

Los Rios District Matriculation & Student Success Committee

Monday, September 19, 2016

District Office Main Conference Room

2:30pm-4:30pm

Minutes

Members Attending: **Judy Mays** (Chair), Sue Lorimer (Administrative Liaison), **Deb Luff** (VPSS Representative - SCC), **Kate Jaques** (VPSS Representative – FLC), **Tera Diggs-Reynolds** (Non-Counseling Faculty/Local Co-Chair – ARC), **Christine Thomas** (Matriculation Coordinator – ARC), **Jerome Lahey** (Classified Matriculation Rep – ARC), **Kathy Degn** (Non-Counseling Faculty/Local Chair – CRC), **Richard Andrews** (Classified Matriculation Rep – CRC), **Mark Garrett** (Counseling Rep – FLC), **Melanie Dixon** (Matriculation Coordinator – FLC), **Leila Stone** (Counseling Rep – SCC), **Irina Marsant** (Classified Matriculation Rep – SCC).

Members Not in Attendance: **Victoria Rosario** (Administrative Liaison), **Troy Myers** (DAS Liaison), **Salena Mamuyac** (Assessment Rep), **Jessica Nelson** (Counseling Rep – ARC), **Tadael Emiru** (Matriculation Coordinator – CRC), **Howell Ellerman** (Non-Counseling Faculty Rep – FLC), **Angie Lambert** (Matriculation Chair – SCC), **Molly Springer** (Matriculation Coordinator – SCC).

- I. **Call to order** – The meeting was called to order at 2:34pm.
- II. **Approval of agenda** – The agenda was approved as presented.
- III. **Approval of minutes for May 16, 2016** – A minor spelling error was corrected on page 2 item C. It was moved by Mark Garrett and seconded by Melanie Dixon to approve the minutes as amended.
- IV. **Public comments** – None.
- V. **Introductions** – Kate Jaques, Interim VPSS from FLC was introduced.
- VI. **Administrator's report**
 - a. **Review of District Probation/Dismissal Practices** – Victoria Rosario placed this item on the agenda, however, she was unable to attend the meeting. In her absence Deb Luff provided some background information on the topic. Probation and dismissal procedures across the District have been summarized in a seven page spreadsheet. The document was compiled and vetted by a district wide committee that met last academic year to discuss probation and dismissal practices at each campus. The document is now ready to be vetted district wide by other groups. After being vetted at the campus level, primarily for accuracy and also for comments and feedback, it will come back to DMSSC for discussion. DMSSC will be asked to consider whether there is a desire to come up with practices that may work at each college. A copy of the document will be forwarded to all Committee members to distribute to their constituent groups and for discussion at local Matriculation Committee meetings.
- VII. **Chair's report** – Judy Mays reported that she noticed a discrepancy in the name of the Committee as reflected in the proposed regulation (R-3412) that was voted on last spring by the Committee. Judy pointed out that the name of the Committee in the proposal which includes updates to the Committee's charge and composition is *District Matriculation and Student Success & Support Program Committee (DMSSSPC)*. She noticed, however, that the Committee agenda, meeting minutes and other communications reflect the Committee name as *District Matriculation & Student Success Committee*. Prior to the meeting Judy contacted Dan Crump, District Academic Senate Secretary, for guidance on how to handle the discrepancy. Upon doing some research, Dan informed Judy that the name of the Committee was officially changed from *District Matriculation Committee* to *District Matriculation & Student Success Committee* in 2013. The change was reflected in DAS minutes dated November 5, 2013. Consensus among Committee members present was to keep the name as it was officially changed in

2013. Sue Lorimer retrieved a copy of the current regulation (3412) on file and discovered that the name of the Committee was never updated after it was officially changed in 2013. Judy will update the name of the Committee in the proposal and send it out to all Committee members for one final look.

