



Academic Policies & Procedures

AP&P Agenda

Thursday, April 23, 2026

3:00 pm – 5:30 pm CH 302

Type of Meeting: *Regular*

Note Taker: Jamie MacMillan

Please Review/Bring: The past minutes for accuracy.

Committee Members:

Dr. Jonathan Compton, Co-chair
Kathryn Mitchell, Co-chair, Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs
Dr. Jessica Eaton, Articulation Officer
Tim Atkerson, AKIN Representative
Travis Lee, IAAT Representative
Alfred Brubaker, IAAT Representative
Darren Watters, HSS Representative
Vacant, HSS Representative
James Dorn, MSE Representative
Dr. Zia Nisani, MSE Representative
Heidi Williams, LACA Representative
Rhea Vichot, LACA Representative

Gabby Fenn, SBS Representative
Yadira Arellano, SBS Representative
Cynthia Littlefield, AHUM Representative
Carla Corona, AHUM Representative
Stephanie Orellana, Library Rep, Librarian
Tamira Palmetto, Student Services, Counseling
Tanya McGinnis, Student Services, Counseling
Amaka Donn, Adjunct Representative
Dr. Wendy Stout, Administrative Position
Nate Dillon, Administrative Position
Dr. Windy Franklin-Martinez, Administrative Position
Armando De La Torre, Student Representative

**Absent*

Items	Person	Action
I. Call to Order	<i>Kathryn Mitchell</i>	
II. Attendance – Roll Call	<i>Kathryn Mitchell</i>	
III. Opening Comments from the Public (3 minutes maximum)		
IV. Approval of the Agenda	<i>All</i>	
V. Approval of the Minutes – 3/26/26	<i>All</i>	
VI. Informational Items – TOP to CIP Updates – 4-year cycle (emails sent to reps, chairs, and deans)	<i>Kathryn Mitchell</i>	
VII. Training –	<i>Kathryn Mitchell</i>	



Academic Policies & Procedures

<p>VIII. Action</p> <p>Substantial Course Revisions</p> <p>LAC 900 Supervised Tutoring LAC 901 Supervised Learning Assistance LAC 920 Managing Writing Anxiety LAC 922 Math Study Strategies LAC 923 Managing Math Anxiety LAC 931 Level 1 Tutor Certification LAC 932 Level 2 Tutor Certification LAC 933 Level 3 Tutor Certification LAC 950 AI Essentials</p> <p>Programs Revisions</p> <p>College Readiness - Reading and Writing Cert (Noncredit)</p> <p>Program Amends</p> <p>AVC Tutor Certificate (Noncredit)</p>	<p><i>Kathryn Mitchell</i></p>	
<p>IX. Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class max protocol 	<p><i>Kathryn Mitchell</i></p>	
<p>X. Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 	<p><i>Kathryn Mitchell</i></p>	
<p>XI. Catalog</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft (2nd review) 	<p><i>Robyn Serrano</i></p>	
<p>XII. Date of Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5/14/26, 5/28/26 		
<p>XIII. Adjournment</p>	<p><i>Kathryn Mitchell</i></p>	
<p>NEXT MEETING DATE: May 14, 2026</p>		



Academic Policies & Procedures

AP&P Minutes	Thursday, March 26, 2026 3:00 pm – 5:30 pm CH 302
-------------------------	--

Type of Meeting: *Regular*

Note Taker: Jamie MacMillan

Please Review/Bring: The past minutes for accuracy.

