**MLEA MINUTES**



# LPC Mission Statement

Las Positas College provides an inclusive, learning-centered, equity-focused environment that offers educational opportunities and support for completion of students’ transfer, degree, and career-technical goals while promoting life-long learning.

# LPC Planning Priorities

* Establish a knowledge base and an appreciation for equity; create a sense of urgency about moving toward equity; institutionalize equity in decision-making, assessment, and accountability; and build capacity to resolve inequities.
* Increase student success and completion through change in college practices and processes: coordinating needed academic support, removing barriers, and supporting focused professional development across the campus.

# Committee Membership: 8 Quorum: 5

**Voting Members:**

Instructional Faculty (3)

Counseling Faculty (1)  
Dean (2)  
Tutoring Center Director or designee (1)  
LPCSG Representative (1)

**Non-Voting Members:**

Chair  
Director of Student Equity and Success  
Director of DSP&S or designee (1)  
Dean (1)  
Acad. Services Classified Professional (1)  
Assessment Specialist (1)

**Math And Language Equity & Achievement Committee**

November 23, 2021| 2:30-4:00pm | via ZOOM  
Meeting ID: 926 3666 6532  
Passcode: 957281

**Minutes**

* **Call to Order: 2:34 pm**

All present except for Chris Crone.

Guests: Richard Dry (English), Michelle Gonzales (English, Puente)

* **Review and Approval of Agenda:**

Kristy Woods motioned to approve; Jackie Carrillo seconded; approved by consensus.

* **Review and Approval of October 26 Minutes**

Kristy Woods motioned to approve; Jackie Carrillo seconded; approved by consensus.

