**MLEA MINUTES (draft)**



# 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) Student Services and Academic

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) Academic  
Acad. Services Classified Professional (1)  
Assessment Specialist (1)

**Math And Language Equity & Achievement Committee**

April 26, 2022| 2:30-4:00pm | via ZOOM  
Meeting ID: 926 3666 6532  
Passcode: 957281

**Agenda**

1. **Call to Order 2:32 pm**
2. **Review and Approval of Agenda**

Leslie moves to approve, Mike Sato seconds

1. **Review and Approval of March Minutes**

Leslie moves to approve, Mike Sato seconds

1. **Meeting time for 2022-2023 (2:35 pm, 10 minutes, All)**

* Basic skills polled its members and picked this meeting time back in early 2021, but a review of the College meeting calendar reveals that neither MLEA’s meeting nor Student Services’ department-wide meeting made it on to the calendar.
* Dr. Wilson emailed Katie to explain the various types of Student Services meetings that happen on Tuesday afternoons. (Joel later provided context that historically, the meetings were on Tuesday afternoons, though that changed under Elizabeth David for a time.) Dr. Wilson suggested that MLEA meet the first Tuesday, but Dr. Mattern pointed out that President Foster’s Speaker Series is that day at 3 pm.
* The committee reviewed curriculum and SLO meetings, and all the deans go to curriculum and Dr. Mattern does not go to SLO on the 4th Monday, but she is on facilities.
* We can’t overlap with Rajinder’s IPEC or Mike A.’s Classified Senate or Student Senate or Nan’s RAC or College Council.
* Joel suggested the first Tuesday 1-2:30, with Dr. Foster’s speaker series at 3 pm. However, Mike S. is teaching until 1:50 on Tuesdays.
* 4th Monday, 1-2:30 might also have worked, but Katie is teaching.
* Michael Peterson will be teaching from 2-3:15 on Tuesdays so meeting from 3-4:30 on Tuesdays would work, but it still would clash with student services.
* Katie thought that perhaps SEA committee doesn’t go the full time, and we could share that slot, but Shawn said Thursday is his busiest day.

1. **Committee Charge and Governance Worksheet (2:45 pm, 5 minutes, Katie)**

* Katie shared highlights of what she listed as MLEA’s accomplishments: reviewing main activities: assessming data, sharing pedagogical and curricular approaches that address equity (though it would be nice to do that more), coordination with SEA, the Flex Day session that Michael initiated, various barriers for students and transition plan, hearing from ESL and new marketing coordinator.
* Katie apologizes for not bringing it to committee earlier, but she didn’t change the charge or membership. She recalls an earlier discussion around whether faculty representatives should be English, math, and ESL. ESL yes, but presumably AB705 reps. will come regardless.
* With term, she didn’t change it because we hadn’t talked about it, but we could consider changing to 1 year next time if we like.
* She finished by checking many boxes for accreditation—what we can contribute information to.

1. **Assessment Center website (2:50 pm, 5 minutes, Mike Alvarez)**

* Mike shared the Assessment website revision work that he had done initially and then the further work he did with Katie’s input. It is updated, it is saying the same things as the English GSP and English website. Added comparison table for 1A and 1AEX (from English website), and added link for English support options (on GSP). Mike would like to work with Michael P. to make sure information matches Math GSP and website as well.
* More accessible to students, easier to get a hold of Mike. The connection to Mike’s Zoom Room is central.
* Mike added a list of GSP’s that are offered.
* He has yet to update CLASS-WEB GSP tutorial.
* Katie asked Leslie about how she feels about ESL information. She asked for a separate little paragraph about ESL because they do not do GSP; their placement has to be taken in-person. Mike will meet with Leslie. He said also that now the CELSA can be taken electronically at any time as long as they have 45 minutes. Eventually it will be online.

