

## YCCD Math-Stats Dept Meeting Minutes

Date: Tuesday, Feb 17, 2015

Time: 1000--1600

Venue: CCOF Room C-3

Present: K. Boyes, T. Chetra, M. Clark, L. Felver, S. Kovacs, S. Lanier, C. Noffsinger, M. Papin, D. Schiermeyer, K. Stemmann, J. Thoo

-----

The meeting began at 10:10 am with a minute of silence in honor of Ken Gaal.

A) Stat 1 C-ID alignment (C-ID Math 11): where are we with this at WCC and YC?

Both WCC and YC were missing a specific mention of the technology (computer) component to the course. Clark has resubmitted the course for C-ID approval for WCC. He is now revising the Course Outline of Record (COR) to update the text, SLOs, and GE requirements. Noffsinger will be revising and resubmitting the course for YC. He will consult with Clark.

B) Statpathways. Please see the statement from BOARS:

<[http://ms.yccd.edu/Data/Sites/1/userfiles/math/dmdm/20150116boars\\_statway.pdf](http://ms.yccd.edu/Data/Sites/1/userfiles/math/dmdm/20150116boars_statway.pdf)>

BOARS is allowing Statway, as designed by the Carnegie Foundation, to be a Statistics course that will be accepted by UC. However, C-ID still only mentions Intermediate Algebra as the prerequisite of Statistics. We will continue to monitor the situation but not yet make a response.

The topic of Statistics led to a discussion of the Min Quals to teach Stats in our district in light of our separate Stats department. Clark will contact Lauren Syda about past objections to allowing a Masters in Statistics as a Min Qual to teach Stats. Along these lines, it was mentioned that any equivalency requests for either Math or Stats faculty should get input from faculty at each campus.

C) Waiting period to re-interview a potential adjunct instructor.

At the 2013 DMDM we agreed: "It was also decided that the following policy that YC has adopted [YC mtng Oct 18, 2013] will be uniform at both WCC and YC: An unsuccessful adjunct instructor applicant would have to wait two years before we would consider the person again unless there was evidence that a significant change had occurred for the interested person." YC has decided to change this to one year. Does WCC agree?

It was decided that both WCC and YC will change this to one year.

D) Evaluating adjuncts who teach at both WCC and YC.

At the 2013 DMDM we agreed that we would ask the deans who assign mathematics and statistics classes

at WCC and YC to establish a formal process to inform each other about adjunct instructors when they are hired or evaluated. Where are we with this?

It is unclear how much of a formal process has been established. K. Stemmann forwarded the following email from Denise Daniel in which she says that a supervising manager can and should review previous evaluations.

**From:** Denise Daniel <[ddaniel@yccd.edu](mailto:ddaniel@yccd.edu)>

**Date:** February 5, 2015 at 5:16:49 PM PST

**To:** Karsten Stemmann <[kstemman@yccd.edu](mailto:kstemman@yccd.edu)>, Kristina Page <[kpage@yccd.edu](mailto:kpage@yccd.edu)>

**Subject: Re: Adjunct Evaluation List - Spring 2015 Semester**

Hi Karsten,

The supervising manager has authorization to review previous evaluations and should. This is beneficial and helpful.

The evaluation list includes the status code of N which indicates "Needs Improvement". When an instructor receives a Needs Improvement evaluation, the instructor is added to the following semester to be evaluated OR the next time that instructor is scheduled to teach. What we have experienced is that there are cases where an instructor has received a Needs Improvement in one semester, the instructor is added to the evaluation list for the next semester, but the instructor is not evaluated. When the instructor is not evaluated in a semester, the evaluation is assumed satisfactory. Then the instructor continues on the evaluation cycle.

E) Associate's degree mathematics competency requirement and GE Area D2 requirement.

