President's Cabinet Action Notes

Bill Scroggins, *President & CEO* • Irene Malmgren, *VP of Instruction* • Audrey Yamagata-Noji, *VP of Student Services*
Mike Gregoryk, *VP of Administrative Services* • James Czaja, *VP of Human Resources*

MT. SAC
Mt. San Antonio College

April 1, 2014

1. Cabinet was joined by Bob Hughes, Director of Enterprise Application Systems, and Daniel Daniel Lamoree, Senior Systems Analyst/Programmer, for an update on the Executive Information System. The new system now replicates the 320 extract from Banner, meaning that both reports show the same FTES produced from each term.

   - The need for exception reports was discussed, that is, errors in entries in the Banner class schedule (like wrong instructional method or a start/end out of date range for the term) that would drop FTES for that section out of the 320 Report. Some Argos exception reports already exist, and the team will drop these into the new system. Daniel will work with the Instruction Team to develop any additional exception reports that may be needed to avoid loss of FTES.

   - Already in development is a tool that will allow allocation of FTES to departments by the Instruction Office.

   - Another need is a room availability tool as the feature in Banner is difficult to use; the team will work on such a report in the new system.

   - It would also be useful to have a report on Capacity Load Ratios for each room. The current report makes this calculation only for courses offered by TOP code. (Capacity Load Ratio measures space utilization by room type—lecture, lab, library, prep rooms, office, and so on— using state formulas that drive our eligibility for state facility funds. For example, if we have underutilized lab space, then we do not qualify for state funding to build more labs.

   - This led to a discussion of how rooms are utilized. Mike's team will do a physical space inventory of instructional rooms to determine the actual number of student stations in each—and if any non-instructional use is in place (such as storage units or bookcases). This data will be tabulated with existing Banner information on student stations in each instructional space and the Title 5 driven number of student stations that should be in each room. Cabinet will review this information when available.

2. Audrey updated Cabinet on the issues of reading competency determination for the associate degree.

   - Currently, the Degrees of Reading Power (DRP) exam is used for assessment both of placement into Reading courses and to determine graduation competency in reading. The DRP is used as a competency test in that a satisfactory score upon taking the DRP (placement into READ 100) is deemed to meet the graduation requirement of reading competency. The DRP is approved by the Chancellor's Office for use by Mt. SAC as a "Locally Developed & Locally Managed Assessment Instrument" (link). The approval by the Chancellor's Office is for use of the DRP as a placement instrument. Is the use of the DRP as a competency assessment valid? At issue is Title 5 Section 55522(c)(2) which states that a college may not "use any assessment test in a manner or for a purpose other than that for which it was developed or has been otherwise validated." The above linked web site states, "Degrees of Reading Power has been updated to provide diagnostic reporting on students' progress as measured by Common Core State Standards objectives." Does this imply competency assessment?

- Another issue is the ability to retest. It was Cabinet's opinion that existing policy on assessment retesting should apply to all instruments, including the DRP: wait three months to take the same test again.
- In addition to the DRP, an internally developed Reading Competency Test (RCT) is used to meet the graduation requirement. The RCT has not been validated, is seldom taken, and is rarely passed. The college is at risk by continuing to use an unvalidated test, and Cabinet has given direction that use of the RCT cease no later than the end of this academic year unless validated.
- Cabinet felt that providing more than one means to determine reading competency is the best course of action. These choices for students might be: 1) pass a validated test, either the DRP or the RCT, at the level of eligibility for READ 100; 2) pass READ 90; or 3) pass ENGL 1A or a higher English course.

3. As a follow up to this discussion of reading competency assessment, I read *The Terrain of College Developmental Reading* by Jodi Patrick Holschuh and Eric J. Paulson of Texas State University ([attached](#)). For a white paper on reading, I found it especially dense to read. I came away thinking that assessment of reading is quite a complex venture.

4. Audrey gave an update on international students. Approval was given to hire a person to oversee international students using the job classification, Director, Student Services-International Students. The line item revenue from international student fees will be used to cover the compensation. Cabinet also approved a one-year temporary full-time counselor to work with international students, again funding the position from international student fees.

5. Changes to [AP 5050, Student Success and Support Program](#), as recommended by CCLC and flowing from recently modified statutes and regulations, was reviewed by Cabinet and passed to PAC for recommendations.

6. Changes to [BP 5010, Admissions](#), as recommended by CCLC and flowing from recently modified statutes and regulations, was reviewed by Cabinet and passed to PAC for recommendations.

7. Mike presented a recommendation from the Budget Committee ([attached](#)) that the college discontinue the practice, now in its second year, of not making the annual contribution to the OPEB Trust and paying current year retiree health premiums from the interest earned on the existing OPEB Trust. Cabinet discussed the matter and will make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees that the budget for 2014-15 include the contribution to the OPEB Trust, estimated to be $2.5 million, but that the practice of paying current year premiums from the Trust interest should be continued.

8. Cabinet discussed research support for development of the revised Student Equity Plan. The [attached summary](#) outlines the type of support, organized by writing teams. This proposal will be made to the Student Equity Committee at its next meeting on April 14th. Cabinet approved use of categorical funds to support a research position to support this work.

9. Items for future agendas (items for the **next** Cabinet meeting are shown in **BOLD**:
   a. Degree Works Phase 2: Auto-Award, etc. (Audrey, 5/13)

b. Emergency Response Plan Implementation (Mark DiMaggio & Karen Saldana, 5/20)
c. International Student Initiative (Audrey & Irene, 5/6)
d. Adult Ed Partnerships (**Irene & Donna, 4/15**)
e. Executive Information System (Vic, Daniel & Irene, 5/13)
f. New Reading Competency Assessment (Audrey, 5/6)
g. Improvements in Request to Fill Process and Form (**James, 4/15**)
h. Update on shift differential (James, 5/6)
i. Room utilization data (Mike, Irene, 5/13)