



## Solano Community College

### Academic Senate

# Student Equity and Success Committee

## Minutes

Friday 10/12/18, 12:00-1:30pm, Room 135

### **In Attendance:**

Voting Members: **Josh Scott** (Student Equity and Success Coordinator, co-chair), **Dwayne Hunt** (Administration, co-chair), **Jose Cortes** (English Success Coordinator), **Sarah Donovan** (Math Success Coordinator), **Candace Roe** (DSP), **George Olgin** (ASTC), **Michael Wylly** (Pathways), **Melissa Reeve** (FYE), Isabel Anderson (Puente), **Kimberly Ramos** (Counseling), **Jocelyn Mouton** (TAP), Danielle Widemann (Math/Science), Maria Isip-Bautista (Social and Behavioral Science), Atticus Frey (Library), Terri Pearson-Bloom (Health Sciences), Dawn Carpenter (CTE), **Claudia Tenty** (Institutional Research).

Advisory Members/Guests: Neil Glines, Sarah McKinnon, **Pei-Lin Van't Hul**, Heather Watson-Perez, **Erica Beam**, LaNae Jaimez, Rachel Purdie, Lauren Taylor, Lisa Abbott. **David Williams**, **Kristin Connor**, **Joe Ryan**

1. **Call to order** – Joshua Scott, Chair
2. **Comments from the public.**
  - a. Jose and Melissa announced the CAP events coming up 11/16 in Emeryville. These are one-day workshops focused on classroom pedagogy in post-AB705 curricular models for Math (2 days), English and ESL. The cost is low, about \$100 per person, and funds are pre-approved in the BSSOT grant.
3. **Approve minutes from 9/28**
  - a. George moved to accept, Jack seconded, approved by acclaim with no changes.
4. **Update on Proposal Process.** Dean Hunt will share where we are with the new process, what decisions still need input from the group, and how this may impact the approval process timeline for round #2 (due 10/23).
  - a. Dwayne presented a proposed process for making decisions about SESC funding proposals (attached)
  - b. Josh presented some concerns with the process Dwayne had outlined.
    - i. We want to clarify the role of the dean's meeting so that it doesn't feel like a duplicate step or that it is where the "real" decision is made
    - ii. If there will be discussion of the proposals at the dean's meeting, the faculty co-chair and the proposals' authors should be present at the meeting

- c. Committee member asked about what the Dean’s signature at the start of the process signifies—approval, or acknowledgement. Dwayne confirmed the intent is the latter.
- d. An additional concern was that people making the proposals aren’t asked to be present where the “real decision” is being made (Management meeting)
  - i. Dwayne clarified that the management meaning isn’t about how to get to “no,” but rather about how to operationalize and scale the proposals
  - ii. There was some confusion by proposers about the kinds of feedback they received from the management meeting in the first round
- e. One problem identified is that the proposed structure (and the structure used in Round 1) seems to have 2 approval processes; a suggestion was that maybe management team should review and make suggestions about the proposals *before* the SESC approval process so that feedback can be taken into consideration by SESC, who would still make the approval decision.
- f. The questions arose, since management is already well represented on SESC, why isn’t their voice on the committee sufficient for approval? Why do committee-approved proposals have to go behind closed doors to an all-management setting for the final decision?
- g. David W. expressed concern that the committee expects management to approve all proposals that come forward
  - i. This was not the faculty concern; rather, the concern is that managers are already on SESC, so why don’t they represent management concerns at that time? Why the need for a secondary process?
  - ii. Further, Josh asked, if there does need to be a second round, then why aren’t (non-manager) proposers and the faculty co-chair of SESC welcome to attend the second meeting?
- h. Joe R. pointed out that it’s better to have the full discussion and decisions in SESC meetings, which are subject to Brown Act and have complete minutes.
- i. Jocelyn suggested that the Dean for the respective are should be present at the SESC meeting, so there is the opportunity for full input at that time.
- j. Dwayne stated that none of the 4 proposals that came in for the first round are at the scale they need to be, to really impact equity. Part of the problem is the short timeline, because we’ve gotten caught up in spending last year’s funds.
- k. Members asked, when do we get to start talking about the \$2.9 million for this year? Maybe the reason the proposals that came in were small, is that the amount of money identified is the \$500K that needs to be spent by Dec. 2019. We need to think in terms of all the available funds, and the timeline for developing more sweeping proposals.