Ca Ed Code Section 55063 "Minimum Requirements for the Associate Degree," states in part:

Effective for all students admitted to a community college for the Fall 2009 term or any term thereafter, competence in mathematics shall be demonstrated by obtaining a satisfactory grade in a mathematics course at the level of the course typically known as Intermediate Algebra (either Intermediate Algebra or another mathematics course at the same level, with the same rigor and with Elementary Algebra as a prerequisite, approved locally) or by completing an assessment conducted pursuant to subchapter 6 of this chapter (commencing with section 55500) and achieving a score determined to be comparable to satisfactory completion of the specified mathematics course. Satisfactory completion of a mathematics course at the level of Intermediate Algebra shall satisfy both this competency requirement and the coursework requirement set forth in subdivision (b)(1)(D)(ii) of this section.

<<http://www.dvc.edu/instruction/pdfs/Title5AssociateDegree.pdf>>

It seems, therefore, that every course that satisfies the competency requirement must also satisfy the Area D2 requirement.

We will defer to the Curriculum Committees for interpreting this section of the Ed Code (Shawn Frederking is investigating for YC). If it is deemed that every course that satisfies the competency

requirement must also satisfy the Area D2 requirement, then all YCCD courses listed for the competency requirement will also be listed for the D2 requirement.

F) Credit for courses taken at other institutions.

Our past practice (at YC at least) has been that if a person has passed a mathematics or statistics course at another institution that we deem to be equivalent to a YCCD mathematics or statistics course, then that course may meet any prerequisite requirement or GE Area D requirement, BUT NOT the competency requirement. Our past practice has been that only a YCCD mathematics or statistics course may meet competency. Do we or do we not want to continue with that practice?

Currently, when certain students wish to use a math or statistics course from another institution to satisfy a YCCD requirement they fill out a petition, which then goes to the math department at YC or WCC (but not at Clear Lake) for approval. It was the department's consensus that if the petition is for the math competency requirement then the petition will be denied. Only a YCCD mathematics or statistics course OR passing an extended version of that course's final exam will meet the competency requirement. Clark will check on where to go with this policy. It will be important to communicate it well with A&R and counselors.

[Post-meeting note: Papin spoke with Clear Lake's student service technician who then consulted with a senior student service technician at Marysville. They stated that they follow the guidelines set by the state, and if a student passed intermediate algebra elsewhere they will count it for the YCCD math competency requirement.]

G) "M" (mathematics) designation in course outlines: what does it mean?

Background:

From: Shawn Frederking <sfrederk@yccd.edu>  
Date: February 12, 2015 at 6:10:47 PM PST  
To: Karsten Stemmann <kstemman@yccd.edu>  
Subject: The Meaning of "M"

Hello Karsten,  
Would you mind forwarding this question to our Math faculty? Thanks!

Hello Everyone,

We need to clarify the meaning of the Math advisory: "M." It is currently defined in the catalog as "college-level computation skills." Would you agree with the following definition?

M= Eligible for math 50, 50A, 50B, 52, 52A, or 52B

If not, how should we define it?

Thank you for your help!

~Shawn

Noffsinger and Clark will communicate with the curriculum committees so that they ask the disciplines which have an "M" designation what they mean by it. This may require several levels of "M".

[Post-meeting note: Noffsinger spoke with S. Frederking who said that "M" is defined as "eligible for a college-level math course." According to this definition, it would mean "eligible for Math 52, 52A, 51, 58, or higher."]

H) Course caps: what are they, and are they District-wide?

A handout from October, 2009 was circulated with course caps at that time. They are:

Math 110: 40 students

Math 111, 50, 52: 45 students

Math 50A, 50B, 52A, 52B: 30 students

All other math classes: 45 students

It was decided to hold off on any changes for now.

I) Simulcasting courses

This involves a course being conducted simultaneously at more than one site or in more than one room at a single site. It is a live broadcast, like Polycom, in which an instructor in one location and students in another location can see and hear one another. Considerations for this modality include hiring an IA or tutor for tests and the instructor teaching at both sites (alternating). Kovacs will be piloting a Math 20 course at both Sutter and Marysville this summer.

J) Common final exams.

J1) Comments regarding last semester's

The discussion focused on the length of the exams (they should not be too long or too short), the wording of instructions (they should be similar to the wording in the text), and early drafts (the drafts should go out early and feedback should be returned early).

J2) Do we want to continue with District-wide common final exams, or instead have separate common final exams for WCC and YC, or no more common final exams?

It was the consensus that we would continue with District-wide common finals, but that YC and WCC might give them at different times.

