Mt. SAC
Mt. San Antonio College

Members [21]

☒ Audrey Yamagata-Noji, Co-Chair	☒ Lance Heard, Co-Chair		☒ Briseida Ramirez-Catalan
☒ Madelyn Arballo	☒ Guadalupe De La Cruz	☒ Matt Munro	☒ Lani Ruh
☒ David Beydler	☒ Francisco Dorame	☒ Michelle Nava	☒ Tammy Knott-Silva
☒ George Bradshaw	☒ John Kuchta	☒ Donna Necke	☒ Chisa Uyeki
☐ Monika Chavez	☒ Sara Mestas	☒ Bruce Nixon	☒ Jeanne Marie Velickovic
Student Representatives:	☒ Hugo Fulcheri	☐ Mark Josephson	☐

Guests: Maria Tsai, Eric Lara

Item No.	Agenda Item	Discussion	Outcome
1.0	**Review Today's Agenda and Minutes:** **December 7, 2020**	Lance asked the Council for permission to record the meeting. Recordings will be used for members who request them and/or reference for meeting minutes. The Council will grant permission. John noted to revise minutes reflecting his attendance at the December 7 meeting.	Minutes moved, seconded and approved by the Council. Accreditation Standard IV.A.7
2.0	**Committee Meeting Minutes for Review and Approval**		
a.	Student Equity – no minutes received for acceptance		
b.	Assessment and Matriculation – November 18 and December 9 minutes received for acceptance		November 18 and December 9 minutes accepted by the Council. Accreditation Standard IV.A.7
c.	Retention and Persistence –November 24 minutes received for acceptance	Jeanne Marie shared that the committee's focus is the data from the different programs. So far, it has been an exploration; however, they are hoping in the next few months to come up with some proposals on how to follow up on items. Chisa shared that the proposals looking at contextualized math courses and recommendations will be interesting in looking at the multiple ways students	November 24 minutes accepted by the Council.

		are succeeding. Audrey will send studies from the Public Policy Institute of California and the California Acceleration Project to Jeanne Marie to share with the Retention and Persistence committee. Although these studies were looking mostly at the compliance and implementation of AB 705, the PPIC report also details specific strategies that could be implemented. The California Acceleration Project took a DEI approach on their assessment of where California Community Colleges were with the implementation of AB 705. David will ensure that the work being done in the Assessment and Matriculation committee is in sync with the work being done in the Retention and Persistence committee.	Accreditation Standard IV.A.7	
	Action Items			
3.0	AP/BP 4240 Academic Renewal - Address the time to request Academic Renewal for Mt. SAC students. Regional institutions (i.e., LBCC, Rio Hondo) have 12 months/1-year Academic Renewal time request versus Mt. SAC we have a 2-year completion before Academic Renewal can be requested. We are seeking to discuss this topic to and get approval to decrease the timeline to request Academic Renewal at Mt. SAC and mirror that of other regional campuses. (Francisco, Lupita, George & Chisa) • AP 4240 Academic Renewal • BP 4240 Academic Renewal without Course Repetition	Francisco, Lupita, George, & Chisa formed a workgroup to work on AB/BP 4240 Academic Renewal. Francisco shared with the Council that the workgroup looked at the number of years to request an academic renewal. They found that Mt. SAC's sister campuses in the region generally have 1 year, whereas Mt. SAC students have 2 years before Academic Renewal can be requested. Lupita shared that one of the reasons this came up was to look at this in an equitable and transfer-friendly way. The Transfer Center hears a lot of struggles that students face with their academic record and the effect on transferring, in terms of being competitive and their GPA. With this taken into consideration, there is an equitable focus on how long it takes students to do an academic	The workgroup will take the Council's suggestions and continue to work on the AP & BP 4240. Both will be brought back to the next meeting Accreditation Standard I.B.7 Accreditation Standard I.C.5 Accreditation Standard I.C.8 Accreditation Standard I.C.10 Accreditation Standard IV.A.7	

renewal correctly and what other campuses are doing.