Committee Members:

Dr. Jonathan Compton, Co-chair
Kathryn Mitchell, Co-chair, Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs
Dr. Jessica Eaton, Articulation Officer
Tim Atkerson, AKIN Representative
*Travis Lee, IAAT Representative**
Alfred Brubaker, IAAT Representative
Darren Watters, HSS Representative
Vacant, HSS Representative
James Dorn, MSE Representative
Dr. Zia Nisani, MSE Representative
Heidi Williams, LACA Representative
Rhea Vichot, LACA Representative

Gabby Fenn, SBS Representative
Yadira Arellano, SBS Representative
Cynthia Littlefield, AHUM Representative
Carla Corona, AHUM Representative
Stephanie Orellana, Library Rep, Librarian
Tamira Palmetto, Student Services, Counseling
Tanya McGinnis, Student Services, Counseling
Amaka Donn, Adjunct Representative
Dr. Wendy Stout, Administrative Position
Nate Dillon, Administrative Position
*Dr. Windy Franklin-Martinez, Administrative Position**
*Armando De La Torre, Student Representative**

**Absent*

Guests: Lisa O'Leary

Items	Person	Action
I. Call to Order	<i>Dr. Jonathan Compton/ Kathryn Mitchell</i>	The meeting was called to order at 3:03pm
II. Attendance – Roll Call	<i>Dr. Jonathan Compton/ Kathryn Mitchell</i>	
III. Opening Comments from the Public (3 minutes maximum)		
IV. Approval of the Agenda	<i>All</i>	Action Taken Motion to Approve: Motion Second Motion Approved
V. Approval of the Minutes – 3/12/26	<i>All</i>	Action Taken Motion to Approve: Minutes for 3/12/26



Academic Policies & Procedures

		<p>Motion Second Abstentions: James Dorn, Cynthia Littlefield, Stephanie Orellana Motion Approved</p>
<p>VI. Informational Items – TOP to CIP Updates</p>	<p><i>Dr. Jonathan Compton</i></p>	<p>Jonathan shared the crosswalk with the committee. He encouraged them to use this tool when changing/verifying their CIP codes.</p> <p>TOP codes will remain until they are ready to transition from them for reporting purposes. End date projection: Fall.</p> <p>Count of Colleges column can help determine patterns to help check accuracy.</p>
<p>VII. Training –</p>	<p><i>Dr. Jonathan Compton</i></p>	
<p>VIII. Action</p> <p>Course Amends</p> <p>PHYS 110 General Physics</p> <p>PHYS 120 General Physics</p> <p>PHYS 211 General Physics</p> <p>Program Amends</p> <p>Aeronautical Non-Destructive Inspection Cert</p>	<p><i>Dr. Jonathan Compton/ Kathryn Mitchell</i></p>	<p>Course Amends</p> <p>Motion to Approve: PHYS 110 General Physics Motion Second Comments: Changed units back to 4 Motion Approved</p> <p>Motion to Approve: PHYS 120 General Physics Motion Second Comments: Changed units back to 4 Motion Approved</p> <p>Motion to Approve: PHYS 211 General Physics Motion Second Comments: Changed units back to 5 Motion Approved</p> <p>Program Amends</p> <p>Motion to Approve: Aeronautical Non-Destructive Inspection Cert Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved</p>



Academic Policies & Procedures

Aircraft Airframe Cert		Motion to Approve: Aircraft Airframe Cert Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved
Aircraft Powerplant Cert		Motion to Approve: Aircraft Powerplant Cert Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved
Biology AS-T		Motion to Approve: Biology AS-T Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved
BIP Level I - Business Information Professional Quick Start Certificate of Achievement		Motion to Approve: BIP Level I - Business Information Professional Quick Start Certificate of Achievement Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved
BIP Level II - Business Information Professional Two Certificate of Achievement	<i>Dr. Jonathan Compton/ Kathryn Mitchell</i>	Motion to Approve: BIP Level II - Business Information Professional Two Certificate of Achievement Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved
BIP Level III - Business Information Professional Three Certificate of Achievement		Motion to Approve: BIP Level III - Business Information Professional Three Certificate of Achievement Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved
Cal-GETC Cert		Motion to Approve: Cal-GETC Cert Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved



