

Los Rios District Matriculation Committee

February 23, 2015

DO Board Room

2:30pm-4:30pm

APPROVED Minutes

Members Present: Kathy Degn (DMC Chair), Vice Chancellor Sue Lorimer (Administrative Liaison), Richard Andrews (CRC Classified Staff), Robert Heisleman (SCC Classified Staff), Salena Mamuyac (District Rep. for Assessment), Jerome Lahey (ARC Classified Staff), Mark Garrett (FLC Counseling Faculty), Bobby Gosal (FLC Classified Staff), Angelia Jovanovic (SCC Counseling Faculty), Jessica Nelson (ARC Counseling Faculty – ARC Matric Co-Chair), Judy Mays (ARC Matriculation Coordinator)

Members Teleconferencing: Ally Joye (ARC Non-counseling Faculty/ Matriculation Chairperson, Camile Moreno (CRC Non-Counseling Faculty/Matriculation Chairperson), Denise Marshall-Mills (CRC Counseling Faculty), Lisa Sapra (FLC Non-counseling Faculty/ Matriculation Chairperson), Melanie Dixon (FLC Dean of Student Services), Stephen Mayfield (FLC Student Representative)

Members Absent / Excused: Associate Vice Chancellor Victoria Rosario (Alternate Administrative Liaison), L. Milan Fisher (ARC Student Representative), Anna Lozano (CRC Student Representative), Debra Luff (SCC Matriculation Coordinator), Jeff Stephenson/Robin Neal (ARC VPSS), Christine Thomas (CRC Matriculation Coordinator), Gerri Scott (SCC Counseling Faculty/Local Chair) Remi Rivera (SCC Student Representative)

Guests: None

- I. **Call to order** – The meeting was called to order at 2:40 p.m.
- II. **Approval of agenda** - Approved with one addition to discussion items (See item f. below).
- III. **Approval of minutes for December 8, 2014** - Approved with corrections.
- IV. **Public comments** - None
- V. **Introductions** - None
- VI. **Administrator's report** - None
- VII. **Chair's report** - None
- VIII. **Action items** - None
- IX. **Discussion items**
 - a. Update on Math Course Repeatability Issues – VC Lorimer and Group

There is a concern regarding how repeatability is being implemented between the sequences of courses that occur in one semester vs. those occurring in two semesters. It is possible that students would be able to fail a course multiple times in the one semester format then switch to the two semester course and receive additional chances to repeat, which could be argued is the same course but in another format. It is doubtful that our current configurations of some courses would not pass an audit test, thereby making the District financially liable. The Math faculty and Deans have met and have asked for IT staff to join them to identify these courses and how students might be prohibited from possibly enrolling in courses that may not be “legal”. Staff would like a way to redirect students to a more appropriate course based on their prior success. I.e. – if a student fails a one semester format course they might be redirected to a slower paced course or provided with a different course altogether. What is really needed is a way to identify strategies to promote student success and be more proactive. Ann Licciardi from SCC is the Dean of Mathematics who will be invited to speak on this subject at the next DMSSC meeting. It was recommended that DMSSC members conduct a conversation with their campus Math Department to find out what their interests are in regards to courses that might be affected by this possible change and to students who fall into this situation.

b. Update from Campuses on Course Recency Practices – VC Lorimer and Group

There was a short conversation about creating a recency policy that centered around levels of math (or similar) not the specific course title itself and that there was possibly a committee already working on this topic. The question was raised about who is participating on this committee? It was also noted that any decision needs to be made slowly and deliberately and should not be rushed. Committee expressed support that a revised recency policy would benefit students and the district should reevaluate the existing policy. It was also noted that there may already exist alternative courses that students could be referred to. For example, at some colleges “math boot camp” courses are available, at other colleges these courses are named differently but provide the same learning benefits.

c. Adult Education Grant Update – VC Lorimer

The final plan is due to the state Chancellor’s Office on Friday, February 27, 2015. There was a trailer bill introduced that provided for \$500 million in total state funding. This included \$350 million for maintenance of effort to support existing programs, those that continued to function despite past years budget cuts. The remaining \$150 million can be used to expand adult ed programs but only at K-12 districts, not Community Colleges. The funds could however be available to support course alignment between K-12 and the CCC. In the original grant proposal LRCCD was intended to be the Fiscal Agent for the grant funds but changes in the trailer bill will allow the local County Office of Education to act in this role. LRCCD is hopeful that the Sacramento County Office of Education will take over in this capacity. A seven member allocation board will decide how the money is allocated and LRCCD will remain as a member of this group. It is still to be decided what role LRCCD will play in the actual education programs developed, it is expected that this would be primarily in the role of coordinating efforts between k-12 and our existing courses.

d. LRCCD Regulation and Policy 7145 update (Distance Education) - VC Lorimer

The policy piece was approved by the LRCCD Board of Trustees in January 2015. Policy was changed to reflect what we must do and not how we will do it. The policy is now being reviewed by the Faculty Unions and Academic Senates to determine the next steps. The policy focuses on what and how we would determine which “Learning Management Systems” (LMS) would be utilized. We currently have multiple

LMS and the desire is to pare this down to one system. The question was raised if “My Math Lab” could still be used in the classroom setting vs online? The answer was that yes, this would still be allowed as long as ADA and FERPA requirements were being met. There is also currently a discussion about the possibility of adding My Math Lab into the D2L system, this is a possibility but a contract between all parties must be entered into.

e. What can we do to help Basic Skills Students better succeed at our Colleges?

It was stated that over 3000 students in the district tested into basic skill level courses, yet higher level courses are offered in larger numbers and are more available to students. Suggestions were made that better planning needs to occur, using information from things like iSEP’s to make a prediction of the need for certain level of courses, the basic skills report card - i.e., measuring what is our ability to move students forward at a “faster pace?” should be utilized. The question was asked about how we factor in the number of students who assess into basic skills and never actually enroll due to limitations of course availability.

f. Completion of Comprehensive iSEP’s and SSSP Funding

Since a large portion of SSP funding will be based on the number of iSEPs completed, (initial iSEPs are worth 5% of funding and comprehensive iSEP’s are worth 35%, but only the first iSEP completed of each type can be counted towards this funding) it is critical that LRCCD have a well-defined and thorough policy about this process. There was a question regarding whether there was any consequence to students for not having a comprehensive iSEP and if not, then because of its high status for funding what is the district’s position on how to encourage completion of it? It was also noted that considering the financial benefit to the district of student’s having a comprehensive iSEP done, does the standard 30 minute counseling appointment allow enough time to produce a valuable product for the student to use?

Members would like either Victoria Rosario or Jeff Stephenson (who chaired that workgroup) to provide guidance on the comprehensive vs. initial iSEP policy for the district.

Other: It was requested that at the next DMSSC meeting we review the priority agenda items identified at the DMSSC meeting from May 2014.

X. **Next meeting:** Spring 2015 – March 16, 2015 - D.O. BOARD ROOM

XI. **Adjournment** - The meeting was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.