



**Student Preparation and Success Council**  
 Student Services Center, 9B – Ragan Room  
 December 5, 2016 – Minutes

**Members**

- |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Audrey Yamagata-Noji, Co-Chair | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Martin Ramey, Co-Chair | <input type="checkbox"/> Tom Mauch              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sandra Padilla     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeff Archibald                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LeAnn Garrett          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bruce Nixon | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Pellitteri    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> George Bradshaw                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luisa Howell           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Ocampo  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ana Silvia Turcios |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sun Ezzell                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matt Judd              | <input type="checkbox"/> Maia Lopez             | Eric Lara  |
| <b>Student Representatives:</b>                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corey Case             |   | <b>Guests:</b> Barbara McNeice-Stallard                |

| Item | Agenda Topic   | Discussion  | Recommendations   |
|------|--|---|---|
| 1.0  | <b>Review Agenda for December 5, 2016 and Minutes from November 2016</b> | Delete “Concern is whether...” on 5.a.<br>Correct recommendation “how the MIS data elements are being reported”<br><br>3.b. “A.S. government”   | Minutes approved with minor changes as noted.   |
| 2.0  | <b>Committee Reports</b>   |   |   |
| a.   | Student Equity   | No minutes to share. Next meeting December 12   |   |
| b.   | SSSPAC Advisory  | No minutes to share.  |   |
| c.   | Basic Skills   | No minutes to share. Next meeting December 8  |   |
| 3.0  | <b>New</b>   |   |   |
| a.   | Basic Skills Progress Research Study and Scorecard                       | Presentation from RIE Team – Barbara McNeice-Stallard attended to present the Basic Skills Progress Study. This progression study looked at students’ success rates as they transition from English and math basic skills classes to college level classes.<br><br>Scorecard vs. Current Velocity: The scorecard uses a 6-year tracking model which tracks ultimate success, not initial success. This study looks at the current velocity of success – the first 2 years. Instead of tracking from 2009-10 to 2014-15 to see how they are 6 years later, the | Barbara will review the list of questions generated and return later to address them. |



**Student Preparation and Success Council**  
 Student Services Center, 9B – Ragan Room  
 December 5, 2016 – Minutes

| Item | Agenda Topic | Discussion   | Recommendations |
|------|--------------|--|-----------------|
|      |              | <p>current velocity method is to look at progress at each step (progression in basic skills classes) along the way. Each “step” is the level that the student is placed into. This method provides the student with a 2-year period to enroll in the next, sequential basic skills level. There are 6 steps based on 6 levels of basic skills classes. Different groups of students, one for each milestone.</p> <p><b>FINDINGS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MATH: give up versus not passed – students are not enrolling in the next level course. Low progression from LERN 49 (students who pass LERN 49—Math Skills Review) to Math 50 (enrolling into Math 50). Higher retake rates in later course progression levels: the more they take courses, the more likely they are to retake if don’t pass. Initial success is low but ultimate success is average for LERN students. The lower one starts in the math progression, the poorer the progression.</li> <li>• AMLA: ultimate success rates (after repeats) are high. Where they start matters—the higher the levels, the higher the initial success. AMLA students who progress to English 68 and 1A do better than native students placing into English 68 and 1A.</li> <li>• ENGLISH: higher the level start at the better they do. More likely to retake the course if fail.</li> </ul> <p>These students are likely still here at Mt. SAC which provides us an opportunity for greater follow-up.</p> <p>Profile of students placing into LERN was undertaken earlier. Request was to incorporate this into this work.</p> |                 |



**Student Preparation and Success Council**  
 Student Services Center, 9B – Ragan Room  
 December 5, 2016 – Minutes

| Item | Agenda Topic | Discussion  | Recommendations |
|------|--------------|---|-----------------|
|      |              | <p>Disproportionality impacted groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MATH: African Americans, students with disabilities, Latinos/Latinas, foster youth, males</li> <li>• AMLA: Latino/Latina; male; 25+ age [need to clarify age range]</li> <li>• ENGLISH: Latino/Latina, African Americans, 20+ age, students with disabilities, foster youth, male [need to clarify age range]</li> </ul> <p>Need to look more indepth at populations (especially by ethnicity) to determine the specific profiles of students who need more focused equity/success interventions.</p> <p>Questions raised by council members were noted for future follow-up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council would like to more about students who “stop out” and no longer enroll in the sequence/progression of courses.</li> <li>• Suggestions to do focus groups and follow up with students who are not enrolling in the next sequential level</li> <li>• Council would like further follow-up on the degrees of disparity by reviewing real data related to disproportionality</li> <li>• Review of the profile data of students placing at the lowest levels needs to be integrated into this work – especially looking at SES and first generation level</li> </ul> <p>Sun shared an article about students’ level of preparation and the impact of precollegiate courses. [“Remedial Course Taking at U.S. Public 2 Year and 4 Year Institutions: Scope, Experience and Outcomes.” For “weakly” prepared students, enrollment and progress in “remedial” courses had bigger impacts on students’ abilities to be successful.</p> |                 |