Academic Policies & Procedures

Chemistry AS		<p>Motion to Approve: Chemistry AS Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved</p>
Computer Engineering AS		<p>Motion to Approve: Computer Engineering AS Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved</p>
Computer Networking Cert		<p>Motion to Approve: Computer Networking Cert Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved</p>
Computer Networking Multi-Platform Cert		<p>Motion to Approve: Computer Networking Multi-Platform Cert Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved</p>
Computer Science AS	<p><i>Dr. Jonathan Compton/ Kathryn Mitchell</i></p>	<p>Motion to Approve: Computer Science AS Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved</p>
Computer Science AS-T		<p>Motion to Approve: Computer Science AS-T Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved</p>
Electrical Engineering AS		<p>Motion to Approve: Electrical Engineering AS Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved</p>
Engineering Fundamentals Cert		<p>Motion to Approve: Engineering Fundamentals Cert</p>



Academic Policies & Procedures

<p>General Aircraft Maintenance Cert</p>		<p>Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved</p>
<p>General Engineering AS</p>		<p>Motion to Approve: General Aircraft Maintenance Cert Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved</p>
<p>General Engineering AS</p>		<p>Motion to Approve: General Engineering AS Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved</p>
<p>Geographic Information Systems Cert</p>	<p><i>Dr. Jonathan Compton/ Kathryn Mitchell</i></p>	<p>Motion to Approve: Geographic Information Systems Cert Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved</p>
<p>Math and Science - Option I AA</p>		<p>Motion to Approve: Math and Science - Option I AA Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved</p>
<p>Mathematics 2.0 AS-T</p>		<p>Motion to Approve: Mathematics 2.0 AS-T Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved</p>
<p>Mechanical Engineering AS</p>		<p>Motion to Approve: Mechanical Engineering AS Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved</p>
<p>Physics 2.0 AS-T</p>		<p>Motion to Approve: Physics 2.0 AS-T Motion Second Comments: Due to PHYS unit changes Motion Approved</p>

<p>Program Revisions</p> <p>Site Supervisor I Cert</p> <p>Site Supervisor II Cert</p> <p>Software Development Essentials Cert</p> <p>Video Design and Production Cert</p>		<p>Program Revisions</p> <p>Motion to Approve: Site Supervisor I Cert Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved</p> <p>Motion to Approve: Site Supervisor II Cert Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved</p> <p>Motion to Approve: Software Development Essentials Cert Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved</p> <p>Motion to Approve: Video Design and Production Cert Motion Second Comments: Added language for VA requirements Motion Approved</p>
<p>IX. Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update "How to Write an Effective Syllabus" document (draft rewrite provided) - Finish 4 yr cycle roadmap 	<p><i>Dr. Jonathan Compton/ Nate Dillon</i></p>	<p>Update "How to Write an Effective Syllabus" document (draft rewrite provided): A "How to Write an Effective Syllabus" draft was distributed. The committee was asked to review and make any necessary changes/additions. Will be brought back to the committee for a vote. Jonathan also displayed the "Guidelines for Creating an Effective Syllabus"</p> <p>VP Mitchell requested that it would be great to remind faculty not to give out personal information (i.e. personal phone numbers, social media, etc.)</p> <p>Finish 4 yr cycle roadmap: Email sent with a link to the Master List - 4 Year Revision Cycle. Jonathan asked the committee to check the spreadsheet for accuracy. Jonathan would like this to be completed before the CourseDog rollout. Warning: First four years will be</p>



Academic Policies & Procedures

		bumpy due to the incorporation of CourseDog, this may require back-to-back reviews of courses. Jonathan requested that the members not share this out with "All Faculty". He'll do so.
X. Reports –	<i>Dr. Jonathan Compton</i>	
XI. Catalog –	<i>Robyn Serrano</i>	
XII. Date of Next Meeting – 4/23/26, 5/14/26, 5/28/26		
XIII. Adjournment	<i>Dr. Jonathan Compton/ Kathryn Mitchell</i>	Motion to Adjourn: Motion Second Motion Approved The meeting concluded at 4:02pm
NEXT MEETING DATE: April 23, 2026		

Procedure for Establishing or Modifying Maximum Class Size

Formal local procedure for new courses, revised courses, and standalone class-cap actions

Document Status	Draft prepared for AVC local review
Intended Use	Internal procedure and implementation tools for establishing or modifying course maximum class size.

