**Members**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Audrey Yamagata-Noji, Co-Chair |  | Lina Soto, Co-Chair |  |  |  |  |
|  | George Bradshaw |  | Matt Judd |  | Jim Ocampo |  | Martin Ramey |
|  | Sun Ezzell |  | Tom Mauch |  | Sandra Padilla |  | Ana Silvia Turcios |
|  | LeAnn Garrett |  | Bruce Nixon |  | John Pellitteri |  | Ned Weidner |
| **Student Representatives:** | |  | Corey Case |  | Brian Moon |  | Daniel Garcia |

**Guests: David Beydler, Michelle Dougherty, Margie Whalen, Koji Uesugi**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item No.** | **Agenda Item** | **Discussion** | **Outcome** |
| 1.0 a. | Review Today’s Agenda |  |  |
| b. | Review and Approve Minutes from June 5, 2017 | Correct spelling to the following agenda items:  Item 4.0: “SSPAC” to “SSSPAC”  Item 6.0: “Madeline” to “Madelyn” & “SPAAC” to “SSSPAC”  Item 7.0:”basic skills” to “basic needs” | Approved with minor corrections |
| c. | Review 2016-17 Year End Accomplishments | The document was already reviewed by Council at the June 5, 2017 meeting. Submission is currently not required. | Accepted |
| 2.0 | Review Council’s Purpose and Function(*new format*), Membership and 2017-18 Meeting Dates | LeAnn pointed out that the current purpose statement is not grammatically correct. She moved the following change: *The Student Preparation and Success Council exists to make recommendations regarding student preparation and success based on stakeholder input and informed discussion.*  Lina asked about function #2: add back in “to provide input to the campus decision-making process.” Therefore, it would read: *Analyze and synthesize data and information to develop recommendations on policies to provide input to the campus decision-making process.* | M/S/C to change the purpose statement.  M/S/C to change function #2. |
| 3.0 | Council’s Strategic Plan Goals 2017-18  *Review & Approve Columns 1&2 for Oct. 1 submission* |  | Held over to next meeting |
| 4.0 | Multiple Measures – Math & English Department Proposals  *David Beydler confirmed to present Math Proposal*  *Margie Whalen to present English Proposal* | Jim shared that Chris Graillat from the Chancellor’s Office has stated that we don’t need to renew any dates on any of our instruments with expiration dates.  **MATH DEPARTMENT** (David Beydler)  David provided background that led to the math department’s recommendation to move to Multiple Measures for course placement using high school grades and GPAs for placement. The state Chancellor’s office developed a MM model (MMAP) accurate. The math department met over the summer and put together a specific proposal. The handout “Mt. SAC Math Placement System” (11 points) was approved by the department on August 25, 2017. Although the department thought about having a pilot first, they believed the data was so clear that there would be a disservice to students if it wasn’t put into place. Additionally, a pilot could be confusing and lead to greater inequity. Unweighted, cum GPA + last math course completed + grade in the course + current math course enrolled.  The hand-out “Mt. SAC Mathematics Multiple Measures Model – Version 8/25/17” is a grid showing the Mt. SAC math course and the course and GPA for both direct matriculants and non-direct matriculants. It also shows deviations from the statewide MMAP model. For Math 100 and 110, the statewide model only has an Algebra I requirement, but the department is requiring an Algebra II requirement, especially since Intermediate Algebra is a prerequisite to this level of math. Courses need to have been passed with a “C” or better. David passed out another hand-out entitled “Mt. SAC Math High School Performance Placement System” (an updated version of the other hand-out).  Michelle mentioned that AB 705 provides that we cannot require a prerequisite unless we can prove that the student would not be successful.  “Non-Direct Matriculants”: **need to clarify our definition of non-direct matriculant** – what is the length of time a student has been out of high school? One definition is that the “non-direct” means the student’s GPA is not definitive because the student is still enrolled in high school. A “direct” would mean that the HS GPA is complete as the student has graduated high school.  Research supports the use of HS GPA up to 10 years post high school.  New Course Proposal: Math 53 - *Essential Topics from Algebra* (2-unit) to tack onto Math 130 or Math 71. However, due to repeatability issues, they may need to develop it into 2 separate courses. Certain CRNs would have this link as a corequisite. Additional coursework could either be front-loaded or infused as the course moves along.  