**Student Preparation and Success Council**  
 Student Services Center, 9B – Ragan Room  
 December 5, 2016 – Minutes

| Item | Agenda Topic                  | Discussion  | Recommendations   |
|------|-------------------------------|---|---|
|      |                               | SCORECARD Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unprepared students are trending upward in terms of increased success rates over time.</li> <li>• CAUTION: AWE rubric changed along with placement levels over the latter years of this frame; the impact of the economy more than likely has also had an impact on the fluctuation of enrollment and success rates</li> <li>• Mt. SAC is higher than the statewide average for both prepared and unprepared students.</li> <li>• Success rates in remedial English dipped in the 6 year time frame ending in 2014-15 but rose in 2015-16.</li> <li>• Success rates in remedial Math also dipped in the 6 year time frame ending in 2014-15 and rose somewhat in 2015-16.</li> <li>• AMLA success rates are steadily declining – however, our rates are much higher than the statewide data. Problems also with the definition/measurement for this criteria.</li> <li>• CTE metric looked at students completing 8 credits in the same TOP code area – Mt. SAC's #s are going up and higher than the state</li> </ul> |   |
| 4.0  | <b>Updates</b>                |   |   |
| a.   | New Student Orientation (Tom) | In Tom's absence, Audrey disseminated the college's Guided Pathways Student Intake Process flow chart indicating the proposed change in the matriculation process – orientation prior to assessment with a focus on career development. Discussion focused around whether having students return for so many steps (assessment info/prep; assessment; orientation; ed plans) will have a negative impact on students. A   | Jim will look into whether we can assist students with bus transportation to return to the college. |



**Student Preparation and Success Council**  
 Student Services Center, 9B – Ragan Room  
 December 5, 2016 – Minutes

| Item | Agenda Topic  | Discussion  | Recommendations   |
|------|---|---|---|
|      |   | suggestion was made to assist incoming students to have access to a bus pass in order to return to complete successive steps in the process.  |   |
| b.   | BP 3930 - Children on Campus (Ana Silvia; Sandra and LeAnn) | <p>Sharing of proposed language changes to the BP - modeled after Glendale College (carryover from 11/21)</p> <p>Changes were suggested to change BP 3930 from “Children” to “Minors” on Campus and removing a reference to age (“children under 12 years of age”) to “minors”. Changing from supervised by “a responsible adult” to “the supervising adult who brings them to campus.” Further clarification was added “shall not be left unattended in College buildings, outdoor areas, or in private automobiles.”</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “supervising adult who brings them to campus” doesn’t pertain to all situations – like students who are dropped off to attend an athletic event or come to use the college library</li> <li>• The intent is for all minors to have a parent supervising them at all times when on the college campus</li> <li>• Concerns raised about older students coming to campus to participate in activities or to use services</li> <li>• Concern in changing the age cut off (under 12 years of age) in exchange for “minors” – especially if this is discouraging to potential students</li> </ul> | <p>Subcommittee will re-look at the term “minors” and to possibly include exceptions such as Glendale College’s policy.</p> <p>Look at the possibility of writing an AP related to Minors on Campus – and reviewing existing APs related to minor children.</p> |
| c.   | Multiple Measures (Jim)                                     | Update on MM survey results used for placement.   |   |
| d.   | Review of AP and BP 5000 series (Martin)                    | Update on statutory comparisons report  |   |



**Student Preparation and Success Council**  
 Student Services Center, 9B – Ragan Room  
 December 5, 2016 – Minutes

| Item | Agenda Topic  | Discussion  | Recommendations |
|------|---|---|-----------------|
| 5.0  | <b>Review action follow up items from November 7 meeting</b>                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Student Equity Purpose and Function Statement:</b> Communication clarification to be sent to CSEA regarding change to Classified Senate. (Audrey)</li> <li>• <b>Multiple Measures:</b> Request to RIE related to research needs of implementing MM. Request related to the significance of current placements by multiple measures, and an analysis of the differentiation of points assigned to various questions/responses. (Jim)</li> <li>• <b>AP/BP 5050:</b> These are related to SSSP and Matriculation and do not appear to be accurate. Council requested a review of these APs. (Jim)</li> </ul> |                 |
| 6.0  | <b>Set agenda for Spring meetings</b>   | Ongoing review and updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AP/BP 5000 series</li> <li>• BP 3920 – Children on Campus</li> <li>• Multiple Measures</li> </ul>  |                 |
|      | <b>Spring meeting dates:</b> March 6 & 20<br>April 3 & 17, May 1 & 15, June 5 | <b>Meetings are held the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Monday of the month, 2:00 – 4:00 PM in the Ragan Room</b>  |                 |