Design Note

This package is written to align with the current AVC AP&P Handbook language and the faculty collective bargaining agreement provisions you provided. It is drafted to be rigorous, operational, and reviewable without treating dean support or overenrollment as a substitute for the official AP&P-approved class cap.

1. Purpose

This procedure establishes a formal, evidence-based process for proposing, reviewing, and determining the official maximum class size for new and existing courses at Antelope Valley College. The procedure is intended to support consistent decision-making, preserve instructional quality and student learning, document the basis for class-cap decisions, and ensure that the official class cap recorded in the curriculum management system is supported by a clear evidentiary record.

2. Scope

This procedure applies to requests to:

- establish a maximum class size for a new course;
- increase the maximum class size for an existing course;
- decrease the maximum class size for an existing course; or
- establish a different maximum for the lab, clinic, studio, activity, or comparable component of a course when the local course proposal structure permits differentiated enrollment limits.

This procedure applies to face-to-face, hybrid, and distance education offerings. If a course is offered in more than one modality, the petition may identify any modality-related considerations, but under current AVC practice this procedure does not ordinarily establish different official maximum class sizes by modality.

3. Authority and Relationship to Other Local Documents

This procedure is intended to operate consistently with the AP&P Handbook, the AVC curriculum workflow, and the applicable provisions of the current collective bargaining agreement. For purposes of this procedure, the official course maximum class size is the class cap established through the AP&P process and recorded in the curriculum management system.

- A section may not be treated as having a different official class cap merely because it is scheduled, coded, or staffed differently in a downstream system.
- Overenrollment of a particular section does not change the official course maximum class size. Overenrollment is a separate section-level action governed by the applicable collective bargaining language and any required overenrollment agreement.
- When a class-cap request is embedded in a new course proposal or a substantial course revision, that request proceeds through the ordinary curriculum approval sequence required by local practice.
- When a class-cap request is presented as a standalone matter, AP&P makes the class-cap determination and directs implementation in the curriculum management system, with downstream systems brought into alignment thereafter.

Key Distinction

This procedure deliberately separates the official AP&P-approved class cap from section-level overenrollment and from scheduling implementation. That distinction should reduce the risk that temporary scheduling practice becomes the de facto curricular record.

4. Guiding Standards

The following standards govern review of every petition:

1. The burden of proof rests with the petitioner. The current class cap remains in effect unless the proposal provides sufficient documented justification for change.
2. Requests must be course-specific. Discipline custom, anecdotal preference, or room size alone is not sufficient justification.

3. The strongest considerations are instructional quality, preservation of course rigor, safety, legal or accreditation requirements, supervision demands, and the feasibility of meaningful assessment and feedback at the proposed enrollment level.
4. Requests to decrease an existing maximum class size require especially strong evidence because they may affect access, scheduling efficiency, and section availability.
5. AP&P review shall be based on the petition record and supporting documentation, not informal assumptions about how a course has historically been scheduled.

5. Definitions

Official maximum class size: The approved maximum class size for the course as recorded in the curriculum management system.

Standalone class-cap action: A proposal focused on class size itself rather than a broader new course proposal or substantive COR revision package.

Petitioner: The faculty member or discipline faculty submitting the class-cap request.

Complete petition: A petition that includes all required sections, supporting documents, signatures, and narratives necessary for substantive review.

Comparable colleges: Peer institutions whose published course structures or local curriculum documents are reasonably similar enough to support contextual comparison.

6. When This Procedure Must Be Used

A petition under this procedure is required when any of the following applies:

- a new course proposal includes a proposed class cap;
- a revised course proposal changes maximum enrollment;
- discipline faculty seek to lower or raise an existing class cap outside a broader course revision;
- a differentiated lecture/lab or lecture/clinic maximum is requested; or
- implementation practice, Banner coding, or registration limits have diverged from the official class cap and an AP&P determination is needed to resolve the discrepancy.

7. Required Petition Components

Every petition must include the following minimum components:

A. Course identification Subject, course number, title, discipline, division, modality or modalities, and whether the action is new, revised, or standalone.

