

1946 - 2011

### **Student Preparation and Success Council – Meeting Minutes** October 21, 2013 9B-Student Services Center- Ragan Room

Members				
X Audrey Yamagata-Noji (Co-Chair)	<u>X</u> Daniel Smith (Co-Chair)	XKristina Allende	<u>X</u> Tom Mauch	<u>X</u> George Bradshaw
XMatt Judd	XJim Ocampo	X LeAnn Garrett	XMicol Christopher	XGlenda Bro
XLinda Diaz	XBarbara Gonzalez	XElisabeth King	X Kelsey Breland	

Absent: Alina Hernandez, Eric Kaljumagi, and May Ochoa

### Guest: Juan Carlos Astorga, Student Equity Co-chair; Tom Edson (guest)

<u>ltem</u>	Agenda Topic	Discussion	<b>Recommendations</b>
1.0	Review Agenda & Minutes from Oct 7th meeting		Action: The minutes were approved unanimously
2.0	Information Sharing:	Dan reported that he attended the RP Group Student Success Conference. There was a presentation on MAP and Jason Chevalier served on a panel. The first meeting of the Institutions Set Standards Task Force on November 22 <sup>nd</sup> will focus on how we set our standards/goals and how to show we measure success.	Informational
3.0	Continuing Agenda Items		
a.	AP 5010 – Admissions – Dan/George	<ul> <li>The Council reviewed the revised AP and discussed the following changes:</li> <li>International Students – reference AP 5012: to remove the details of International Students admissions to AP</li> </ul>	Action: To approve to remove the international students language. Motioned Moved by: Glenda Motion Seconded by: Dan



1946 – 2011

<u>ltem</u>	Agenda Topic	Discussion	Recommendations
		<ul> <li>5012.</li> <li>The end of AP 5010 will read "referenced in AP 5012 International Students."</li> </ul>	Approved: Unanimously
			The Council agreed with the following recommendations:
			<ul> <li>George to review AP 5012: International Students and provide any suggested revisions to the Council at a future meeting.</li> <li>George and LeAnn is to work together to review AP 5013: Student in the Military and AP 5015: Residence Determination, provide any suggested revisions, especially in reference to the military spouses, and bring back to the Council at a future meeting.</li> </ul>
b.	Reading Requirements for Graduation – Audrey/Jim	Jim reported that the issue regarding the reading requirement was raised at last year's Student Preparation	The Council was in agreement with the following directive to the
		& Success meeting as well as currently by the President. The issues are:	Assessment and Matriculation Committee:



1946 – 2011

<u>ltem</u>	<u>Agenda Topic</u>	<u>Discussion</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
		<ul> <li>The use of a placement test (DRP) as a competency test;</li> <li>The no re-test policy; and</li> <li>whether the reading requirement was to be reviewed after the initial year – and whether this was ever done.</li> <li>The Council received the following documentation: <ul> <li>Senate Resolution Reading Competency Modification (2010-08)</li> <li>Senate Resolution Reading Competency for AA &amp; AS Degrees (04-09)</li> <li>Reading Competency Requirement for Graduation (compiled by Jim Ocampo on 1/26/09 and revised 5/31/13) – The revision was: "A student has received an <i>baccalaureate associate</i> degree or higher"</li> </ul> </li> <li>The following was discussed or shared: <ul> <li>The notation on the "Reading Competency</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Directive: Jim is to take the issues to the Assessment and Matriculation Committee and have a comprehensive discussion in order to provide recommendations/feedback about the Re-testing "policy" and provide Reading Competency Test data (# taking, # passing, background of the test) to the Council at a future meeting.
		<ul> <li>Requirement for Graduation: document states the transcript evaluation on reading competency be done by Admissions and Records Clerk III.</li> <li>Eric mentioned that Associate degree competencies mentions reading but the specific course requirement</li> </ul>	



1946 - 2011

<u>ltem</u>	Agenda Topic	Discussion	<b>Recommendations</b>
		is not stated but is locally determined.	
		The new AATs cannot have additional, local	
		requirements, including reading competency.	
		Barbara mentioned that at the General Education	
		Outcomes meeting, reading competency was included.	
		She mentioned that the document states that the	
		<ul><li>campus "values" reading comprehension.</li><li>Why the no re-test practice was put into place. If a</li></ul>	
		student can test into READ 100 and achieve	
		competency upon entrance, why can't they retest at a	
		later date into READ 100 and achieve competency?	
		Barbara explained that the DRP has a 100 point scale	
		and can be aligned to do readability on textbooks.	
		Many textbooks are at the READ 100 level. The	
		department has readability information on textbooks in	
		some disciplines. Barbara provided information to	
		demonstrate the particular textbooks and other	
		information. LeAnn mentioned that textbooks for	
		college classes are to be college level.	
		<ul> <li>Many students can prove their competency at a later time and pass it successfully. It was mentioned that</li> </ul>	
		some students have test anxiety and are in honors	
		courses and have not tested and have not taken	
		reading but are successful.	
		<ul> <li>Goal is to help students who need the remediation to</li> </ul>	



