

Membe	Members [18]					
\boxtimes	Audrey Yamagata-Noji, Co-Chair	\boxtimes	Lance Heard, Co-Chair			
\boxtimes	Madelyn Arballo	\boxtimes	Francisco Dorame		\boxtimes	Ned Weidner
\boxtimes	David Beydler		Michelle Dougherty	□ Donna Necke		
\boxtimes	George Bradshaw	\boxtimes	Matt Judd	☑ Bruce Nixon		
\boxtimes	Guadalupe De La Cruz	\boxtimes	Sara Mestas			
Stu	dent Representatives:		Jacob Duarte	Shailah Arreola-Bittner		Sophia Ruiz

Guests: Lisa DiDonato, Koji Uesugi, Andi Sims, Alejandra Gonzalez

Item No.	Agenda Item	Discussion	Outcome
1.0	Review Today's Agenda and Minutes from April 20, 2020	Add to the agenda: temporary solution to AmLa placement (David)	Minutes of April 20 approved.
2.0	Committee Meeting Minutes for Review and Approval		Accreditation Standard IV.A.7
a.	Student Equity – no minutes for acceptance	Student Equity met last Monday.	
b.	Assessment and Matriculation – April 8 minutes for acceptance	David pointed out that this was about the initial discussion about AmLa references – which subsequently changed.	April 8 minutes accepted.
			Accreditation Standard IV.A.7
3.0	Research Agenda (David) David to provide update to Council on the findings to date and plans for further research (Carried over from last meeting)	David shared math placement results and success rates. Success rates have fallen over time – Statistics went from 60% to 47% success rates – but there was increased access to transfer-level math courses based on the AQII for Fall of 2019. Overall, the number of successes in transfer-level courses has gone up in terms of total numbers of students. For example 1,690 students passed Math 100-180 from Fall 2017 to 2,129 students passing in Fall 2019. This is inclusive of the fact that the numbers of students enrolling in math dropped by almost 1000 students. Research on first-time math students is needed to show a more accurate measure of throughput under the AQII model.	The equity statistics are compelling such that a joint discussion between Assessment and Matriculation, Student Equity, SPEAC and faculty from English, math, reading, AmLa and Noncredit and students is recommended. Audrey will meet with Richard to develop and organize such a discussion – hopefully in the spring semester.



With respect to grade distribution, there is a decrease in the #s of A;s, B's, and C's and higher F's and somewhat more W's. However, the distribution of A, B, and C grades among all passing grades for Math 100-180 classes is about the same.

There is insufficient information about student enrollment in pre-transfer-level courses. Discussion about students who are "woefully unprepared" for transfer-level math and know that they are not prepared. Matt Munro expressed that we are not giving enough guidance and information to students who need placement at a lower level as well as students who have lower confidence and probably could succeed at a higher level. Additionally, there are fewer pre-transfer-level credit math courses available. AIME (noncredit) courses are available.

Sara asked about the ability for students to change math courses during the first week of class. The problem is that there isn't always a place for these students to go. Math Information Tables are a joint effort between math faculty and counseling faculty.

David shared the guidance that is available for math faculty to advise students – especially if they appear to be highly unlikely to succeed in the class. A Math Support Options webpage is also available.

In a Fall 2019 survey, students in Math 71 stated they enrolled at that level to prepare for transfer-level courses. Only 6% didn't know they could enroll in a transfer-level course.

Lisa will work with David. Matt Munro, Matt Judd, Ned Weidner, Michelle Dougherty to devise a survey of Spring 2020 students enrolled in various levels and with/without coreg classes. Some suggestions parallel the fall survey: how prepared they feel for the class, why they enrolled at this level of the course, particular challenges they have faced, impact of moving to an online/remote learning environment (if class was not originally DE/DL). Faculty would have students complete the survey. Another aspect is whether we should ask faculty to do anything further but instead send the survey directly to students.