B. Current and proposed cap Current official class cap, proposed class cap, and any separate lecture/lab or component-specific maximums.

C. Type of action Check whether the petition is for a new course, an increase, a decrease, or a differentiated component maximum.

D. Narrative justification A detailed course-specific explanation tied to pedagogy, supervision, assessment, safety, compliance, and resource realities.

E. Evidence attachments All data, comparators, room/equipment counts, accreditation or licensure materials, and any other claimed supporting documents.

F. Discipline recommendation A statement confirming discipline review and summarizing the recommendation or any internal disagreement.

G. Dean response A written dean response indicating support, opposition, or conditional support, with operational comments.

H. Faculty certification A certification that the submission is complete and that the evidence is accurate to the best of the petitioner's knowledge.

8. Required Evidence

Evidence should be proportional to the nature of the request, but the following categories must be addressed whenever applicable.

8.1 Pedagogical and instructional evidence

- How the proposed class cap supports the course objectives, content, and level of rigor.
- How the proposed class cap affects faculty-student interaction, demonstrations, critiques, supervision, discussion, or coaching.
- How the proposed class cap affects methods of evaluation, turnaround time for feedback, grading load, or the integrity of authentic assessments.
- Why the course can or cannot sustain the requested enrollment level without material loss of quality.

8.2 Safety, compliance, and supervision evidence

- Workstation counts, lab stations, specialized equipment counts, or seat-limited instructional setups.
- Safety protocols, required observation ratios, clinic supervision expectations, or hazardous environment concerns.
- External standards, licensure expectations, accreditor requirements, or documented legal constraints.

8.3 Comparative and enrollment evidence

- At least five comparable class-cap examples from other colleges when a reduction or disputed adjustment is requested.
- Section counts per year, fill rates, waitlist information if available, and annual student volume or demand indicators.
- Comparison to similar courses within the discipline and, where helpful, adjacent disciplines with comparable instructional structures.

8.4 Operational and implementation evidence

- Room assignment realities, but only as supporting context rather than as a standalone rationale.
- Impact on sectioning, access, scheduling feasibility, and alignment between the curriculum system and Banner/registration settings.
- Any anticipated implementation issues if the proposed cap is approved.

8.5 Modality-related considerations

- If the course is offered online, hybrid, or in more than one modality, the petition should identify any modality-related instructional considerations that inform the requested class cap.
- If Under current AVC practice, this procedure does not ordinarily establish different official maximum class sizes by modality.

9. Enhanced Requirements for Requests to Decrease an Existing Class Cap

Because reductions in class size may affect student access, schedule construction, and fiscal efficiency, a request to decrease an existing maximum class size shall ordinarily include a fuller evidentiary record than a request establishing a cap for a new course. At minimum, a decrease request should normally include:

- five or more comparable college examples;
- recent fill-rate and demand information;

- section history for the course;
- comparison to related courses in the discipline;
- documentation of the specific pedagogical, safety, accreditation, or equipment-based reason the current cap is not supportable; and
- an explanation of why the concern cannot be adequately addressed by section design, staffing, equipment replacement or obtainment, or another less restrictive solution.

10. Discipline Review

Before submission to AP&P, the petition shall be reviewed within the discipline. The discipline review shall confirm that the request has been discussed, that the rationale is course-specific, and that the supporting materials are substantially complete.

If discipline faculty do not agree, the petition may still proceed, but the petition shall include a brief summary of the differing views so the committee has a complete record.

11. Dean Review

The division dean shall provide a written response addressing operational, scheduling, facility, staffing, and implementation considerations. The dean may support the proposal, oppose the proposal, or support the proposal with conditions or comments.

Lack of dean support shall not prevent committee review. However, the dean response becomes part of the official petition record and should be weighed carefully when implementation issues, equipment limits, staffing concerns, or scheduling constraints are materially implicated.