1. **Upcoming English Work and Planning Session, SEA-Funded (2:55 pm, 5 minutes, Katie)**

* English will be meeting on May 31 to work on more co-requisite options.
* We will be looking at the idea of a Jam. Preliminary research shows that most Jams seem to be for multilingual students, not native speakers. Perhaps there was a shift away from Jams for native speakers with AB705. Katie does like the idea that Kristy had that the week before the semester would be a great time to get ready to work! Perhaps for English, though, we would focus on student skills that are necessary for success in English more than grammar, perhaps, given the fact that we don’t want to intimidate students when our Linguistic Justice focus welcomes all Englishes.
* Shawn noted that in a recent student meeting with 24 students, they expressed a desire for a mid-semester tune-up. Now, it feels like a constant acceleration. It would be great to have a re-charge mid-semester. Flex Day for students? He knows that faculty don’t want to lose days, but students were enthusiastic about this.

1. **AB1705 and LPC Data on Math 30 and 39, NGRs (3 pm, 30 minutes, Katie, Michael P., Rajinder)**

* Rajinder shared research he's done in response to a request from Sarah Thompson, who is doing some statewide advocacy to oppose AB1705, which would eliminate students’ right to take below-transfer-level (BTL) courses unless it's a requirement for a particular certificate. It's an interesting law, because for us, who already decided to go down that road, some of the language is what we're already doing in response to the Chancellor’s Office November memo. However, this is a next step, using legislative means to essentially outlaw those courses, which has really concerned people, including FACCC and ASCCC.
* Sarah asked Rajinder to look at who we might be losing. The positive throughput data we’ve been looking at for years has not considered students who have NGR’ed out of the course. The data: <file:///Users/eaglips/Dropbox/Las%20Positas%20College/lpc%20committee%20work/SEA-MLEA/LPC%20-%20Math%2030%20and%2039%20Outcomes%20of%20First-Time%20Math%20Students_04.12.22.pdf>
* Rajinder noted that it is data that could mean a lot of things—for instance, when Katie and Michael met with Rajinder last week, Michael suggested that some of these students could have decided to NGR out of out of these particular math courses, Math 30 and 39, but enroll in one that's not the STEM path.
* The data was very challenging to obtain—we don’t have NGR’s in our database, so he had to get a file that contained NGR’s, and the student had to withdraw between the first day of class and the last day to NGR, and he needed to account for the fact that some might have switched sections. The state does not receive the NGR data, so it’s not something the state could provide. Rajinder also included success, non-success, and withdrawals.
* These are first-time math students in Calculus I. He combined the data for three semesters: Fall 2020, Spring 2021, and Fall 2021.
* Almost 1/5 of students dropped out during that NGR period—19%. The state never receives this information. After the NGR period, we had 45% success, 13% non-success, and 23% withdrawals.
* Results for gender: females a little bit more likely to NGR than males.
* When we look at race/ethnicity, we can see that students having the most challenges are Latinx at 35% success rates, and African Americans 32%, and 1 out of 4 Latinx students NGR, 1 out of 5 white students do that as well.
* Jin wanted to clarify that this data is changing our success rates because state has not had this information to give us before.
* Rajinder noted that age group is interesting to look at. The success rates overall were 45% but the younger students have a success rate of 47%, older students have a success rate 37%. If we were to take the NGR out (36% for older students), the older students would have a slightly higher success rate.
* We don’t know why they NGR’ed. Decided on STEM pathway? Decided they weren’t ready for it? Decided they were taking the wrong course? The disproportionate impact is more amplified, though. First generation students have a 32% success rate versus not first generation’s 49%, and 1 out of 3 first generation students are dropping out in the NGR period. More students 22 and older are NGR-ing.
* This data inevitably leads to more questions.
* Katie asked what this means for the all the conversations we've been having and the work we’ve been doing? Michael and I were struck by the fact that the data still show that the success is much higher than it used to be in the old system, where we had all these pre-requisites. Yet, we’re seeing that more students are NGR-ing, and more of those who are NGR-ing are from DI groups than we realized. The AB705 change has simultaneously helped DI groups and hurt DI groups.
* The throughput is higher, but how much are students learning? What are their grades? Are more of the students who came from BTLs getting A’s? The students who got through before might have been learning more, but there were fewer. More are now getting through, but if their grades are not as strong, they may be learning less. The bill eliminates the option for students to take the BTLs and potentially get higher grades.