* **AB 705 Implementation Transition Plans (All)**
  + - 1. **Digest Memo from Chancellor’s Office**
      2. **Review AB 705 English Math DI Summary (Rajinder)**
      3. **Calibrate with Previously Referenced Research (CAP, RP Group, Equity Dashboard, Through the Gate, other)**
      4. **Keep Track of Concerns, Anticipate March Response, Plan Additional Research**
* Katie forwarded the Chancellor’s Office memo and related attachments. It was just delivered last Friday. She noted that as we go through the memo during this meeting, we should have our past conversations about data, various publications (most of which are on our MLEA website under “resources”), about what students and types of programs do not seem to fit with “full implementation,” in mind.
* The bulk of the memo reviews the history and data that led up to the law and then to this moment. Certain things stand out in this review:
  + - 1. Reminder that district placement method may be based on GSP and self-placement only if a student’s high school performance data is not available. This prepares us for default placement idea and for understanding that presenting students options as we’re doing is not okay.
      2. Reminder of validation practices and high bar.
  + Michael Peterson noted that math learned of a problem with coding, that CLASS-WEB was allowing students to skip the GSP and enroll in below-transfer courses. There was no coding blocking enrollment. Of course, math had all kinds of messaging explaining that taking a transfer-level class the best choice, but we can’t rely on those messages being delivered. If those messages are delivered the first day of class, that’s great, but it’s really too late by that time. Katie supposed that this happened with English students as well and confirmed with Richard. Data from David and Rajinder confirmed that there was a huge correlation between students enrolling in below transfer and students not doing GSP. This will now be prevented. For Middle College, students need a counselor override to do below transfer. This is happening with non-credit classes, too, and students who have already taken a class with us will be blocked from enrolling in below transfer level until they do the GSP.
  + Amy worried that if a student’s registration is blocked, they might not know why and have to click through many websites to find the answer. Kristy said that math was working with the coding people on that. We hope it will be in place for spring, but what with COVID activity and stress, it may not.
  + The memo also reminds readers of the data submitted in January 2021. It led to a Validation of Practices Excel file. Color-coded results indicate whether colleges/departments are maximizing.
    - 1. Colleges can’t “require, encourage, or allow” students to enroll in pre-transfer coursework.
      2. English is green in every area except for “all other GPA levels.” Mike suggested that this likely means that students who are in middle and highest GPA bands are registering for 104, which we have indeed seen, and maybe this is because they are not doing GSP. Math is red in all areas.
      3. The “Results: Equity” tab breaks it down according to DI groups: “No action needed,” “Consider action,” “No substantive DI.”
      4. Michael pointed out small sample sizes. For English, students enrolled in 104 were ten, 4 of them completed English in one year. For students who started in transfer-level, throughput higher, 77%.
      5. Jackie shared her experiences in college-level algebra at LPC; she took Algebra 2 in high school, but she never took pre-calculus, so she took advantage of concurrent support. Kristy confirmed that Algebra 2, by contrast, is an Associate’s level class but not a transfer-level class. Given what we learned from the RP group throughput study, we should be encouraging students to start with transfer-level.
      6. Richard noted that some students in 104 are multi-lingual students without a transfer goal, and that will affect throughput rate—it will look like students are not successful if they start one level below, but they never had an interest in registering for a transfer-level English class. He wants Julia and Leslie to know about these enrollments.
      7. Rajinder asked if the data included educational goal, which Michael says it did: “Transfer, unknown/unreported, or degree goal.”
      8. Richard suggested that if we can’t even allow students to take pre-transfer given the goal of maximizing throughput, the only step we could take to satisfy the law is to block students who have a GPA not in the low band from taking our pre-transfer courses. Or, as Katie says, just place students directly in the pre-transfer, but of course Richard said that they could drop and register for an alternative without being blocked.
      9. Amy asked whether the seven colleges who are full implementers have eliminated their pre-transfer classes. Katie said that she was not seeing them when she was looking at websites over the weekend and said that the colleges seem to have transfer degrees but not local Associate’s degrees and certificates that require intermediate algebra. Kristy noted that our LPC Associate’s degrees do not require college-level algebra and that intermediate algebra “unlocks” other courses at LPC, say economics or biology, and these students don’t need transfer-level math. Kristy also reminded us that high school algebra 2 can satisfy a math requirement. This course is significantly easier than college algebra. Hopefully we can start getting information about whether students have taken algebra 2 in high school if we get a new hire to audit transcripts.
      10. Katie wondered if these seven colleges aren’t offering these below-transfer courses, and Kristy reminded her that there is the B-STEM versus the SLAM pathway, and if those courses needed for B-STEM aren’t available, students could go somewhere else to take them.
      11. Richard said that for the category “all other GPAs,” does that mean the students who had the lower band and enrolled in 104 classes were still compliant? Katie said that would have to mean they took 104 and 1AEX or 1A and passed within a year—does it have to be at same rate? Richard noted that English was in the “green” for the lowest band, so he wonders if this data is saying that we are maximizing throughput for this group even though some of them have enrolled in 104. Michael showed that the Excel spreadsheet data for lowest band had only 2 104-enrolled students who had an educational goal of transfer. One of them completed transfer-level, a 50% rate; for lowest band students who enrolled directly in transfer (6 students), 3 of them passed that class, making the throughput rate also 50%, so that’s why we got the “green” for maximizing on the other table. For the unknowns, 1 started in 104 and 1 passed transfer-level, so that made the throughput 100%, whereas the unknowns who started in transfer-level had a throughput of 73%. Michael said that Aisha Lowe noted in that July presentation to Board of Governors that some colleges were not maximizing throughput for anyone, some were maximizing for some but not others, etc. Some had sample sizes that were too small to make a definitive conclusion, so we may fall into that. We might need more students to make a firm decision. Richard agreed that we’re looking at 14 students total, so hard to gauge value of data. Rajinder noted that this data is Fall 2019-Spring 2020. He is not sure if the data goes through the summer of 2020 (that would not affect 104, though). Mike Sato noted that these students are the ones who went through the GSP, so he wonders if those who just signed up weren’t caught in this data.