VIII. **Action items** – None.

IX. **Discussion items**

- a. **SSSP Best Practices – How is each College deciding how the money is being spent?** – An email from Victoria Rosario dated May 17, 2016 addressed this agenda item and no committee members present expressed a desire for any additional information about how SSSP funds are expended at each campus. Christine Thomas noted that things are moving along as presented in each plan, but that adjustments are also made when necessary. Committee members were also given a copy of a letter dated July 5, 2016 from the State Chancellor’s Office which explained that SSSP, Equity and Basic Skills plans would not be required in 2016-2017. It was noted by several Committee members that the State Chancellor’s office has intentions to require greater alignment of each initiative by having colleges submit one plan that includes all three. It was also noted that a district wide group of SSSP coordinators and other representatives from each campus are currently meeting and planning a district wide event to take place next spring that will further inform faculty and others about the various initiatives and their funding requirements.
- b. **New Standard Assessment Practices Implementation (CAI) delay** – A letter from the State Chancellor’s office dated September 12, 2016 explaining that the implementation of the Common Assessment Initiative has been delayed was distributed to each committee member. Irina Marasant provided additional information by informing the committee that bi-weekly meetings of the IT group and general meetings with the original 12 pilot colleges are still ongoing. She also mentioned that beta testing and field testing of the instrument will continue in October. However, the date in which the assessment will be ready is still unknown. Jerome Lahey also stated that the State Chancellor’s office is currently in negotiations to keep the Compass assessment available through the transition, but the status of this decision is not currently known. Sue Lorimer reported that the faculty in the District have completed competency mapping for the new Common Assessment.
- c. **Process and procedures of “I” grades** – A lack of understanding among students about Incomplete grades and their impact on student success prompted discussion of this topic. The concern expressed on behalf of students is that they are often unaware of what is required of them to complete a course in which they received an Incomplete and sometimes do not understand that their grade will default to a different grade if the work is not completed within one year. Incomplete grades that default to “D” or “F” can have a negative impact on a student’s academic standing. An email to inform students about their incomplete grade and the work to be completed has been suggested and also drafted.

There was also concern expressed that there is a lack of clarity among faculty around the circumstances in which an Incomplete grade is justified and whether the criteria for issuing the grade are consistent at all four colleges? Also, whether there is an expectation of faculty to follow-up with students who are issued Incomplete grades is not clear.

Clarification of what options students have to complete their work when the faculty member leaves the institution is also desired.

It was agreed that DMSSC members would take this topic and a copy of the draft email for students to their campus Matriculation committees. Campus level Matriculation committees should provide feedback on the concept and content of the draft email message as well as get input on whether the concern of lack of clarity about Incomplete grades among faculty is indeed an issue and whether it should be taken to the campus Academic Senate.

Sue Lorimer commented that it is within the purview of this Committee to notify students about Incomplete grades as drafted in the email message and to also decide when and how many times students would receive messages.

- d. **Dual Enrollment and issues impacting student success support programs and services** (i.e. assessment, counseling, probation status, etc.) – Sue Lorimer provided a general overview of the status of Dual Enrollment in light of the legislation passed last February. According to Sue, J. P. Sherry has drafted a MOU to be used as a template for colleges to enter into agreements with school districts. Each MOU must have a first and second reading by each District’s Board of Trustees. All faculty teaching college courses on the high school campus must be hired by the college; however, there are some contractual issues that still need to be worked out with regards to STRS credit. Issues of concern as they relate to matriculation and SSSP include: 1) Will high school students be subject to the same re-test policies for any assessments completed as a dual enrolled student? 2) Will high school students complete each matriculation step and subsequently be considered fully matriculated upon enrollment after high school? 3) Will high school students who are dual enrolled be counted in the 900:1 counselor to student ratio?
- e. **Priority .75 Registration for Athletes – What is the take rate?** – This item was postponed to the next meeting.

X. **Next meeting:** October 17, 2016 in District Board Room

XI. **Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 4:42pm.