Mt. San Antonio College
Student Success and Support Program Advisory Committee Minutes
February 13, 2019
2:30–4:30 pm
Location: 9C-5 Council Room

Committee Members:

x Evelyn Hill-Enriquez (co-chair)	x Patricia Maestro	x Naomi Avila	_ Ned Weidner
x David Beydler (co-chair, recorder)	x Michael Harper	x Dianne Rowley	x IT Rep (Bev Heasley, Chuong Tran)
	x Maria Tsai	x Chisa Uyeki (guest)	x Meghan Chen (guest)
x Francisco Dorame	x Audrey Yamagata-Noji (guest)	x Karelyn Hoover (guest)	
x Michelle Sampat (guest)	x Lina Soto (guest)		

ITEM	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME
1. Approval of January 30 and February 6, 2019 minutes		Both approved after minor changes.
2. Future meeting times	Chisa: Can't change outside of regular semester SSSPAC meetings. Get recommendation at first meeting. Share with others on committee.	Will make final decision about meeting times during first spring semester meeting.
3. Dr. Yamagata-Noji's discussion points	**3A: Governance Process** Audrey commended the extra time and effort of the committee meeting during the winter. She expressed her concerns that the implementation of assessment-related efforts is not following a process inclusive of all, which leads to a lack of communication, coordination, and proper approval. She also pointed out that there is not a link of communication between C&I and the SP&S Council, so new curriculum approvals might not be known to Student Services staff. As another example, she raised the	Dianne and Evelyn will work on Reading placement AQ messaging and will bring it back to committee. Evelyn and David will attend the SP&S meetings.

ITEM	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME
	question "Should we inform students about reading placement changes?" This was discussed at the President's Cabinet as well as approval process questions, but there was no movement forward to send a reading placement message nor was there an answer to the approval process questions. President Scroggins will hold a meeting to continue discussion about process. Audrey acknowledged the problem that SP&S doesn't meet in the intersessions, which can slow the approval process. She also described the existing process, whereby SSSPAC makes recommendations to SP&S, and then SP&S takes the recommendations to Academic Senate and AMAC. Dianne described how she took the Reading placement model through EDC and C&I, stating that faculty make decisions on placement. Chisa (current Academic Senate President) affirmed that it is the purview of department to determine placement. Audrey expressed that we need to be clearer about what has been approved and what is being worked on. She agreed that placement issues related with curriculum are the purview of the corresponding departments. But when implementing it, how does it happen? Is it a decision or a recommendation? She also mentioned that communication with Counseling is not enough to reach all of Student Services.	SSSPAC will put its work in the form of recommendations, stipulating items as informational items, consent items, or action items.

ITEM	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME
	Chisa stated that there is a larger structural issue—that the current committee structure hasn't been working. She shared that Academic Senate leadership and AMAC are currently discussing how to have a structure that can be dynamic but still work as a whole, with communication, mutual agreement, and faculty maintaining areas of purview. Communication gaps between different groups exist all across campus. Dianne pointed out that there has not been an evaluation of the how process is working. Evelyn stated that on Feb 27, SSSPAC will compile all of the assessment implementation recommendations and bring them to SP&S. Lina shared that after Academic Senate approves the recommendations, then they might go to AMAC (if needed) and then probably the President's Cabinet. Audrey brought up the discontinuation of placement tests as an example. SSSPAC should send SP&S a recommended timeline for this, along with a rationale. Another example is: can students retake the AQ? Patricia gave an example of a policy question: are we still going to require official transcript to change AQ results? A related procedural question is: when does this become effective?	