12. Technical and Completeness Review

All petitions shall undergo technical and completeness review before placement on an AP&P agenda. A petition may be returned without substantive review if it is incomplete, internally inconsistent, unsupported by attachments it claims to include, or presented in a manner that prevents the committee from evaluating the request.

A petition should ordinarily be marked incomplete if any of the following applies:

- the current and proposed caps are not clearly identified;
- the narrative rationale is conclusory rather than evidentiary;
- a decrease request lacks comparator data or local enrollment data without explanation;
- a safety or compliance claim is made without documentation;
- the dean response is missing; or
- the requested implementation cannot be understood from the form.

13. Committee Review and Decision

AP&P shall review complete petitions and may approve, deny, table, or return the petition for revision and resubmission. Faculty may be asked to attend to answer questions or clarify the record.

In reaching a decision, the committee should evaluate at least the following:

1. Whether the petition establishes a clear educational rationale connected to the course structure and assessments.
2. Whether the proposed cap is compatible with safety, supervision, equipment, or compliance requirements.
3. Whether the local and comparative evidence is sufficiently strong for the type of request being made.
4. Whether the proposed cap is likely to preserve meaningful student interaction and timely assessment.

5. Whether the implementation path is clear and likely to remain consistent across curriculum and scheduling systems.

Decision Standard

Approval should mean more than “no objection.” The record should affirmatively support the requested cap. If the evidence is not adequate, the committee should deny or return the petition rather than approving a cap on assumption or convenience.

14. Implementation

Once approved, the official maximum class size shall be entered or updated in the curriculum management system and then communicated for implementation in Banner, scheduling, registration, and any related local forms or records. Where a conflict exists between the official class cap and a downstream implementation setting, the records should be reconciled as promptly as practicable through the appropriate offices.

Approval of a class cap does not, by itself, guarantee section scheduling, staffing, room assignment, or funding. Those matters remain subject to normal college operations.

15. Resubmission

A denied or returned petition may be resubmitted. A resubmission should address the committee’s stated concerns and include any additional documentation needed to cure deficiencies in the original record. Resubmission, rather than appeal, is the ordinary next step under this procedure.

16. Recordkeeping and Source of Truth

The curriculum management system is the official record for course maximum class size. AP&P action, the petition, the dean response, and supporting materials should be maintained in a manner that permits future verification of the basis for the approved class cap.

To reduce disputes regarding overenrollment forms and registration limits, the office responsible for maintaining the curriculum record should make the current approved class cap reasonably accessible to faculty, deans, and scheduling personnel.

17. Roles and Responsibilities

Role	Primary Responsibilities Under This Procedure
Petitioning faculty / discipline faculty	Develop the proposal, assemble evidence, complete the petition, and present the educational rationale.
Division dean	Provide a written response on operational and implementation issues; identify concerns without acting as a veto point.
Technical review / curriculum staff	Check completeness, identify missing components, and prepare materials for AP&P review.
AP&P Committee	Evaluate evidence, determine the official class cap for standalone actions, and act on class-cap requests embedded in course workflow.

Scheduling / implementation offices	Bring downstream systems into alignment with the official class cap after approval.
-------------------------------------	---

18. Common Errors That Should Trigger Caution

- Using room size as the only rationale.
- Equating a historically underfilled section with proof that a lower official cap is educationally necessary.
- Using current scheduling practice to override the documented curricular record without AP&P review.
- Requesting a lower cap without showing why educational quality, safety, or compliance actually requires it.

Appendix A. Suggested Minimum Attachment List

- Current COR or course proposal.
- Current and proposed class-cap statement.
- Narrative justification.
- Comparable college examples, if applicable.
- Local section history, fill-rate, or waitlist data, if applicable.
- Room, equipment, or workstation documentation, if applicable.
- Accreditation, licensure, or compliance material, if applicable.
- Dean response.
- Any additional supporting exhibits referenced in the petition.