This AP/BP can help the student populations that affect retention and completion. Creating a more flexible academic renewal policy can have a positive impact on marginalized students who tend to be more at risk. This could help reduce the time elapsed before a student can petition for academic renewal.

One of the main goals was to make sure that the AP no longer refers students to the catalog for information on Academic Renewal.

Bruce inquired of the revisions being marked on the AP (i.e. strikethroughs, bold/underlined). Lupita says that the workgroup plans to reconvene to work on revising the AP and the BP; however, prior to doing so, they wanted to bring it forward to the Council members and to support further development. The workgroup will provide more data that will support the revisions being proposed. Chisa added that we have to really think of it from the student's perspective of what it can mean what would happen to a student if they cannot gain an academic renewal. Looking at this perspective in terms of retention and persistence for our students. This is why understanding how other campuses handle it becomes really important. Proposed changes can allow a student to be a current Mt. SAC student requesting the academic renewal, versus students coming back to Mt. SAC after the fact.

		Bruce asked what the rationale was for 2 years. Chisa said it comes from a disciplinary approach that we are trying to get away from. Chisa mentioned that this discussion says that we should then include the purpose and why it's important in the AP. That way, we can refer to this rationale in the future. Francisco shared with the Council that the 2-year regulation originated from Title V. However, in recent years, Title V made a modification where they reduced the time on academic renewals. Many schools adapted to the new timeline. Matt asked if there is a limit on the number of times that a person can apply for academic renewal. The catalog shows 24 semester units.	
	5-Minute Break		
	Informational Items		
4.0	Summary of AB 705 Data Report Summary • AB 705 Data Submission Summary submitted December 2020	Audrey shared the background of the AB 705 report due to the state in December 2020. AB 705 legislation, in essence, tells us that we need to use multiple measures for placement of students, which had to be implemented by fall 2019. Students have a goal to get an AA or transfer start in transfer level English and math levels. It is expected that students would complete transfer level English and math in their first year of enrollment at the College. In part, they measure throughput and placement rates. Maria Tsai shared the AB 705 Data Report Summary with the Council. Although we no longer place students below transfer level, the report asks if we also offer pre-transfer level courses, of which	Accreditation Standard II.C.5 Accreditation Standard II.C.7 Accreditation Standard IV.A.5

we still do. By their definition, we still need to submit some data based on enrollment.

The first set of data we submitted in December is identifying the cohort that students actually enrolled in fall 2019 and their first English and/or math courses in the sequence. Some students might have both English and math sequence courses in fall 2019 and some students could just have one. This is the cohort that was compiled based on the definition. Ethnicity distribution is very close to the enrollment distribution.

The blue column in the document is the summary of the cohort that we submitted. This is 5,492 cohort students total, of which was identified as cohorts to track. The Chancellor's office did request data regarding throughput rates; however, only requested students of this cohort with the lowest high school GPA. With this restriction on the lowest GPA, the number that we could report was reduced drastically. The total number is 659, which is about 12% of the total cohort that we can identify.

For the English cohort containing students with the lowest GPA band, we found 77 students that placed at a transfer level, with a 1-year throughput rate of 32.5%. Similarly, we also tracked Math cohorts, based on their career path (BSTEM/SLAM). This can be difficult identifying which major is actually BSTEM/SLAM. The math department recommended using the math courses to determine whether the course is a requirement for the BSTEM major or the SLAM major. As a result, all of the pre-transfer level math courses go into BSTEM.

In summary, these are the reports of the data we submitted. The numbers are quite small.
When broken down by ethnicity to do the equity gap analysis, the number is even smaller. This is why there is a concern of why they only asked for the lowest GPA band. Maria says that for the colleges who did not abide by the placement rules recommended by the Chancellor's Office, they were required to provide evidence and show that even the lowest GPA band students would benefit, when placed at transfer level (not below transfer level). Therefore, they want us to provide the data to show that they do not belong in transfer level. In most cases, this will be very difficult for colleges to prove. We are given a 1-year span of tracking students, whether they can complete transfer level English or math. For the lowest GPA student, if placed several levels below, it would likely take longer than a year to complete transfer level courses. Our data shows that a fair number of students started at transfer level (22%), even though they had a lower GPA and throughput. Moving forward, what will be further researched is what happened to the students who could not successfully pass the first course and what do we do to support these students?

