

Mt. San Antonio College
Student Success and Support Program Advisory Committee Minutes

March 13, 2019

3:00-4:30 pm

Location: 9B – Ragan Room

Committee Members:

x	Evelyn Hill-Enriquez (Co-chair) (AWE) (Co-recorder)	x	Ned Weidner (English)	x	Maria Tsai (RIE)
x	David Beydler (Co-chair) (Math) (Co-recorder)	x	Patricia Maestro (Counseling)		
	Francisco Dorame (Dean, Counseling)	x	Naomi Avila (Continuing Ed.)		
x	Dianne Rowley (LERN)		Theodos Kidane (At-Large)		

Guests:

x	Michael Harper (English)	x	Hansel Alvarez (English)	x	Chuong Tran (IT)
x	Audrey Yamagata-Noji (VP Student Services)	x	Michelle Sampat (Associate Dean, Instruction)	x	Debbie Rivers (Math)
x	Nico Martinez (Assessment Center)				

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>	<u>OUTCOME</u>
1. Approval of Minutes from February 27		The February 27 minutes were approved.
2. GTEC	E Hill-Enriquez shared that Amla approved use of GTEC to show proficiency equal to TOEFL 450, and is asking for SSSPAC approval.	SSSPAC committee approved.
3.	Updates from SP&S. Items #1-8 were agreed and accepted—with the exception of item #5, which was agreed and accepted with revisions.	
4. SSSPAC Recommendations	The following recommendation items were discussed.	Items #4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>	<u>OUTCOME</u>
	<p>#4 (Reading Placements): D Rowley shared updated rationale. C Tran asked: What should we do with students who have less than 3.1 that already took AQ? M Sampat clarified that such a message will take place at the VP level.</p> <p>#5 (Reading Messaging): Approved.</p> <p>#9 (AMLA Reading Messaging): Approved.</p> <p>A process clarification was made about bringing recommendations forward with exact messaging.</p> <p>#10 (Phase 2 math placement and support recommendation model): Approved.</p> <p>#11 (Geometry Competency Test): Approved.</p> <p>#12 (Intermediate Algebra – First Half Competency Test): Approved.</p> <p>#13 (Phase 2 AQ suggested math course(s) based on major): Discussion about how the major descriptions are going to appear in Banner. P Maestro’s recommendation #1 that students just see the basic table of math meta majors and not individual details for each student. P Maestro’s recommendation #2 that the descriptors “science,” “non-science,” “AS/non-transfer” to make it as simple as possible to give a suggested math class. D Beydler shared that Animal Science is an example of a major that does not have the same math requirements as typical science majors, which makes the use of meta-majors difficult. All agreed that the message should be clear that students can take the math class they feel ready for. N Weidner clarified that at the end of the AQ students will be referred to a MAP workshop and/or counselor. The committee agreed to move item #13 forward.</p>	<p>were approved to move forward to SP&S.</p> <p>P Maestro will get student feedback about the math eligibility and recommendations messaging.</p> <p>All English recommendations were approved, with the added caveat that for #25 E Hill-Enriquez and N Weider will discuss with RIE and IT additional branching in the AQ for students who do not have 3 years of “regular” English at a US high school.</p>

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>	<u>OUTCOME</u>
	<p>#14 (Phase 2 AQ math placement and recommendation messaging): Approved.</p> <p>#15 (Phase 2 AQ math guidance): Approved.</p> <p>#16-22: Skipped.</p> <p>#19 (Phase 2 AQ prototype): C Tran sees that there are parts he can start on. A Yamagata-Noji asked C Tran to map out what he thinks it looks like now.</p> <p>#20 (Date to “Go Live” with AQ 2): April 2 is it possible? It is impossible, per C Tran. English and Math give permission for counselors to override the system so that new/returning students who meet the new AQ Phase 2 requirements can register for the math courses using the new guidelines for placement recommendations. <i>[3/27/19 edit: After the 3/13/19 SSSPAC meeting, the issue of overrides were brought to the Math Department Chair Jimmy Tamayo. Jimmy said he would like to have further discussions with A Yamagata-Noji about this before making a formal decision to allow counselors permission to give these overrides for math. He also requested that this issue be discussed further in SSSPAC.]</i> Possible go live date of May 1.</p> <p>#23-27 (English Placement & Messaging): Approved.</p>	
5. Summer/Fall Schedule Edit Deadlines		Noted deadlines for summer and fall.
6. MyPath Update		No update on MyPath to come. The process has changed.

Next Meeting: March 20, 2019 from 3:00-4:30pm 9B-FF Conference Room *[3/27/19 edit: This meeting was canceled since quorum was not met. The next meeting is scheduled for March 27, 2019 from 3:00-4:30pm in 9B-FF Conference Room.]*

Expanded rationale for Feb 27 recommendation #4 (that SP&S agreed to on 3/4):

Prior to the AQ, DRP distribution data averaged approximately 52% of students placing into READ 100, 34% placing into READ 90, 13% into READ 80, and 1% into READ 70. Current AQ distribution data (per Maria Tsai on 2/6) with eligibility for READ 100 GPA set at 3.1 or higher, only 31% of students are placing into READ 100; 58.5% of students are placing into READ 90. Lowering GPA eligibility for READ 100 from 3.1 to 2.6 will increase the number of students eligible for READ 100. Since eligibility for READ 100 meets the graduation reading competency, that's where the bulk of students should be placing so they are not required to take a reading class.