1946 - 2011

<u>ltem</u>	<u>Agenda Topic</u>	Discussion	<u>Recommendations</u>
		<ul> <li>know about this early on in their college careers.</li> <li>Tom Edson presented that the Senate Executive Board would like to create a Task Force to address reading issues.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>In summary, the issues are:</li> <li>Reading assessment to assist students who need assistance in reading to be successful in college</li> <li>Reading competency as a degree requirement</li> <li>The validity of the Reading Competency Test</li> <li>Other measures/evidence/means by which students can meet this requirement</li> <li>Title 5 55521-Prohibited Practices – not using the test for a purpose other than for which it was designed or validated</li> <li>College practice to not be able to re test</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>College practice to not be able to re-test</li> <li>Should we agree to be out of compliance in how we are using the DRP and therefore allow for re-testing, to prohibit students waiting to take the test?</li> <li>The APs and BPs were never adjusted, and there is only one mention in "initial Reading Placement exam" on page 63 of the college catalog.</li> </ul>	
C.	PowerPoint Presentation: Implementation of the Student Success Act – Audrey	Audrey reviewed the current status of the new Student Success Act and gave a PowerPoint presentation. In summary, the presentation included:	The PowerPoint presentation will be sent to all Council members via email.



1946 – 2011

	- 2011		
<u>ltem</u>	<u>Agenda Topic</u>	Discussion	<u>Recommendations</u>
		<ul> <li><u>NOTIFICATION SYSTEM</u>: required notices to students (began Spring 2013 and continues)</li> <li><u>MANDATORY ASSESSMENT/ORIENTATION/ED</u> <u>PLANS</u>: clarifying/defining abbreviated and comprehensive ed plans; completion of ed plans in MAP; recording completion in MIS</li> <li><u>ENROLLMENT PRIORITIES</u>: programming system to accommodate new criteria ("test run" this Summer 2014)</li> <li><u>APPEALS/EXEMPTION PROCESSES</u>: establishing processes to appeal loss of enrollment priorities and waiver from mandated assessment/orientation/ed plans</li> <li><u>MIS DATA ELEMENTS</u>: defining services, recording service contacts by student, programming and reporting</li> </ul>	
d.	Mt. SAC Student Success Plan – Audrey & Dan		Tabled
e.	CIRP Questions - Audrey		Tabled
4.0	Reports from Committees		
a.	Assessment & Matriculation – Jim Ocampo	Jim presented approved minutes from September 11, 2011 and two more sets of minutes from September 25 and October 16 have not yet been approved by the Committee.	Informational



1946 – 2011

1540	1946 - 2011					
<u>ltem</u>	<u>Agenda Topic</u>	Discussion	<u>Recommendations</u>			
		<ul> <li>The following was reported:</li> <li>Discussions are focusing on the proposed pilot for the AWE Rubric that Eric and Barbara McNeice-Stallard put together.</li> <li>Eric shared the proposal with the AWE Facilitators but may have missed some of the committee members. There was a misunderstanding about inter-rater reliability; some felt that it was necessary to identify the rater. It was clarified that there was no need to do this – you simply identify the similarity in placement results (3 readers used).</li> <li>The Committee reportedly approved the rubric on October 16 such that the pilot should be starting soon.</li> </ul>				
b.	Basic Skills – Glenda Bro Minutes:	Glenda reported that there was no meeting on October 10 <sup>th</sup> ; prior minutes were presented at the prior meeting. The committee is working on data collection for End of Year Report to be posted to the web page and working on to finalize the format and rubric for the project proposals for next year.	Informational			
C.	Student Equity – Juan Carlos Astorga/Phil Maynard	<ul> <li>Juan Carlos distributed the Minutes from September 23<sup>rd</sup> to the Council. The following was reported:</li> <li>The Committee is gearing up for a renewal of the Student Equity Plan. At the present time, there are</li> </ul>	Informational			



1946 – 2011

<u>ltem</u>	Agenda Topic	Discussion	<b>Recommendations</b>
		<ul> <li>five categories: Access, Course Completion, ESL/Basic Skills, Degree/Certificate Completion, Transfer Rate.</li> <li>The committee received feedback from the Academic Senate to have faculty representative from DSPS and EOPS.</li> <li>Chau Dao, Director of Financial Aid, will be present at the next meeting for the discussion of reviewing satisfactory academic progress as it relates to students on Financial Aid</li> </ul>	
5.0	Future Agenda Items:		
a.	Mt. SAC Student Success Plan & Educational Master Plan		
b.	Student Surveys: CCSSE & Graduate		
C.	Reading Requirements for Graduation		
d.	Catalog Rights for Degrees		
6.0	Set Agenda for next meeting: November 4, 2013		