Accreditation Standard II.C.5 Accreditation Standard II.C.7 Accreditation Standard IV.A.7



		Lance shared a concern about students who "walk away" and never are seen again. Discussion about how to best reach/advise students – that counselors are doing an excellent job. What role should math faculty play? With regard to equity and the 80% Index, African Americans and Latinx students were the lowest performing at 32% and 59% pass rates in Math 110; and for all math courses, 40% for African Americans and 61% for Latinx. Discussion about having cross-discussions between Assessment and Matriculation, Student Equity Committee and SPEAC. Inviting faculty with "boots on the ground" (from these departments) is critical. Shailah expressed students' confusion related to the purpose of the corequisites and whether they will be retained or phased out. Ned shared the English department's perspective. Their corequisite classes were designed to assist students in completing transfer-level English 1A in 1 semester instead of 3. English department success rates haven't dropped as much as Math. Discussion about having follow up surveys in class.	
		Another major consideration to study is "what is happening with students who drop a math course?"	
4.0	Assessment and Matriculation recommendations #51 & #52 (David)	Recommendation 51: Make a change to the AQ related to students' checking their highest level of education. This recommendation would unbundle "Earned a high school diploma" and "earned a high school equivalency." For "equivalency" – querying whether students took the GED	Suggestion to add: "score unknown" related to GED math score. Accept both recommendations #51 and #52. Will these



		math test and to enter the score (between 100-200) and the GED English test and enter the score. Scores from GED would correspond to the level of support recommendations that students would receive (support strongly recommended; support recommended). For now, this is just for math. For students who both attended high school and took the GED, the GED scores are assumed to be more recent, thus the GED scores would be used. Madelyn shared that the GED test is of high rigor and therefore may be reliable. It is normed on high school students.	recommendations need to go through the Academic Senate? Lance will follow up. Changes from last meeting related AmLa changes in the AQ are still pending from IT. The Academic Senate was fine with this recommendation.
		Recommendation 52: Reading placement for students who did not attend HS in the U.S. to be provided with a drop down menu to help filter out placement recommendation between READ 90 and "See AmLa Department." A Guided Self-Placement document is available online and students can speak to a counselor about READ 100 eligibility.	Accreditation Standard II.C.5 Accreditation Standard II.C.7 Accreditation Standard IV.A.7
5.0	Subcommittee(s) for Administrative Procedures & Board Policies (ongoing) Discussion to review process to appoint BP/AP subcommittees Status update on AP 5035, BP 5140, and AP/BP 5300 (Maridelle) History: This item was on the agenda for March 2 nd , 2020, but was to be held over until the next meeting. Lance said that the Council should think about		AP 5140 and AP 5300 will be brought forward to the Council in the Fall.
	whether establishing a separate workgroup for AP/BPs is a benefit. April 6, 2020: recommended postponing this discussion and to only work on the most critical ones, and those that are close to moving forward.		Accreditation Standard I.B.7 Accreditation Standard I.C.5 Accreditation Standard IV.A.2 Accreditation Standard IV.A.7



	AP 5520: Audrey will work with Andi, Alejandra and Koji and will have ready for next meeting. Look into AP 5035, if it was already changed at a SPEAC meeting, it can go back to AMAC. Maridelle to follow up. 5140 and 5300: Need to get update from Grace and Student Equity Committee as to whether to move these forward this semester. Maridelle to follow up with them April 20, 2020: carried over from last meeting		
6.0	AP 5520 Student Discipline (Koji, Andi, Alejandra, Audrey) Update from President's Cabinet <i>History:</i> Brought to the SP&S Council by Student Life because it had been reviewed by a consultant in September 2018. Was not presented in 2018-19 or Fall 2019. Council is requesting summary of issues to be addressed. April 20, 2020 - Added "The Standards of Conduct shall apply to conduct related to College activity or College attendance, including but not limited to conduct that occurs on College premises, at College sponsored activities and at College off-campus activities, whether these activities are taking place face-to-face or online activities." "Substantial incongruity between the proposed sanction and finding" – needed clarification. Proposed rewrite "There is substantial imbalance between the proposed sanction issued in comparison to the violation finding." Council members are to continue reviewing changes, including definitions. This AP will be agendized for	 Koji reviewed additional changes made – including the changes from the 4.20.20 meeting and changes suggested by President's Cabinet from 4.23.20. Change "accommodation" and make it "accommodation(s)" Clarification of the role of an attorney as an "advisor" – to observe, consult with the student, and provide support to the student. Additionally, the following language was added: "Upon receipt of the notification, the college representative and the student conduct board may also be accompanied by an attorney whose role is limited to that of an advisor to the Student Conduct Board." "If the Student Conduct Administrator makes a recommendation for expulsion, the recommendation will be forwarded to the College President/CEO. At the Board of Trustees level, it is not a "re-hearing" but Ed Code references the Board's involvement as a "hearing". Additionally, the Board of Trustees is not required to ask questions nor respond to questions as part of their hearing process. 	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