      12. Richard asked if the 215 class we are proposing will “count against” us as far as not maximizing.
  + Rajinder moved onto look at his AB705 DI group summary. This data is from the state Chancellor’s equity dashboard. It’s based on students who took their first English or math transfer-level course. Educational goal is not considered in this data. 5 years of data, 2015-2020.
    - 1. In English, success rate starts at 67% in 2015-2016 and reaches 76% by 2019-2020, the first year of AB705. It also shows that Latinx students are disproportionately impacted in all those years, as are students in lower two GPA bands. Veterans, foster, youth, and those ages 25-34 are the least DI’ed. The caret means that there is DI, but the sample size is too small. This is true for foster youth in 2017-2018.
      2. Math’s data show that they started off with 29% throughput and are now at 59%, which is great progress. There are more DI groups in math than English. Again, Latinx students and students in STEM below 2.6 GPA and students in SLAM below 2.3 GPA. Michael commented that this is extra motivation to require concurrent support for those in these lowest bands.
      3. Data was pulled from CalPASS+. Katie asked if there is still an uneven CalPASS reporting rate. Rajinder will check, but he was thinking about that when Kristy was talking about transcripts. How much data are we getting out of CalPASS? We need the transcript data! Richard asked if it’s possible to disaggregate the percentages to see how far below students are and if some groups are more DI’ed than others. Rajinder will check, and Richard liked the idea of targeting our first priorities. Rajinder noted that the link to the Transfer Completion Dashboard is provided at the bottom: <https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Chancellors-Office/Divisions/Educational-Services-and-Support/transfer-level-dashboard>
  + Richard returned to his question about pre-transfer. If we block 104 and 205, can students who enroll in transfer then take our new 205 course if they fail the transfer course? Kristy responded that she believes AB705 says that students are supposed to repeat the course. The definition of throughput needs to be one year, so they would want to see if the students can pass it in a year. Richard noted that the law demands proof that students can’t pass the transfer-level class in order to keep offering the remedial course, so it seems that would be satisfied. Kristy believes that the state definition of “not passing” for Richard’s hypothetical would be two semesters in a row. Richard wondered if it could be an option for students to take. Michelle commented in the chat that if life circumstances led to the student not passing, repeating the course makes more sense. She then said that we shouldn’t create language that encourages students to take courses that they don’t actually need. Richard said that he would say they cannot take it unless they failed the class [twice].
  + Michael noted that the memo will say that if they are a high school graduate, they will not be allowed to take a pre-transfer class.
  + Katie noted that this does seem to be the favored path, that everyone is placed into transfer level, including ESL, but ESL gets a 1A geared towards ESL students. Julia and Leslie have created this course. We know that a former ELL student who graduates from high school isn’t necessarily proficient, yet Katie believes that transfer-level placement is still the default at a number of colleges.
  + The memo’s instructions for placement:
    - 1. Colleges must “place and ensure enrollment of all students with high school data available in the transfer level courses, including students who may have been out of high school 10 or more years”--so that was a population we were not sure about, I believe at this point, English recommends they take 104 [or see a counselor]. I remember we were concerned about what to do with this population. Michelle noted that older students, of course, often have life skills that help them do well.
      2. The second point is that colleges must place and ensure enrollment of all student groups, regardless of their background or special populations status, using the GPA default placement rules.
      3. The third point is that we must place and ensure enrollment of ELL who graduated from high school directly into transfer-level English or an ESL-equivalent transferable course.
      4. The fourth point is that we must place students who have completed higher level math in high school into higher level mathematics courses, based on their high school performance. In other words, having them retake a course they already took in high school doesn’t improve throughput. When we used Accuplacer, they were sometimes placed in a lower level math! Jackie contributed that AP scores would be taken into account, too.
      5. The fifth point is to strongly consider placing BSTEM students using GPA default placement even if they didn’t complete Algebra 2 in high school. Katie assumes that this is a controversial bit, but she figures that the Chancellor’s office sees students increased transfer and graduation rates as most important.
      6. The sixth point is to carefully consider placing and ensuring enrollment of students who may not have completed high school, but have completed at least the 10th grade using the chancellor's office high school GPA, the same right. They are appending research to support this point.
  + So, it’s pretty strict, and we are being told to do the default placement.
  + By Fall 2022, full implementation must be complete, and schools must end all local practices that are in conflict with the law. All graduates of high school will be placed in and must enroll in transfer-level courses.
  + Michael Peterson commented that the addition of “and enroll in” is the new thing, because he believes LPC was already placing students in transfer level.
