

Los Rios District Matriculation & Student Success Committee

Monday, September 18, 2017

District Office Main Conference Room

2:30pm-4:30pm

Minutes

Members Attending: **Judy Mays** (Chair), **Kimberly McDaniel** (VPSS Representative – CRC), **Koleen Ostgaard** (Interim VPSS Representative – ARC), **Tera Diggs-Reynolds** (Non-Counseling Faculty/Local Co-Chair – 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), **Leila Stone** (Counseling Rep – SCC), **Karen Tercho** (Non-Counseling Faculty/Local Chair rep – SCC), **Molly Springer** (Matriculation Coordinator – SCC).

Members Not in Attendance: **Victoria Rosario** (Administrative Liaison), **Salena Mamuyac** (Assessment Rep), **Troy Meyers** (DAS Liaison), **Jessica Nelson** (Counseling Rep – ARC), **John Hess** (Non-Counseling Faculty/Local Co-Chair – ARC), **Christine Thomas** (Matriculation Coordinator – ARC), **Camile Moreno** (Non-Counseling Faculty Rep – CRC), **Shannon Cooper** (Matriculation Coordinator – CRC), **Howell Ellerman** (Non-Counseling Faculty Rep – FLC), **Davin Brown** (Matriculation Coordinator – FLC), **Tucker Zurawski** (FLC – Student representative), **Irina Marsant** (Classified Matriculation Rep – SCC).

- I. **Call to order** - Meeting called to order 2:35pm.
- II. **Approval of agenda** – DMSSC Chair added “Assessment Representative to the committee” as discussion item “c.”
- III. **Approval of minutes from March 20, 2017 meeting** – Minutes approved by consensus; however, it was noted that the Chair should research what constitutes quorum for conducting the business of the committee. Committee members agreed that nothing would be moved to Action Items without this information.
- IV. **Public comments** – There were no public comments or comments made on behalf of the public.
- V. **Introductions** – Formal introductions were made to welcome two new Committee members.
- VI. **Administrator’s report** – Victoria Rosario was unable to attend the meeting so DMSSC Chair, Judy Mays asked if Kim McDaniel would provide an update on the Student Experience Lifecycle vetting process. Kim, co-chair for the CRC implementation team, reported that each campus team has provided their wish list compiled last spring and the task force is on target to have a final product identified by the end of the semester. The committee in charge of reviewing the Requests for Proposals has also been identified. Training needs for the new product and ensuring use by instructional faculty were briefly discussed as possible future agenda items. According to Kim, the implementation teams for the course scheduling software selection process are on a similar timeline.
- VII. **Chair’s report** – None.
- VIII. **Action items** – None.
- IX. **Discussion items**
 - a. **Probation & Dismissal Regulations (R-2133)** – A matrix of probation and dismissal regulations and the practices for each group at all four Los Rios colleges was distributed to Committee members prior to the meeting and served as the basis for

discussion. The document was compiled over a year ago for the purpose of assessing whether campus practices are in alignment with District regulations. And where District regulations and campus practices do not align, this provides the opportunity for discussion about how alignment may be achieved. Now that the Student Success & Support Program plans have been in existence for at least two years, there is interest and desire to ensure that District regulations support the intent of the new law. An attempt to discuss campus practices at a prior meeting of this group was halted when it was agreed that having campus data on these various populations could better inform campus practices. Drafted below are several research queries that Committee members in attendance discussed:

- 1) How many students were on probation 1, probation 2 and dismissal in fall 2015, spring 2016 and summer 2016?
- 2) How many students had a hold placed on their account for probation 1 as a result of fall 2015, spring 2016 and summer 2016?
- 3) How many students placed on probation 1 with a hold placed on their account, failed to re-enroll without participating in structured intervention strategies?
- 4) How many students participating in probation 1 interventions have an improved term GPA (2.0+) or a higher number of courses successfully completed in the next two semesters of enrollment?
- 5) How many students readmitted after dismissal have an improved term GPA of 2.0 in the case of academic dismissal and/or successfully completed all courses attempted in the case of progress dismissal?

These research queries should be vetted at campus Matriculation Committees for clarification and to ensure the questions yield appropriate data. Other discussion regarding the matrix focused on follow-up services for students placed on probation 1. Three out of four colleges place holds on students at probation 1 as a way to provide intervention services early on. It was noted that staff working with this population have developed processes for handling students who have the hold placed at one campus, but then decide to attend a different school in the District.

Regarding students placed on dismissed status, it was noted that at least two schools are not in compliance with the District regulation which requires that petitions for reinstatement are submitted no less than 10 working days prior to the start of the new semester. The timing from fall to spring is an issue given the short timeline between terms.

Some initial ideas expressed to address concerns were:

- 1) Have academic standing appear on students' home screen in their eServices account.
- 2) Dismissal holds resulting from fall semester grades could be placed on student accounts several weeks after the start of the term (to avoid the extra workload of releasing holds to allow adding and dropping of courses for students who enrolled prior to having the hold placed). Also, a question was raised regarding when probation 1 holds are placed on student accounts. Schools that place probation holds are asked to provide this information at the next meeting.
- 3) Are current practices scalable given resources?

There was group consensus to move to another agenda item and to continue the discussion of aligning policies and practices at the next meeting.

- b. **Coordination of Integrated Plan: BSI/SE/SSSP** – The following updates were provided regarding the status of the BSI/SE/SSSP integrated plans at each campus:
 - ARC** – The committee charged with writing the plan met several times over the summer; small teams or individuals were assigned different sections; the plan is in draft form and is currently being vetted by the President’s Executive Staff (PES). After PES input/approval, the plan will be vetted campus wide.
 - CRC** – The task force consisting of members from SSSP, BSI and Student Equity committees met several times over the summer and completed the plan; the plan has been vetted by the President’s Executive Staff and has been through a first read at the Academic Senate. Every effort was made to ensure the plan and input on the plan was as inclusive a process as possible.
 - FLC** – The writing team met over the summer to draft the plan which is currently being vetted by the various constituent groups for final input.
 - SCC** – SCC’s writing team worked with USC’s Center for Urban Education (CUE) and the initial plan has been drafted and is currently being vetted by all constituency groups.

- c. **Assessment representative to the committee** – Postponed to next meeting.

X. **Next meeting:** October 16, 2017, Main Conference Room

XI. **Adjournment** – Meeting adjourned at 4:34pm.

XII. **Future agenda item**

- a. Online and hybrid classes not clearly delineated and the impact on enrollment and success rates