	the next meeting for a vote and then forward to Academic Senate to be hopefully approved in the current academic year.	 Lance raised the issue of adding "restorative justice" to allow for the possibility of utilizing this method. This would be added to the Discipline Conference. "Student Life Official may introduce restorative justice options." At the hearing, add "The Hearing Board may recommend restorative justice options." Lance will provide a definition of "restorative justice." Definitions: will be refined and pared down to be essential and pertinent. 	
7.0	Review CIRP Survey questions Review faculty feedback and Council's submitted revisions/suggestions for CIRP institutional questions. Workgroup update. Make a decision whether to go forward with the CIRP for 2020 – or wait until next year. History: The 2016 CIRP was presented to the Council by Bruce in March 2018. This was the last time CIRP was administered. Per Barbara, for CIRP, "Institutions have the option of adding up to 20 multiple choice questions of specific local interest at the end of the questionnaire." Each response choice students give is considered 1 question. So, 20 clicks=20 questions March 2, 2020: Lance provided a brief overview of this agenda item. Maridelle will send a reminder to the Council to review CIRP questions (including a link on CIRP from Mt.SAC's 2017 Institutional Self- Evaluation Report), prior to the next meeting. This agenda item will be carried over to the next meeting and Council members will provide their input on the Mt. SAC's specific questions, as well as provide any recommended new questions.	Lance and Lisa would like to move the CIRP forward. Suggestions were incorporated into the recommendations. There is only one item in question. Q 57: [old version] When I think about how I performed as a student in high school: I am proud of all of my grades in high school I am proud of most of my grades in high school I did what I had to do to get by I am not proud of most of my grades in high school I am not proud of all of my grades in high school I am not proud of all of my grades in high school I am not proud of all of my grades in high school I am not proud of all of my grades in high school I am not proud of all of my grades in high school I am not proud of all of my grades in high school I did not complete version] In high school, how much did you know about taking classes at Mt. SAC? I completed college courses while in high school but knew a lot about Mt. SAC I knew a little bit about taking classes at Mt. SAC I knew very little about taking classes at Mt. SAC I knew nothing about taking classes at Mt. SAC	The Council was split of whether to keep the old version of Q 57 or to accept the newer version of Q57. There was discussion about Q59 such that the responses were amended. There was suggestions about adding 2 more questions: • How much did COVID 19 play into your decision to attend Mt. SAC? • What is your comfort level with taking online/remote instruction as you begin Mt. SAC? We will work to develop responses to these 2 items and to share it with the Council. Suggestion was endorsed to provide the survey to students enrolling in



	April 6, 2020: Lance will meet with Lisa to review the CIRP and the institutional questions. Francisco will review the possibility of delivering the CIRP as part of the New Student Orientation. Council members will submit suggestions for institutional questions to Maridelle. Maridelle will send the current institutional questions to Council members as a reference. Will decide at the next meeting to go or not for Summer/Fall 2020. April 20, 2020: Subcommittee to work on this. [Lance, Lupita, Sara*, Naomi, HSO rep] *Audrey volunteered Sara as she co-chairs Guided Pathways and this is related. Need to determine deadline dates – by when do we need to submit to HERI.	 Q59: Which answer best describes the reason you decided to attend college now? responses were suggested to be changed: To learn new skills To earn a college degree To earn a degree and transfer To transfer to a four-year university None of the above Discussed possibly adding additional questions about the current conditions How much did COVID 19 play into your decision to attend Mt. SAC? What is your comfort level with taking online/remote instruction as you begin Mt. SAC? 	Summer Bridge and STEP Into College this summer. Additionally, the possibility of adding the survey to students in the Mountie Fast Track will be pursued. Accreditation Standard I.B.6 Accreditation Standard II.A.7 Accreditation Standard IV.A.7
8.0	CARES Act update (Audrey)	Audrey provided a brief update as to the plan to distribute the emergency grants to students.	Council members are interested in participating in another CARES Act meeting related to the second half of the funding – "Institutional Support." Accreditation Standard I.C.1 Accreditation Standard I.C.6 Accreditation Standard IV.A.7
	Future Presentations/discussions Listed on a Separate Attachment		
	Next meeting dates: May 18, June 1		