

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.

Appendix A



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 graduations. 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 Arrival") 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,

Appendix B



LEGISLATIVE TALKING POINTS

Issue	Solution
<p>Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival (DACA) students are vulnerable to shifting federal policies on deportations. Over 500,000 students could be eligible for DACA status in California.</p> <p>While immigration is a federal question, the state develops policies on undocumented students, including AB 540—allowing in-state tuition for those meeting certain criteria—and the California Dream Act, affording qualified undocumented students access to financial aid.</p>	<p>AB 21 (Kalra)—<i>Access to Higher Education for Every Student Act</i>, would provide support and protection for all students, including legal, medical, and housing, while ensuring privacy of student information.</p> <p>SB 68 (Lara)—Expands the criteria under which undocumented students are eligible for in-state tuition in public higher education.</p>
<p>Nationwide, one-half of all community college students struggle with housing or food insecurity.</p> <p>Student access to mental health services is limited as this has not been either a funding or policy priority for our system.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>
<p>Approximately 32,550 community college students are expected to lose their Board of Governors (BoG) fee waivers for failing to meet newly imposed academic progress standards. Of this, 61% are Latino; 12% are students with disabilities.</p> <p>There is no consistency in the due process standards for students appealing their loss of the BoG waiver.</p>	<p>AB 204 (Medina) would assist students in this process by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Requiring a statewide review of due process standards at least once every three years to assure a minimum threshold of fairness; 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. When a finding is made, districts would be required to incorporate it into their Student Equity Plans. 3) Allowing students who live far from a neighboring district to use geographical distance as the basis for appeal.