  + Colleges that follow these guidelines will not have to submit data. It sounds like some of us are exploring whether we would keep these below transfer courses and would need to submit data. It seems like it would be challenging to meet validation standards. March 11 is the deadline.
  + For ESL, the adoption plan has been submitted. Students need to complete transfer level within a three-year timeline. For their language acquisition courses, the memo says that ESL programs should focus primarily on international students, adult immigrants, refugees, and F1 visa students. All ESL assessment tools are still approved for use and are being evaluated. ESL departments should continue to review throughput data for students with a goal of transfer.
  + Colleges must access resources and establish infrastructure for this. Thankfully, we have an Assessment Specialist now.
  + Katie asked Kristy whether the decisions math made about requiring concurrent support are still good and relevant in this new landscape, and she confirmed this. Kristy noted that we all need to work on GSP so that it has enhanced information about concurrent support and gives students a positive experience. Katie noted equity in assessment, other things we can do to increase belonging, are as important as the blunt instrument of a placement tool but take more time to have effects.
* **Math/English/ESL Plans for LPC Welcome Week (All)**
  + Planning for this day will be moved to email, but keep in mind that math/English/ESL will be tabling to offer information and support and enthusiasm to students! Be thinking about what you want to do and offer. We may also consider how to integrate sending students over to Mike Alvarez for assessment. Jin put the great resources map that he and his students prepared, along with information about tutoring, in the Chat (see below). Shawn reminded us all that we have students who have never been here showing up in January. Even students who have been here may have forgotten everything, and everyone’s still getting used to being with people!
  + Shawn also added that if a student fails our transfer-level courses, we need to have some mechanism for holding on to them so that they don’t leave. We don’t have Starfish or Early Alert, so we need a team to contact them.
  + Kristy said that they have contacted the district to see if CAN can provide money to fund tutors for calling students who have dropped out of a math class and adding English (and maybe even ESL to that, too). The “Through the Gate” study may help with that. Shawn will mention this to Dr. Foster, too.
* **Report on Math Plans for Requiring Concurrent Support (Michael)**
  + Michael Peterson started by noting that students in the lowest GPA bands usually didn’t complete many high school math courses. Some have wondered, then, if supports should be recommended based on the highest level of math completed. Then you don’t have these GPA bands.
  + Katie noted that for English, we were told that we shouldn’t worry about whether they did well in their English class in high school. For us, data showed that overall GPA sufficient.
  + Michael P. reported that RP group recommended support only for students who completed algebra 2 with at least a C and significant support, along with holistic support for non-academic issues, for students who completed less than Algebra 2.
  + Michael P. then shared BSTEM recommendations for support based on GPA, which he said troubled him a little bit because a student could have taken calculus and done well but would be recommended to take support if they had a low GPA.
  + This led him to want to simply things by providing some options:
    1. If your highest level math class was below algebra 2, regardless of your GPA, we would want to require support for BSTEM students.
    2. If your highest level class was beyond algebra 2, so pre-calculus or calculus, we would not require support but might make some recommendations based on GPA, for example below 3.0.
  + This will be implemented in Fall 2022, they hope. Kristy noted that there are very few folks that will have lots of support recommended, and can also opt for math jam, but they hope it will help.
  + Michael P. clarified for Katie that support not usually with same teacher, might expose them to other instructors they may connect with. Katie noted that the teaching and theme is so different in each English class, it’s hard to have different teacher—assignments become simple, decontextualized exercises. However, high number of drops makes us wonder if sidecar concurrent support would avoid the kind of malaise that can set in when a course has a low success rate and students are dropping.
  + Richard wondered why Math Jam is not considered pre-transfer. Kristy answered that it has a TOP code similar to tutoring. Concurrent support also has a different TOP code. Kristy wonders about non-credit math classes. Could those be offered? Math has talked about whether they should stop offering below-transfer math classes, but they wonder where students would go who really wanted it—adult school? Kristy would like to revisit the TOP code conversation with Craig. She wonders if pre-reqs are okay as long as they can also be taken as a co-req.
  + Michael Peterson’s presentation: <https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1JAvrucf_eNg78C6xsTV_p8421pVMER6K6zif5gmyT60/edit?usp=sharing>
  + Katie encouraged people to do research on other colleges to see if they have gotten rid of pre-transfer courses--presumably they have students with similar needs so are they finding that students are feeling like the courses they need are not there? Are they having huge declines of enrollment in certain populations, or are they not aware of it? I would be curious to know more about that they are doing and what they feel about it. Do they feel that their students are doing fine, even if they are not passing with the same skill set and experiences they would have in the past? We’ve all been going to many meetings over the past years and learned a lot, but it might be a good time to reach out to other colleges again.
  + Amy noted that we will need an action plan for January so that we are not rushing at the last minute to meet March deadline. Katie recommended talking with deans before the holiday. If anyone is going to go down a path where a lot of data will need to be submitted, that will need to be determined right away.
  + Shawn noted that the equity report is due in two weeks, so the narrative and data pieces may be helpful to people.
  + Katie thanked people for their patience in going through the memo and reviewing the law again in terms of our placement policies and current coursework before we did so. It was very helpful.
* **Equity in Assessment in English, continued (Katie, if time—there wasn’t!)**
  + Delayed until spring 2022 meeting.
* **Meeting Adjournment:** 4:05 pm