##### 5. Discussion of AB705 and Guided Self Placement (GSP)

- a. Brief intro/summary of AB705—Josh Scott
- b. Report: What is English doing to implement AB705? Jose Cortes
  - i. ENGL Dept. formed a task force to decide what changes they want to make.
  - ii. One proposal was to create a skills-focused course that would not be part of the placement process; rather, it could be for students who are not on degree / transfer paths and / or just want to brush up on basic / general writing skills. Could possibly develop in conjunction with CTE for workplace writing.
  - iii. Dept. talked about eliminating ENGL 360, but it looks like it will be left in place for a while in conjunction with guided self-placement. However they will pursue

an option that could make it possible for students who opt into ENGL 360 to “ratchet up” the requirements in the second half of the semester to get credit for ENGL 1 by the end. They want to mitigate the impact of students “placing down” by identifying those who were actually ENGL 1-ready and offering a path to complete that credit within the same semester.

1. One piece that would be needed is to develop an 8-week LR-10 that would allow students who moved onto the ENGL-1 track in the second half of 360 to get the LR 10 content as well.

- c. Report: What is ESL doing? Melissa Reeve
  - i. Our ESL sequence is already compliant with the 6-semester timeframe for students to move from credit ESL through ENGL 1.
  - ii. ESL is discussing developing an “ENGL 310-E” to offer in place of 310-D as co-req to ENGL 1 for students transitioning to ENGL 1. This would be required for those students who are currently being advised to take ENGL 360 between ESL and ENGL 1, and available as an option for others including students transitioning from ESL and multilingual students who have not taken ESL courses at SCC. The content of 310E would overlap that of 310D but would also include elements specific to English language development.
  - iii. Need to work on placement tools to replace Accuplacer. Have a proposal funded through SESC to create student testimonial videos, maybe to use in conjunction with example course materials for students to look at in making self-placement decisions. Awaiting further guidance from the research occurring in the AB705 ESL Work Group at CCCCCO.
- d. Report: What is math doing? Sarah Donovan
  - i. Haven’t used Accuplacer in a long time; have been working with transcript data and counselors to place students
  - ii. Developing co-req course for State and Liberal Arts math (Fall 2019)
  - iii. About 75% of SCC students are in the Liberal Arts stream, and most take Stats
    1. Trying to increase placement into Liberal Arts math, which could be a “gentler place” to land before State (for those on transfer path) and suffices for AA
  - iv. STEM-algebra will become CID compliant
  - v. Trying to reduce options for guided self-placement, by offering only the 2-course sequence (Trig + College Algebra) instead of the one big course that covers both. The sequence will be offered as two 8-week courses so students can still complete in one semester.
  - vi. Grappling with Math 112, 1-below transfer, that focuses on getting ready for Math 11 or Math 12, but the demand for it may decrease
  - vii. Trying to preserve the “second chance” opportunity for students lacking past success in math to still have the option to go toward a STEM field; this may require maintaining some basic skills options, though this is a relatively small proportion of the population. There is a concern that AB705 sends students the message to “just take Stats and get out,” while there may be students who have STEM goals and potential that they just haven’t had opportunities to pursue before. We don’t want to discourage that or even make it impossible by overly limiting pathways through math.

1. GP webinar emphasized that the starting point should be identifying students' career interests—if students have a STEM interest, there should be a way for them to reach it.
- e. Report: How are other schools using Guided Self Placement (GSP)? Corrine Kirkbride and Sarah Donovan
  - i. The time for this was limited, as we didn't get started til 1:19. Corrine attended remotely and also sent a Prezi presenting GSP plans from different colleges (<https://prezi.com/view/D85c77kuoBLzRVVZjiLR/>) . Josh said he would convene a follow-up group with the English, Math, and ESL Coordinators to review the Prezi in more detail since we were pressed for time.
  - ii. She collected ideas from the CAP Facebook page. She didn't hear of any schools that have developed a complete GSP plan for Math, English and ESL.
- f. All: What role will GSP play? IF we use GSP, how can we create a student-friendly experience (videos, etc)? Who from campus needs to be involved in this?
- g. All: What is needed from larger campus community (OAR, counseling, assessment, etc)? How can we best coordinate this effort?

## 6. Adjourn.

---

### Upcoming Meeting Topics:

October 26<sup>th</sup>: Report on Integrated Plan (IP) and group norming for IP goals

November 9<sup>th</sup>: Discuss and evaluate second round of proposals (due 10/23)

November 30<sup>th</sup>: Social Justice Taskforce

January 25<sup>th</sup>: Focus on “at risk” course: Anthropology 1