Appendix B. Examples of Stronger and Weaker Justification Language

Stronger	Weaker
The current cap of 32 does not align with the 24 fixed stations used in every lab meeting. Two students cannot safely or instructionally share a station during the required assessment sequence.	The room feels crowded.
The course requires weekly individual performance feedback on complex drafts. At the proposed size of 35, feedback can be returned within the same instructional cycle; at 40, the feedback loop extends beyond the next assignment stage.	Smaller classes are better for learning.
The request is supported by peer comparators, local fill data, and the documented supervision ratio required during live equipment operation.	This is how we have always preferred to teach it.

Petition to Establish or Modify Maximum Class Size

Faculty submission form for new courses, revised courses, and standalone class-cap actions

Document Status	Draft form aligned to proposed AVC procedure
Intended Use	Internal procedure and implementation tools for establishing or modifying course maximum class size.

Design Note

This package is written to align with the current AVC AP&P Handbook language and the faculty collective bargaining agreement provisions you provided. It is drafted to be rigorous, operational, and reviewable without treating dean support or overenrollment as a substitute for the official AP&P-approved class cap.

Submission Rule

Attach all supporting documentation referenced in the form. Incomplete petitions should be returned for revision before substantive committee review.

1. Basic Course Information

Field	Response	Field	Response
Subject		Course Number	
Course Title		Discipline	
Division		Primary Modality	
If multiple modalities are offered, list all		Effective Term Requested	

2. Type of Request

Course workflow context (select one):

New course Revised course Standalone class-cap action

Requested class-cap action (select one):

Increase existing class cap Decrease existing class cap Establish separate lecture/lab or component maximum

3. Current and Proposed Class Cap

Item	Current Official Maximum	Proposed Maximum
Overall course maximum		
Lecture component, if different		
Lab/clinic/studio/activity component, if different		
Other component, if applicable		

4. Required Narrative Justification

4.1 Explain why the proposed maximum class size is educationally appropriate for this specific course.

4.2 Explain how the proposed class cap supports course rigor, supervision, interaction, feedback, and methods of evaluation.

4.3 Explain any safety, equipment, legal, accreditor, or compliance constraints that materially affect class size.

4.4 Explain any modality-specific considerations, if applicable.

4.5 For requests to decrease a current class cap, explain why the current cap is no longer supportable and why other solutions are insufficient.

5. Evidence Inventory

Evidence Category	Included?	Attachment Name / Description	Notes
Current COR or course proposal excerpt	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Comparable colleges (normally 5 or more for a reduction request)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Local enrollment / fill-rate / waitlist data	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Section history by term or year	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		

Equipment, workstation, or seat-count documentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Safety or supervision documentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Accreditation / licensure / external requirement documentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Modality-specific rationale or evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Other supporting material	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		

6. Comparable College Data

Complete this section whenever comparator evidence is used. It is normally expected for requests to reduce an existing class cap.

College	Course / Equivalent	Published Maximum	Source / Link or Doc	Why Comparable

7. Local Data Summary

Metric	Value / Range	Time Period	Notes
Number of sections offered			
Typical fill rate			
Waitlist pattern			
Approximate annual student count			

Other relevant local data			
---------------------------	--	--	--

8. Discipline Review

Summarize discipline discussion and recommendation. If there was disagreement, summarize it here.

9. Division Dean Response

Support Do Not Support Support with Conditions / Comments

Dean comments:

10. Implementation Notes

Identify any Banner, scheduling, room, equipment, or local process implications if approved.

11. Faculty Certification and Routing

Role	Name	Signature	Date
Petitioning faculty member			
Additional discipline faculty, if applicable			
AP&P division representative			
Division dean			

Faculty Certification Statement

By signing this petition, the submitting faculty member affirms that the proposal is complete to the best of their knowledge, that all attached evidence is accurately described, and that the requested class cap is supported by the record submitted.

12. For AP&P / Curriculum Staff Use

Item	Entry
Date received	
Technical review outcome: <input type="checkbox"/> Complete <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete	
Date placed on agenda	
AP&P action: <input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Denied <input type="checkbox"/> Tabled <input type="checkbox"/> Returned for revision	
Approved official maximum class size	
Implementation date / term	
Notes	