**Selected comments from chat:**

* Richard Dry01:11:58

I guess I’m interested in the language would address what can happen after a student fails a transfer-level course

* Richard Dry01:16:07

Would we also have to block students from taking tutoring classes, ie 215, unless they are enrolled in a transfer class?

* Michelle Gonzales01:19:20

Yes, all my words about belonging, right now, have to do with all I’ve learned through reading and teaching linguistic justice curriculum

* Katie Eagan01:20:45

Thank you, Michelle.

* Michelle Gonzales01:21:14

I’d like to find a way to study student engagement in LJ focus courses — my hypothesis is that engagement is increased; when not engaged and life circa get in the way, the likelihood of dropping out is way higher

* Jin Tsubota01:22:59

@ Kristy - It would be great if we could be more proactive and not wait till students fail before we call them.

* Michelle Gonzales01:23:26

@Jin, I agree!

* Katie Eagan01:23:48

Yes, Jin!

* Shawn Taylor01:24:21

@Jin yup

* Michelle Gonzales01:25:12

@Jin @Shawn @Katie increased support for campus support services come to mind. That wouldn’t cost much at all; we just need to get everyone on board

* Kristy Woods01:25:14

We are also trying to see if we can continue to support part time faculty in participating in persistence project sections to get an extra paid office hour to hold those interviews. We are trying to inspire more best practices in the math department with the persistence project and CoP.

* Jin Tsubota01:26:29

@ Michelle, Michael - FYI, we have a new IA at the Tutoring Center, Ashlyn, who is interested in doing more outreach next semester. Let's discuss offline how we may collaborate.

* Shawn Taylor01:26:54

The Equity Innovation Grant might be a place to launch one of these projects. The primary concern is that the money runs out. But if we show results (retention/persistence) we may be able to justify institutionalization

* Michelle Gonzales01:26:58

@Katie, what I really mean is increased support for MARKETING — getting fac and students more aware of the services, pumping them up, and making sure no one support hour goes unused

* Shawn Taylor01:27:32

@Jin we have a new outreach person so Ashlyn can connect with her as well

* Katie Eagan01:28:10

Yes, marketing is all!

* Michelle Gonzales01:28:42

@Jin — great, yes, let’s do more outreach, but we REALLY need the support of all the faculty. All the facts need to be connecting students to support services. As a part-timer, this was hard for me to do, BUT we, the campus, including administration, should be doing all we can do to make it easier to spread the word

* Jackie Carrillo01:31:14

Yes I had math study groups I held in the summer almost daily for my Math 30 class and I saw huge results as well as my classmates

* Jin Tsubota01:31:28

@ Michael - Requiring support makes it easier for tutors. Tutors are no longer just tutoring, they are actually teaching content which is more difficult for them.

* Jin Tsubota01:35:10

@ Michelle - BTW, this is something one of the tutors made for marketing. [Jin attached resources map]
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* Michelle Gonzales01:36:26

@Jin, this is rad!

* Shawn Taylor01:36:55

@jin permission to print this out and have stacks of them at tables during welcome week?

* Jin Tsubota01:37:34

@ Shawn - you all have permission to edit it and do anything you want with it to make it better :)

* Amy Mattern01:37:42

If we don't meet again until January, we need an action plan to get the report done by March with some timelines, etc.

* Kristy Woods01:38:05

Yes! This is great Jin!! Yes, Michelle, we have to improve our marketing AND buy-in from all faculty for support and belief students can do this work with the support.