

Los Rios District Matriculation & Student Success Committee

Monday, March 28, 2016

District Office Board Room

2:30pm-4:30pm

DRAFT Minutes

Members Attending: Kathy Degn (DMSSC Chair), Associate Vice Chancellor Victoria Rosario (Alternate Administrative Liaison), Jerome Lahey (ARC Classified Staff), Richard Andrews (CRC Classified Staff), Mark Garrett (FLC Counseling Faculty), Jessica Nelson (ARC Counseling Faculty), Irina Marsant (SCC Assessment SPA), Tera Diggs-Reynolds (ARC Non-Counseling Faculty/Local Co-Chair), Camile Moreno (CRC Non-Counseling Faculty/Local Chair), Roberto Garner (ARC Student Representative).

Members Teleconferencing: Melanie Dixon (FLC Matriculation Coordinator Coordinator).

Members Not in Attendance: Salena Mamuyac (District Representative for Assessment), Denise Marshall-Mills (CRC Counseling Faculty), Christine Thomas (CRC Matriculation Coordinator), Howell Ellerman (FLC Non-Counseling Faculty/Local Chair), Pamela Smith (FLC Student Representative), Vice Chancellor Sue Lorimer (Administrative Liaison), Leila Stone (SCC Counseling Faculty), Debra Luff (SCC Matriculation Coordinator).

Guests: Julie Olson (CRC SSSP Specialist).

- I. **Call to order** – The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.
- II. **Approval of agenda** - The agenda was approved as presented.
- III. **Approval of minutes for February 22, 2016** - The minutes were approved as presented.
- IV. **Public comments** - There were no public comments.
- V. **Introductions** - The new ARC Student Representative, Roberto Garner was introduced.
- VI. **Administrator's report** – There was no report given.
- VII. **Chair's report**– There was no report given.
- VIII. **Action items** - This item was tabled to a future meeting. The Committee desired to have more discussion about the identification of representatives appointed to this committee.
(a. DMSSSPC – Revisions to Committee Charge – K. Degn)

A byproduct of this conversation was that there is concern about the lack of participation on the DMSSC. This is a large District Wide Committee that is doing important work but yet many appointed members are not showing up for meetings. It was discussed that perhaps we are not communicating with the colleges frequently enough or stressing the importance of having representation at the meetings. In the Future, efforts will be made to increase communications by the Chair to the Presidents of the appointing bodies asking them to encourage their appointees to participate in these meetings on a more consistent basis.

IX. Discussion items

- a. SSSP/Equity –District Wide “kick-off” meeting – update - V. Rosario
There is interest in aligning the LRCCD SSSP/Equity kick-off meeting to the Research and Planning Group Annual Conference. Possible dates being considered for this kick-off are late September or Early October 2016. October is also the due date for the annual SSSP/Equity plans (subject to change) to the CCCCCO. It is expected that the plans will change from the viewpoint of what we are planning to do to also include what our outcomes look like and what has been accomplished.

It was also shared that a calendar is being developed that will include the due dates for the SSSP/Equity plans along with the due dates for other District wide projects and reports. The calendar would be used to facilitate the planning process and to ensure that all constituent groups are included in said discussions.

- b. SSSP Best Practices – How is each College deciding how the money is being spent?
It was suggested that questions be drafted to identify the interest in the project. Once those questions are developed they will be shared with this Committee. A link will be sent to Committee members that will provide access to all four LRCCD SSSP plans and budgets. Also included in this information is a description of the process each campus utilized when developing their individual plans. (The link is included here and in an email sent to all current Committee members: <http://www.losrios.edu/student-services/index.php>)

- c. LMS-Distance Education update – S .Lorimer
Sue Lorimer provided the following written report:
The LMS Work Group has recommended to the District Academic Senate that the Los Rios Colleges agree to join the OEI and transition from D2L to Canvas LMS. The DAS reps are supposed to take that recommendation to the colleges for review and input before DAS makes a formal recommendation to the Chancellor. Also recommended was transitioning as soon as possible such that IT work and faculty training would begin in Fall 2016 with full implementation by December 2017 (18 months from the start of Fall 2016).

A questions was asked in reference to what is the plan to include Student Services in the information loop for this LMS change? Concern was expressed that both the instruction (Cranium Café) and student service departments (on-line orientation) be part of the conversation. The introduction of a new LMS platform is not an exclusive process to the instruction area.

d. Math Course Repeatability – All

The Committee believed that this issue had been resolved by this group and requested a review of the minutes from prior meeting.

Pre-requisite Pilot Workgroup– C. Moreno

Pre-requisite Pilot Workgroup has discontinued their meetings as the work is mostly done and what remains is finalizing the outcomes. It was suggested that this group request that an email be sent out to all students about the possible elimination of the courses that are being considered as repeats. Also a help desk ticket needs to be submitted requesting IT Staff to identify “equivalency groups” of these math courses. This will be needed to identify said courses and prevent “illegal” repeats. It was also suggested the faculty be included in the crafting of a memo about the consequence of these repeats.

e. New Standard Assessment Practices implementation Update (CAI) – All

SCC has begun testing the platform for CAI and will be submitting revisions as needed. The testing process is being done via student participation and their subsequent feedback will be utilized to help determine possible design changes to the platform. SCC currently has 150 students involved in their testing process but over 1,000 students will ultimately be invited to participate and their input will also be incorporated where appropriate. The testing will be completed in time for the new platform to be introduced in the Fall of 2016. Study guides are being developed but they do not yet exist. It was questioned if the current lack of student guides might impact the test results of students currently being tested on the new platform? It was noted that the testing currently being done is for platform design purposes only, it is being done in a “pilot” environment and will not be used for any actual student placement measures.

College have the flexibility to adopt later than Fall 2016, or they can volunteer to adopt at this date. Also if the implementation calendar for the CCCCO comes out and Colleges do not feel ready to switch they can change back to a later date. Faculty at the other LRCCD schools are meeting on a regular basis, these meetings are a “bi-product”

Colleges were encouraged to be as vocal as possible about CAI to ensure that all staff are informed of this new process.

It is anticipated that the CCCCO will soon be announcing the availability of grant funds to facilitate in the implementation of CAI. All College are being encouraged to apply for these “mini-grant” funds when they are announced.

*“To facilitate systemwide implementation of the California Community Colleges (CCC) **Common Assessment Initiative** (CAI), grants are now available to all 113 colleges, announced Jennifer Coleman, Statewide Director of the CAI.”*

<http://archive.constantcontact.com/fs146/1117159276976/archive/1124048485666.html>

f. Process and procedures of “I” grades – FLC

Questions: Do most “I” (incompletes) turn to failing grades? Do students know the process to complete when they have received an “I”?

A request will be made to District IT to create a query to determine how many Incomplete (“I”) notations are given each semester by the different Colleges and how many of these “I” notations are converted to a different grade and how many default to the original grade? It was questioned as to how big a problem this might be and once we identify the size of the problem what action do we take? It was suggested that FLC begin the process of creating draft language that could be given to students explaining what the process is for completing an “I” grade. May want to start with reviewing the catalog language about the process.

X. **Adjournment** - The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.