week of March 28th.

Michelle Poggi stated that due to many institutional deadlines, moving spring break would create a heavy workload issue for staff.

Diane asked the committee if they could see any other detrimental affects for the movement of spring break.

Marty Lee was concerned that the move of spring break might negatively affect registration deadlines for students. However, Diane confirmed that this would not be an issue.
Diane stated, and the group confirmed that instructors who teach the eight week classes should be given a chance for feedback on the movement of spring break. She asked Cheri for a list of these instructors.

Cheri Winter stated that Abe Farkas is willing to push the five week back to back summer session model until Summer 2012.

Filomena related feedback from faculty members. The start and end dates for the five week back to back classes seemed to be confusing to faculty. Other members were concerned with five week back to back summer having an affect on SLO’s.

Janet stated that there will be a task force assigned to a “compressed calendar”. Janet stated that this “compressed calendar” would work with the 2012 summer date for the five week back to back session.

The committee agreed on considering option B with the option of the movement of spring break.

Robin suggested from a comment from her constituents that option B should push the first day of the summer term to be the 20th of June instead of the 13th. Greg stated that this option would help summer intersession classes. Cheri stated that intersession classes were moved last year due to FTES collection. In Cheri’s opinion, because of this lack of intersession courses, a move would not have that great of an impact.

The committee agreed that the placement of the summer semester will remain on the 13th for Option B with the fall semester will start on the 22nd of the next calendar.

Robin stated that the fall semester start date should be noted on the academic calendar.

The next meeting will be May 20th 2009.

Meeting ended at 2:55