

Members

<u>x</u> Audrey Yamagata-Noji (Co-Chair)

xMatt Judd

<u>x</u> Linda Diaz

xCorey Case, Student Rep

<u>x</u> Jeff Archibald (Co-Chair)

<u>x</u> Jim Ocampo

<u>x</u>Luisa Howell

_Vacant, Student Rep

x Dan Smith

x LeAnn Garrett

<u>x</u>Bruce Nixon

_Vacant, Student Rep

x Tom Mauch

<u>x</u> Barbara Gonzales <u>x</u> Randy Wilson

x Irma Marin Recorder

x George Bradshaw

<u>ltem</u>	Agenda Topic	<u>Discussion</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
1.0	Review Agenda & Minutes from Oct 19th meeting.		Action: To approve the minutes as is. Approved: Unanimously.
2.0	Multiple Measures - Jim	Jim provided a Student Success Inventory Summary Report for the period of 3/1/15 to 9/15/15 and Questions/Ratings by departments. Discussion points: 2010: Multiple Measure Retreat comprised of departments impacted by assessment – math, English, AmLa, LERN, reading, chemistry and counseling. Questions were derived to help place students.	Jim will gather further data regarding the number/percent of students placed using multiple measures and outcome data related to their success rates. • Appointed a subcommittee to explore accepting counselors' and advisors' recommendations for placement. Randy, Linda,



<u>Item</u>	<u>Agenda Topic</u>	<u>Discussion</u>	Recommendations
		 2015: The idea was to put the survey onto the student portal –but it wasn't put up until this year. Automation is still incomplete. Currently, the use of multiple measures is a manual process. Responses to questions range from 0 to 2 points. Example: English Writing HS GPA = 3.0 and higher = 1 point Educational Goal = AA or higher = 1 point Math HS GPA = 3.0 to <3.5 = 1 point HS GPA = 3.5 or higher = 2 points Reading HS GPA = 3.5 and higher = 1 point Educational Goal = any choice other than "I don't know" = 1 	Corey, Matt and Jim will serve on the subcommittee to begin exploring "guidance-informed" placement with the English, math and LERN departments. Jim will present the most recent faculty and student placement satisfaction surveys at a future meeting. SP&S directs SSSPAC to review the hope theory questions (20-25) to determine whether to keep using these questions and if so how to utilize responses to these questions.
		 Interpretation of Multiple Measures across the state is unclear. This has complicated the implementation. Discussion: What is the intent in using multiple measures? To only use in certain cases 	



<u>ltem</u>	<u>Agenda Topic</u>	<u>Discussion</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
		(borderline/tie breaker, etc.) or for all students to be used as part of the initial placement?	
		 11,055 students have been tested between 3/1/15 to 9/15/15. 8,089 students completed the survey between 3/1/15 to 9/15/15. 	
		Corey enlightened the council members about his perspective as a student.	
		Concern is that one assessment shouldn't be the sole determining factor. Many students placed into lower level basic skills courses become discouraged and do not enroll in subsequent levels.	
		Can we scale up our process and utilize counselors to use multiple measures for placement?	
		Look at more fairly applying multiple measures criteria for all students' placement. This would mean providing counselors/advisors the authority to recommend a placement level.	
		One of the problems is with the holistic scoring mechanism used with AWE in that it isn't a "score"	



<u>ltem</u>	Agenda Topic	<u>Discussion</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
		but a placement "level". Jim shared that the AWE inter-rater reliability is very high.	
		 If multiple measures criteria can be automated, all students' placement levels would be impacted. 	
		 Questions 20-25 are not being used for multiple measures placement (based on Hope Theory). Response selections of "always" and "never" were not seen as the best type of responses versus – "strongly agree," "agree", "disagree". 	
3.0	Reports from Committees		
a.	Student Equity - Minutes: 5/11/15, 9/28/15, 10/12/2015	Reference September 28 meeting – receiving progress reports on activities that were funded. Even though the state isn't requesting the report, the committee discussed receiving updates. Irene Malmgren's (Instruction team) had a format to report on progress.	Action: Accepted minutes with follow-up
b.	SSSP Advisory - Minutes: 10/14/2015	Minutes not available. Jim will bring to the next meeting. SSSPAC will only have one more meeting this semester.	
C.	Basic Skills - 9/24/15 & 10/8/15		Action: To accept committee's minutes as is
4.0	<u>Updates</u>		
a.	SSSP 2015-16 Plan - Jeff/Dan	The Student Success Plan was passed by the Senate on October 22, 2015.	Informational.



<u>ltem</u>	<u>Agenda Topic</u>	<u>Discussion</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
b.	Student Equity 2015-16 Plan- Audrey/Carolyn		Tabled to the next meeting on
			November 16, 2015.
5.0	New Items		
a.	BP 5010: Admissions		Tabled to the next meeting on November 16, 2015.
b.	AP 5040: Student Records, Directory, and Privacy Information		Tabled to the next meeting on November 16, 2015.
C.	AP 5071: Student Leave of Absence		Tabled to the next meeting on November 16, 2015.
d.	AP 5075: Course Adds and Drops		Tabled to the next meeting on November 16, 2015.
6.0	Next meeting: 11/16/2015		
	 Presentation: Sexual Harassment/Violence Issues and Responsibilities 		
	Future Agenda Items:		
	AP 5520 Student		
	Discipline		
	Revision of CIRP Survey		
	Supplemental Institutional Questions		
	Review CCSSE Survey		
	Early Alert Task Force		
	Update – Pilot		



<u>ltem</u>	<u>Agenda Topic</u>	<u>Discussion</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
	 Common Assessment Presentation – Michelle Sampat and David Beydler Catalog Timeline Discussion – Joumana McGowan 		