Corey raised the issue of student fatigue (7 units) for Math 71 + Math 53. He also was concerned about these courses filling because students may not want to enroll in these many units.  David explained that students would have an incentive to take the course.  It will be critical for counselors, faculty, staff and others to fully inform students of their options. “You can move ahead if you will take the corequisite.”  Other issues relative to Veterans benefits recipients and Financial Aid recipients in terms of what their educational plans will allow and how this will impact their total number of units.  LeAnn raised the question about how adding an additional course has entered into the model. The presentation on campus was limited to using GPAs and highest courses for placement and not the additional coursework. Clarification was made that we are talking about 2 related things: placement by GPA/course and enrolling in an additional corequisite course.  **ENGLISH DEPARTMENT** Margie Whalen gave the presentation, noting that Michelle and Ned were critical in the development of their proposal. Based on their research, they believed that they could reform their placement process by looking at access and success. Their goal is to increase access by establishing multiple ways that students can gain eligibility to classes. Their model is based on cumulative GPA, or grade in 12th grade English or AWE placement test. They hope to implement as soon as possible, being realistic about the time it will take to implement.  The department is clear that there will be a need for institutional support in order to make this model successful including corequisite courses, tutoring/tutors in the classroom, counseling/advising, classroom space, research, and professional development and technological support.  English 90 is an alternative to English 67 and English 68. In their pilot, students who were English 68 level passed at higher rates in English 1A than the English 1A eligible students. 81.6% success rate with cohort vs. 52% success rate, taking two years of English.  An important, related issue is whether the college will maintain the “eligible for English 68” prerequisite for non-English courses.  The department would like to provide students with the option to still complete the AWE.  Jim shared his initial list of implications for these proposals including:  How to test reentry and non-native English students  How to work with international students  How to serve students who don’t fall into the departmental guidelines (lower GPAs)  The work that IT will need to do  Importing high school transcript data into Banner  Jim encouraged everyone to provide additional points about things we will need to do to put this into place.  The English Department is a bit ahead in that they are already using English 66 for a student to bump up into English 1A and to take English 90 to bump into English 1A. | Provide input to Jim Ocampo regarding implications for implementing the MMAP model for English and Math placement. |
| 5.0 | Homelessness and Basic Resources Committee – Purpose and Function and Membership review  *Koji Uesugi (Chair) confirmed to attend* | The Purpose and Function for this operational committee was previously approved at PAC. Corey provided the historical background on the formation for this committee. The purpose reads: *HBRC is responsible for reviewing issues and making recommendations regarding issues that students are facing related to homelessness and/or the lack of other basic needs.*  Once the committee meets, they can decide on the following:   * Whether to elect a co-chair * Whether to entertain the following change to the purpose statement: “HBRC is responsible for ***proposing*** recommendations ***and solutions*** regarding issues students are facing related to homelessness and/or the lack of basic needs.” | Koji will contact appointing bodies to name members to the committee and convene the committee. |
| 6.0 | Integrated Plan (Basic Skills, SSSP and Student Equity)  *Summer work group recap* |  | Held over to next meeting. |
| 7.0 | **Future Presentations/discussions** |  |  |
|  | AP 3540 – Sexual Assaults on Campus |  |  |
|  | Review of AP 5000 series (Marty)  *Topic carried over from June 5th, 2017* |  |  |
|  | SSSP Plan update  *Topic carried over from June 5th, 2017* |  |  |
|  | Student Equity Plan update  *Topic carried over from June 5th, 2017* |  |  |
|  | **Next meeting date:**  October 2, 2017 | Review Council Goals  Review Integrated Plan (latest draft) and timeframe  Update on Multiple Measures implementation |  |