Social Science Department Agenda
4:00-5:30 pm, SS 203
3/8/2017

Attendance:
Department Members: Leah Halper, Debbie Klein, Craig Mosher, Carlton Older, Nick Park, Marc Turetzky, Enrique Luna

Guest: Fran Lozano, Peter Wruck

I. Welcome
   a. Introductions and Check-ins
      i. On the whole people reported doing well. In addition, Peter Wruck noted that he and his wife were signing closing documents on a new house.
      ii. Debbie reported that in the next few weeks she would be traveling to Nigeria to receive acknowledgement as an honorary chief. To reciprocate the honorary title, she will provide a gift of a cow, beads and cloth.
   b. Agenda Adjustments: No adjustments
   c. Approval of Minutes from 2/8/17: Minute approved.

II. Discussion
   a. SLOs with Peter Wruck:
      i. To open discussion Debbie noted recent advice by Institutional Researcher, Peter Wruck, that the college would benefit if department reduced the number of SLOs. Questions arose about the meaningfulness of broadly written SLOs, as well as assessment challenges. In a follow-up email Peter further articulated views presented at the meeting:
         1. [Regarding SLOs] It isn’t so much about measuring mastery of content (which we do with grades); rather, it’s about consistently evaluating a skill, ability, or concept. The following is an example of three SLOs that were heavily content-based and hard to assess:
            a. Demonstrate understanding of the social, political, and economic factors associated with the formulation of and current applications and shortcomings of Marx’s classical theory.
            b. Demonstrate understanding of the social, political, and economic factors associated with the formulation of and current applications and shortcomings of Weber’s classical theory.
            c. Demonstrate understanding of the social, political, and economic factors associated with the formulation of and current applications and shortcomings of Durkheim’s classical theory.
2. Revised SLO became: Critically analyze and evaluate classical social theory.
   a. A common rubric was developed for that single SLO that could be deploy in any section using already existing exams or assignments.
   ii. Nick noted that validating assessments would be challenging, and outlined a process used at another institution. It required time consuming work creating common assessment tools, and then having multiple readers for student work.
   iii. Leah advocated for assessment work funding, especially for part time instructors. Craig reminded the group that there are many courses that are only taught by part time instructors, and in effect assessment work has largely been unpaid.
   iv. While acknowledging concerns expressed by department members, Debbie expressed an interest in continuing to use SLOs to capture discrete learning, and looked forward to sharing her findings with colleagues.
   
   b. Class Cap Update:
   i. Leah and Nick reported on their meeting with VP Michelle Bresso. The VP had limited background on the issues, but said that it would be helpful to get available national data. The college’s broader concern is increasing FTES to get out of “stability” status. Social Science’s class caps have little effect on overall FTES.
   ii. Leah volunteered to conduct initial research in case administers ask the department for data.
   
   c. Innovative Pedagogies:
   i. Marc reported that his is continuing Voter Registration service learning, and student feedback is generally positive.
   ii. Craig reported that he is continuing a project where he takes an unengaging class component and reworks it to make it fun. While not all updated projects have been successful, they are almost always an improvement.
   iii. Leah noted strategic use of current presidential events and issues in class.
   iv. Debbie outlined successful use of “threshold concepts” as a gateway to theories and practices in Anthropology.
   v. Carlton described a process for increasing class engagement by regularly asking direct questions of students. The outcome is that students are practiced in responding, and know that they need to be attentive and prepared.
   vi. Nick provided an example of how he uses himself as a subject of questions. In addressing gender issues, he asked an open question: “how do students know I am male?”
vii. Enrique reported positive advice received from Leah and Carlton for addressing the needs of a self-reported autistic student.

d. FACCC Legislative Priorities for 2017: Food Insecurity, Mental Health, Safe and Inclusive Campuses:
i. Debbie reviewed two documents from FACCC. One is a template letter to legislators outlining FACCC issues. The second is an outline of legislative talking points. (See Appendix A and B below)

III. Reports and Announcements
a. Academic Senate: Marc let the group know that Senate bylaws were being revised, and asked that department members respond with their thoughts on proposed changes.
b. GCFA: Nick asked department members to respond to upcoming union survey regarding negotiation priorities. The next union meeting will be on 3/9/17.
c. Department Chairs: No new material was reported.
d. Civic Engagement: Leah reviewed a meeting with Child Development faculty, and noted that there may be strong links between Social Science initiatives and a STEM-like grant proposal to develop future teachers.
e. Other Committees: None.