In reference to the table in the summary showing who enrolled at which level, Sara asked whether they were referred to and took the corequisite course because the GPA was less than 2.6. Maria says that, for us, the corequisite in not a mandatory requirement (even though it's recommended in the AQ, based on the information the student provides).

		Audrey shares that there is a lot of interpretation of this data statewide. We believe that the Chancellor's Office is focusing on the at-risk students coming in, based on GPA. Maria says there are many ways to dig deeper and understand better. The math department expressed interest on whether we want to require students below a certain GPA to take the corequisite, rather than allowing them to choose. However, there's still a lot of work needed to help our students; finding more information on what will work best for a different group of students with different needs.	
5.0	Summary of 2019-20 SEAP Report • Mt. SAC Student Equity Annual Report and Outcomes Overview 2019-20 • 2019-20 SEA Annual Report	Audrey shared the Student Equity Annual Report and Outcomes Overview with the Council. The summary provides an overview of the Student Equity Achievement Program, which combines the SSSP credit, SSSP noncredit, BSI and Student Equity budgets. The summary also shows the timeline of what has been submitted since 2018, all of which was submitted through the NOVA data system. The NOVA system displays the collected data for California Community Colleges, as well as the certain demographic group that should be targeted. The summary report also lists the initial five Disproportionately Impacted (DI) groups that the College targeted, related to gender and the five equity metrics from the state. All colleges were required to choose one African American and one Hispanic or Latino group. For the SEA Annual Report that was due January 1, 2021, we decided to	Accreditation Standard I.B.6 Accreditation Standard II.A.7 Accreditation Standard II.C.7 Accreditation Standard IV.A.5

		add two additional DI groups: Disabled-female-completion, not transfer level math and English, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander-females-transfer. The summary also contains the most recent narratives that was submitted to the state in the SEA Annual Report. The success story, in summary, describes our integration and accountability by combining everything into the SEA program and our professional development work. It explains how the College organized funding and double checked against our goals and metrics, as well as determining what really should stay funded under the SEA program. In addition, it describes the development of the SEAP work plan, which is currently being completed by every program/department that receives SEAP funding. The challenges section focuses on the kick-off of AB 705 and the concern in using the AQ to measure our throughput rates, as well as trying to look at the impact on students who took the corequisite courses. Additionally, the permissive regulations in regards to withdrawing from classes affected the way we were collecting data and posed a major challenge. The outcomes section is a narrative summary of what was submitted by Council members and the Research department.	
6.0	Launch of SCFF Dashboard Phase 1 • Brief Phase 1 SCFF Dashboard • SCFF Dashboard presentation		Held over until next meeting Invite Daniel Berumun to present Mt. SAC data
7.0	Student Equity Plan discussion (Audrey & Eric Lara)		Held over until the next meeting

8.0	Discussion: Student Equity Committee Purpose and Function Statement • [Student Equity Committee Purpose & Function statement](#)	The student equity committee purpose and function statement was approved through this Council, however, was sent back by PAC. This is due to the "work plan" reference. The correct verbiage should reference the Student Equity Plan. Eric Lara shared that adding, "work plan" was the initial understanding shared by SPEAC. Audrey shared from a discussion at AMAC that the work plan goes through a college wide process and does not start at the committee. Audrey shared with the Council what the SEAP work plan is, compared to the Student Equity Plan that the Council has previously worked on. The work plan is an internal structure. The Student Equity Plan is what we submitted to the State. Chisa shared that it would be a good idea for the work plan to go through governance, so that we are seeing the entirety of it.	The Student Equity Committee will work on revising the Purpose and Function statement. Accreditation Standard IV.A.2
	Future Presentations/discussions		
	See attached		
	Next meeting dates: March 15, April 5, April 19, May 3, May 17, June 7		