* Katie suggested that the system decided that since success rates were so poor, it was better to have more students graduate than have them know as much as we would like them to know in our ideal world. The C would have to be fine because our system is the engine of the economy. That was a sacrifice that they were willing to make.
* Rajinder reminded us of the RP group data that looked at high school GPA, and students who didn’t take Alg. 2 in high school. They still did better in transfer-level than students who worked their way up. They did suggest requiring concurrent support, but that was still striking to have the 33% throughput. It was higher than it had been, but the success rate and throughput rate are the same when students start at the transfer level. Rajinder is reminded of a study he did at Chabot showing that students in sequential sections with high success rates in the lower course did not do as well in the next course in the sequence. Perhaps they had a less rigorous course. This makes him think that the 1/3 who were succeeding may or may not be well-prepared.
* Michael P. noted that CMC cubed, in opposing AB1705, has argued that even though data show that throughput is maximized, but the data is all averages, so you don’t get outliers whose throughput might be maximized if they started in BTL. They’re not part of any particular group that one can identify, but they are out there!
* Katie noted that many have been concerned that non-credit wouldn’t be allowed. Certainly, the bill authors are worried about colleges just repackaging pre-req. courses as non-credit. They will indeed allow non-credit as concurrent support. The bill text: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\_id=202120220AB1705
* There were a number of amendments that were rejected, so Katie didn't know if they were still conversations.
* One part of the law said that we would require students to finish in a year, which is concerning—how would you even do that? Perhaps we could do everything we could to prevent a student from exhausting their three attempts, but that couldn’t be binding.
* Another suggested amendment was to consider students who wanted to address learning loss as one of the special groups allowed to take BTL. We’re coming out of a pandemic, after all.
* Another suggested amendment was to consider students who had a lifelong learning goal; right now, for example, Katie has a student who dropped out of Chabot when she was younger but is now a highly motivated parent, and she wants to learn grammar to improve her writing. It would be interesting if we had a grammar class now, perhaps for our English majors, or a linguistics-type course that would include linguistic justice. That would be a life-long learning goal.
* There was also a suggested amendment that faculty have more help--embedded tutors, professional development. There's this assumption that we're heroes with capes and can do all of this; as Mike Sato said in a previous meeting, we need to distribute the burden of meeting students where they are and helping them pass a transfer-level class. It’s exciting, but it's also quite exhausting.
* These amendments were not in the April 19 revision, though.
* Certainly, if you feel strongly about it, you can advocate with your legislators and join FACCC in opposing it.
* Katie noted feeling ambivalent because again we're on that path towards offering transfer-level courses already, but it is concerning that AB1705 is limiting access to these courses permanently, as opposed to seeing what happens over the next couple of years and collecting data.
* Michael Sato noted a line about how the bill would require the community college to verify the benefits of the coursework to its students.
* Michael Peterson replied that at least from the math context, it appears that the systems office is trying to streamline—have students only take one course before calculus, for example. So in a couple of years, if a student were taking a transfer-level math class that did not satisfy a requirement for their academic goal, the College would need to inform them that this math class will not satisfy a requirement for their academic goal and suggest an alternative math class that would. For example, if you are an engineering major but you took math for liberal arts, the college would need to inform you that the math class you chose is not going towards your major requirements.
* Katie noted that AB1705 also deals with GED students, saying that they must be placed in transfer level.
* The dashboard is mentioned, research we already know is summarized, etc. But it is strict in a way that had not been felt previously. This seems to almost shut the door on the possibility of choosing a group of students whom you think the BTL course would benefit and demonstrating with data that it will equal or surpass other options for maximizing throughput.
* This is being discussed at senate and in divisions, so our committee can help people understand what this debate means not only for “our” students in math, English, and ESL, but for us as teachers and for teachers in other disciplines. Perhaps next year we can do more to take the temperature on what these teachers in other disciplines are seeing and then supporting them.
* Shawn asked about a communication strategy for students coming in. Some students may be surprised that they can’t take a certain thing, and they will need clear information. There are more AB’s coming down. Katie and Kristy talked about this over email as well (see discussion item below).