ITEM	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME
	There was discussion about the process for updating AQ messaging. Michelle shared that in the past, placement decisions have always come thorough SP&S and SSSPAC, for example when changing cut scores. Chisa suggested that a rubric could be developed about which items can move forward, and which need approval/process. There was discussion about the vacant Director of the Assessment Center position on SSSPAC. Lina stated that the SSSPAC committee structure is recommended by SSSPAC and then approved by Senate and PAC. **B. Changes to AQ messaging regarding reading placements** Audrey: "Your placement level qualifies you for: Transfer-Level READ 100" Why doesn't this automatically satisfy reading requirement? Are students required to take it? How do students interpret this? Maybe it should say "If you choose to take Reading, this is your level"? AMLA 32R message. Should they take AMLA 32R or take DRP? What is message? Evelyn: NNES should never take DRP. Now they don't take it. This messaging was never correct for NNES	

ITEM	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME
	Chisa: Need to figure out when would need to be implemented first. If negative impact on students. Maybe e-mail co-chairs of SP&S. Could take to AMAC before full senate. Maybe messaging doesn't have to go through Senate. Go to appropriate departments, then implement. Lina: Where does approval come from? Chisa: Admin co-chair would fill in gap. Audrey: There was a team of Assessment Center folks who could discover and address the issues. Bigger issue: is messaging something department decides or committee reviews? Should we tell students that READ 100 placement satisfies reading requirement for associate degree? Dianne: Difficult question. Described in schedule of classes. Students could check with MAP if students need course for their goals. Francisco: Guided self-placement would have this information ahead of time. Do we provide more information with this READ 100 message, or do we leave the current message? Evelyn: I haven't seen this messaging ever. Where did this reading messaging come from and when did it start? Michelle: I think this is what SSSPAC committee should look at. This should go through SP&S council even as informational item.	

ITEM	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME
	Even if SP&S gives green light to IT, then informational item to Senate.	
	Will co-chairs of SP&S give IT green light?	
	Audrey: CCCs can't do guided self-placement across the board. Only for those without GPAs. All of questions to Chancellor's Office have gone unanswered.	
	Chisa: Include in footer who has been involved with creation of document, so we can track back where it came from. Include dates.	
	Audrey: Include who has approved it, too.	
	3C: A message to students about their new AQ reading placement was denied by President Scroggins.	
	Audrey said that this should be discussed at the President's Feb 26th meeting.	
	Michelle shared that while the decision was made to not mass communicate to all students, the Instruction Office did approve a targeted message to some 17000 students who have already taken AQ. The message should appear in these students' portal today.	
	3D: Clarification of the use of the DRP and acceptance of English 1A completion to meet the AA reading requirement	

ITEM	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME
	Dianne shared that the Multiple Measures Task Force is an Academic Senate task force to discuss on all things related to multiple measures. She also shared that the Mt. SAC Academic Senate supports using reading to satisfy reading competency. Chisa stated that using English 1A to satisfy the reading competency has not happened yet. Dianne suggested that we review data from all these assessment changes before changing how the reading competency works. She clarified that READ 90 is open access, and that students can take DRP or qualify based on high school GPA to get eligibility for READ 100. She said that the GPA cutoff for READ 100 might need to be adjusted down based on CSU data. **3E: Status of NNES AQ for NNES** Evelyn handed out copies of an e-mail from the Vice Chancellor showing a spring 2019 timeline for when guidelines will be released. AmLa will wait for NNES testing until guidelines come out in April before making recommendations. She explained that the current AWE can be used through Fall 2019 (per State Senate Dec. 2018 FAQs, so we have time to wait and see what guidance will be from state. In the meantime, AmLa is working on a guided self-placement process and will collect data about it. **3F: Review of implementation timeline** There was discussion about the implementation timeline and how clarity is important here.	

ITEM	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME
4. Implementation Timeline	Already discussed above under 3F.	
5. Multiple Measures Implementation Campus-wide Update Meeting (Fri, Mar 8?)	Audrey shared that a similar update meeting was done a year ago when piloting, and that all department chairs, instructor leads, and students are invited.	Audrey said we'll wait and reschedule the March 8 date.
6. Spring Flex Day Presentation Planning	There was a discussion about the Spring Flex Day Multiple Measures session, which plans to address the campus-wide impacts of these assessment changes.	*[2/21/19 edit: This Spring Flex Day session was canceled due to low enrollment.]*
7. MyPath Demo (time permitting)	Tabled until next meeting.	
8. STEP 2019, Defining Guided Self-Placement (discussion continued), and all Updates tabled until Feb 27	Tabled until next meeting.	

Next Meeting: February 27, 2019 from 2:30-4:15pm