



Student Services Council Meeting  
 October 26, 2016 • 9:00 AM  
 Room 2314

## MINUTES

| <b>Committee Members Present</b> |                   |   |                       |   |                               |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| X                                | Kehinde Adesina   | X | Nadia Elwood          | X | Kevin O’Rorke                 |
| X                                | Nancy Berkey      | X | Peter Griggs          |   | Sheree Whaley                 |
|                                  | Will Breitbach    | X | Sandra Hamilton Slane | X | Toni Duquette (guest)         |
| X                                | Sharon Brisolarra | X | Tim Johnston          | X | Sara McCurry (guest)          |
| X                                | Tina Duenas       | X | Becky McCall          | X | Jenna Barry Highfield (guest) |

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

- a. The meeting was called to order by Kevin at 9:07 a.m.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. It was moved by Nadia and seconded by Peter to approve the minutes of the October 12, 2016 Student Services Council meeting as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

**III. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS**

**a. Multiple Measure Assessment Project (MMAP) Report – Jenna Barry Highfield:**

Kevin welcomed Jenna, who gave a brief overview of the Multiple Measures Assessment Project (MMAP). Multiple Measures for placement into college courses are the use of informational sources examining a variety of student characteristics in addition to assessment tests to place students into college courses, providing a more comprehensive view of the student. Placement tests have been found to significantly under-place students, who are then more likely to drop out or not complete their course of study. MMAP is a collaborative effort led by the RP Group and Educational Results Partnerships’ Cal-PASS Plus system, with support from the CCCCCO to develop a valid system CCCs can use to accurately place students into courses. Shasta College conducted a pilot study, beginning in Spring 2015, creating a “Multiple Measures Cohort Group” which was comprised of 471 students who directly matriculated from high school. The comparison groups were “traditionally assessed” (students primarily assessed with

placement tests), and “all others” (students not in the multiple measures cohort group and not identified as primarily placed by placement tests). The results showed that students in the Multiple Measures Cohort (MMC) were significantly more likely to be placed in transfer level English courses. Although students assessed with multiple measures were not *more* successful than other students, they were not *less* successful, even though they were placed higher. The overall success rate was 65% for English classes. The MMC was significantly more likely to be retained in English courses than traditionally assessed group. The Math Placement was broken into 4 methods of placement: “High School Transcript,” “Self-Report,” “Placement Test,” and “All Other Methods.” 33% of students were placed into transfer level math courses. Students in the MMC were significantly more likely to be placed in transfer level math courses than others. For self-report math students, 97% enrolled in below transfer level courses (Kevin pointed out that many were enrolled in college level coursework, but below transfer level). Students from the MMC group were significantly more likely to enroll in transfer level courses than students from the traditionally assessed and all other groups. Unfortunately, the results showed that students in the MMC group were significantly less successful in transfer and below transfer level math courses than both the traditionally assessed group and all other groups. The conclusions showed that MMP through the use of high school transcripts appeared to successfully place students into English courses. More students were placed into transfer level math courses through the use of MM, but these students were less successful than their counterparts. It was difficult to make conclusions with the math results due to the self-placement method of placement being convoluted with the placement test and all other methods; therefore, the math study will be repeated at a later date in order to validate the results. Some recommendations and next steps include collaborating with focus groups to examine current placement procedures, identifying common definitions for math placement terminology, and developing protocols/methods to ensure the use of common definitions and procedures for all course placements.

- b. **SAO/SSLO Cycle – Sara McCurry:** Kevin introduced Dr. Sara McCurry, and shared that she would be providing an overview of revisions to the SLO process. Sara announced that we are going to a 2 year SLO cycle. Focus in the first year will be on assessment (course level SLO assessment). The second year will be used for reflection and implementation of change, allowing for the ability to dialogue amongst colleagues, as well as input for both the application and follow up into TracDat. Sara asked to see some of the Service Area Outcomes (SAOs), and Kevin agreed that he would get those to her, and welcomed her input on those. Kevin also shared that Student Services has historically had 100% participation in the SLO/SAO process. Sara mentioned that faculty has discussed using Canvas shells in order to facilitate discussion, etc. and asked if that

might be something we would be interested in. The group expressed interest in that as well. It was noted that TracDat is the reporting tool. Tim asked if there might be a definition on the Student Services side for program review, and whether Student Services should be reporting on that as well.

- c. **TracDat Updates/Changes – Toni Duquette:** Toni reviewed some of the updates in the new version of TracDat. The new TracDat is easier to navigate and find things in. They have tried to put as much of the user manual into the “help” options, which is really helpful. New features include initiatives mapping (which was traditionally an area Student Services was strong in!). There are many shortcuts on the menu, which will be helpful as well. The consensus was that it was much more user friendly. The reports are the same, and there are various ways to filter them, etc., but at this time they will still need to run them through the Research Office. Toni shared that by this time next year they hope to have a nice standard set of reports for us.
- d. **BP/AP 5140 – Sandra Hamilton Slane:** Sandra shared some of the changes to BP/AP 5140, Disabled Students Programs and Services. There were some broader allowances for eligibility, reclassification of some conditions, replacement of term accommodations, a process for considering course substitution/waivers, further explanation of use of service animals, and relocation of the procedure for the emergency evacuation process to be relocated to campus safety policy. Remaining under consideration is changing the name of the department, which the staff would like. She reviewed some of the possible names: “Access Center,” “Disability Resource Center,” etc. She will be meeting with staff to get their feedback and will keep us posted, and will also share a listing of what departments are called throughout the CCC system.
- e. **Annual Area Plans – Preliminary Discussion:** Tim suggested that common plans be worked on first – i.e., webmaster position, etc., but Kevin suggested that there would be more power in everyone doing this separately in TracDat – showing that this came from multiple areas first. We must still differentiate between personnel and non-personnel requests, as this is a college wide procedure. There was discussion on the use and future direction for payment plans, which have been tracking upward, both in the dollar amount and number of students. Kevin discussed the difficulties and complexities of granting some of these to students in the past. Tim is investigating 3<sup>rd</sup> party institutions to take over this process. Becky shared that there has been discussion to get a group together to do more front end advising for various groups (i.e., out of state athletes, etc.), and it was suggested we include Tina and Nick, as well as coaches, in that conversation as well. Peter shared that he is working with Mike Mari on recruitment pieces, and will bring these concerns to that work. Kevin also noted that some of the AAP will be affected

by the results of the bond vote, so some flexibility will be needed. Becky noted that she will just roll the FAID remodel forward.

f. **Area Updates:**

- **CalWORKs:** Nadia shared that her budget was (finally) released. They actually got back everything that was cut in the last several years.
- **Student Life:** Tina shared that the Halloween Door judging will be on Friday, and she is pleased with the wide participation. The International Dinner/potluck will be 11/17. The deadline to sign up for the Giving Tree is 11/18.
- **Access and Equity:** Sharon noted that the second Courageous Conversations event will be on Friday. She is working to bring a well-known specialist on implicit bias to provide training in the future. Nancy gave kudos to Sharon for the Human Library event, which her students found very powerful.

IV. **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 9, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. in room 2314.

Recorded by:

Sharon Strazzo  
Executive Assistant,  
Vice President of Student Services