1. **DSPS Students and AB705: Future Plans (3:30 pm, 10 minutes, Chris, Katie)**

* It was really helpful to hear from Chris last meeting and think about what we’d like to know about how our DSPS students are handling/will handle these changes.
* Chris shared a paper written by a previous DSPS director from LA and previous president of CAPED, and that all AB705 data did not address students with specific disabilities that directly or indirectly affect cognitive and/or sensory ability; instead, DSPS was just one category.
* Results were that DSPS students were like every other student, they were not progressing when taking BTL courses. However, if it had been broken down, the sample sizes would have been too small. It was left to colleges to figure out how to collect data and learn about their experiences.
* The paper recommends written guidance for all CCC’s that students with cognitive or sensory disabilities have access to appropriate, non-embedded remedial classes at least one semester before.
* They also recommended looking at a resolution called Connecticut Senate Bill 40. This has the type of amendment that was recommended. i.e. not only co-requisite options. For those with more severe disabilities, they recommended looking at two semesters of remedial work.
* Are students using accommodations? That is always a factor.
* Chris had a great conversation with a former colleague on Universal Design. She shared that we should not talk about it as a disability initiative because it will then become all about compliance. It needs to be more of a mindset for teachers to organize their instruction or all students.
* Shawn shared the following link in the chat: <https://udlguidelines.cast.org/>
* Chris asked what training LPC has had and what interest there is in learning about it and piloting it.
* What would a UDL classroom look like? What does research show about how students benefit?
* Katie noted the last agenda item focuses on goals for next year. Will we talk more about campus-wide initiatives to take on certain approaches? UDL? Differentiated learning? Can we provide universal training, a unified approach, as opposed to people just going to whatever Flex Day session they want?
* Back to plans for DSPS students: Katie asked Rajinder how we could do a better job of looking at data. Would one goal, then, be to look at one strand, say students who sign up for services? Rajinder said that our databases have different types of disabilities. Would we look at LD’s only? We would need to keep in mind that they are intersectional beings as we all are, so we could break down data by race and ethnicity.
* Katie also wondered about NGR data for English, too. Perhaps this data would influence how we are messaging about these classes and doing a full-court press to try to prevent them NGR-ing. We still don’t really have an early alert system. Mike Sato noted that this semester, that was his experience, where students started to drop before census. Do students freak out? It would be interesting to see historically what is going on with NGR’s.
* Rajinder recalled that Michael P. asked this question, too. What did this NGR data look like before COVID?
* Chris had a question about primary versus secondary disability. Rajinder will check. Of course, one often finds that the sample sizes are too small.
* Michael P. wondered about other representatives from student outreach team sharing what they are telling students, and then we can give feedback, also hearing what students are saying about courses available. He also shared a story of a student who wanted to take a BTL course who had a vision impairment. He liked the idea of collaborating more closely with Student Services.
* Katie shared that she had Rajinder research what grades students were getting; so far, we have it broken down by race and ethnicity for English. Katie has noted that nursing students don’t want anything lower than a B, so they drop. It would be great to provide more information to them going into it. Identifying typical student struggles that might lead to drops.
* Thinking of UDL again: Should we continue to offer Flex Days on teaching approaches? We could plan for a Flex Day this summer if we have a speaker in mind.

1. **AB 705 Implementation Transition Plans (3:40 pm, 15 minutes, All)**

* What are we doing to make sure students are prepared?
* Kristy shared that GP will have some websites explaining math and English plans, so presumably they will run these by us.
* Shawn says we will have a welcome week again—it might take a slightly different form because the students bore a lot of the load. It will be in person. Connecting with the outreach people to make sure they are telling students about starting with college-level English and math, and stress that it is a positive. We had a great campus tour last night. Katie wondered what they were saying about TL English and math. Shawn said that there is one in June. There was a waiting list of 41 families.
* Mike A. will check with Sarah to make sure she has the current math and English information. They have been sharing it with feeder schools, too.

1. **Good of the Order (3:55 pm, 5 minutes)**

* GP Institute—Shawn will be attending AB705 breakouts.
* Katie will email about AB1705 updates.
* ESL is having their open house next Friday and then have two virtual open houses the week after. They are also having registration workshops for continuing students.
* Shawn asked about money for ESL ambassadors.

1. **Meeting Adjournment: 4:02 pm.**