IV. Adjournment
a. Next Meeting: 4/12/2017
b. Adjournment: 5:25 pm
March 6, 2017

Re: California Community Colleges

Dear

Thank you very much for your strong support of California Community Colleges. With over 2.1 million students across 113 campuses statewide, our community colleges comprise the largest system of public higher education in the country.

This year, you will have numerous opportunities to invest in our colleges by increasing services to students and ensuring that our campuses remain safe, open, and inclusive. Specifically, I urge your support on the following policy and budget proposals:

**Food Insecurity:** It is estimated that one-half of community college students across the country struggle with food or housing insecurity. Assisting students in this regard is a wise investment and retention strategy. I urge your **support for AB 214 (Weber)** which would increase student participation in the CalFresh Program and express legislative intent to reduce hunger and homelessness among college students in California.

**Mental Health:** One in four students has a diagnosable mental illness and 40 percent do not seek mental health when they need it. Research shows that for each dollar invested in student prevention and early intervention mental health services, California will see a return of at least $6, and up to $11 from more gradations. I urge your **support for directing mental health funds in the budget process from the Proposition 63 Mental Health Services Account to community colleges and other segments of public higher education.**

**Safe and Inclusive Campuses:** An estimated one-half million Californians are eligible for DACA (“Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals”) status, with many of our undocumented students fearful of recent changes in federal deportation policy. I urge your **support for AB 21 (Kalra), enacting the Access to Higher Education for Every Student Act,** and **SB 68 (Lara),** which expands the criteria for undocumented students eligible for in-state tuition. These two measures meaningfully affirm the values of our state by protecting our most vulnerable students’ right to higher education.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival (DACA) students are</td>
<td>AB 21 (Kalra)—Access to Higher Education for Every Student Act, would provide support and protection for all students, including legal, medical, and housing, while ensuring privacy of student information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vulnerable to shifting federal policies on deportations. Over</td>
<td>SB 68 (Lara)—Expands the criteria under which undocumented students are eligible for in-state tuition in public higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 students could be eligible for DACA status in California.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While immigration is a federal question, the state develops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies on undocumented students, including AB 540—allowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-state tuition for those meeting certain criteria—and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Dream Act, affording qualified undocumented students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to financial aid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide, one-half of all community college students struggle</td>
<td>AB 214 (Weber) would work to improve student participation in the CalFresh Program (food stamps) and express legislative intent to reduce hunger and homelessness among college students in California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with housing or food insecurity.</td>
<td>Mental health services for community college students should be funded in the budget process from money in the Mental Health Services Act (approved by the voters in 2004 as Proposition 63).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student access to mental health services is limited as this has not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been either a funding or policy priority for our system.</td>
<td>AB 204 (Medina) would assist students in this process by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 32,550 community college students are expected to</td>
<td>1) Requiring a statewide review of due process standards at least once every three years to assure a minimum threshold of fairness;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lose their Board of Governors (BoG) fee waivers for failing to</td>
<td>2) Requiring a local district review at least once every three years to determine if a specific group(s) of students has been disproportionately impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet newly imposed academic progress standards. Of this, 61% are</td>
<td>When a finding is made, districts would be required to incorporate it into their Student Equity Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino; 12% are students with disabilities.</td>
<td>3) Allowing students who live far from a neighboring district to use geographical distance as the basis for appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no consistency in the due process standards for students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appealing their loss of the BoG waiver.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>