J3) If we decide to continue with District-wide common final exams, then we need to have new writers for the next three years beginning Fall 2015.

Beginning Fall, 2015 we will have the following writers for the final exams:

Math 111- Lanier

Math 50 – Noffsinger  
Math 52 – Papin

#### J4) Problem sheets for final exams

These are handouts for instructors with examples of the types of problems that may appear on a final exam. Boyes and Chetra gave out their problem sheet for Math 50. Other problem sheets will be forthcoming for Math 111 (Thoo and Lanier) and Math 52 (Clark and Kovacs). Input and feedback are requested for each of these.

#### K) Math 1A/B/C units; also Math 2

Math 1A/B/C: For the Computer Science AD-T it is difficult to stay within the required 60-unit cap. One possibility is to reduce Math 1A from 5 units to 4 units. After some discussion it was decided to let Doug Joksch take the lead on this and find out how other colleges handle it. Though it seemed possible that going to 4 units could work, the consensus was to leave it at 5 units unless there is an external reason that warrants the change.

[Post-meeting note: Doug Joksch met with the YC math faculty on 2/20/15 and explained the situation for the Computer Science AD-T. He asked for openness to the possibility of 4 units for Math 1A and it was agreed to be open to the possibility.]

Math 2: Lanier brought up the possibility of increasing the units from 3 to 4. After some discussion the question remained about what effect this might have on the unit caps for AD-T degrees (e.g. Engineering, Math). Lanier will check into this.

#### L) New calculus sequence (for Biology majors)

Currently, Biology majors need some calculus beyond Math 9, but not as much as Math 1A/B/C. Is there a need for something comparable to the Math 17 series at UC Davis? WCC might have a need. YC may follow if a need exists. Clark will take the lead and explore this. Thoo and Boyce will help as co-contributors.

#### M) Textbooks: Math 50 and 52; Math 20; Math 21; Math 1A/B/C

Math 20: There was a desire to have options to present some topics at more of a precalculus level. Other college algebra textbooks may offer this option. Also, using a precalculus text is a possibility. Chetra and Boyes will request texts from publishers.

Math 21: McKeague is well-liked with the negotiated price. Chetra will try to re-negotiate a good price. If there is not a substantial increase it will continue to be used. Other possibilities for this course, and any other course, might be open source texts, as long as they are of good quality.

Math 1A/B/C: The current edition is good until 2017, but this means a transition will need to begin in the Fall of 2016. So, beginning this Fall, 2015 textbooks will need to be looked at. There are a number of non-commercial texts available and they will be considered as well.

N) Restructuring the Big 4: do we want to do this finally, or set it aside for the time being?

The discussion began with what to do with Math 110 students if the Big 4 is restructured to the Big 3. Options mentioned included providing a lab course, a self-paced course, a non-credit basic skills course. It was also mentioned that the Learn/General Studies department has a course, Learn 174, that could take on the subject matter of Math 110. A positive result that could emerge from removing Math 110 from the math department is that it would help with staffing needs, since a master's in math would not be required for Learn 174 for instance. Also, it would set the floor for the math department at Math 111, which is more in line with other colleges.

Also, it was suggested that there could be options for Math 111. For example, 1 unit of supplemental instruction could be offered for Math 111 students to cover arithmetic topics. Thus, there could be 2 prealgebra courses: the regular 4-unit Math 111 and a 5-unit Math 111S with supplemental instruction. Another option could be to offer Math 111 in a year-long sequence – Math 111A & 111B.

Thoo asked that we think of topics for the Big 3 that we want covered leading up to Math 20. It was suggested that we begin by looking at the breakdown of topics that Thoo suggested in an email in the Fall, 2014. Lanier tracked down the email and copies were produced for everyone. It was briefly reviewed and a brief discussion ensued. It was suggested by Schiermeyer that the topics be put in outline form. This has since been done by Lanier. See his email of 2/17. Please provide feedback by 3/7 (Reply to All), so that it can be finalized by 3/20. This can include suggestions on reorganizing the topics or adding topics. Thoo will then circulate the outline to publishers to see if any can put all of it together into one text. Kovacs will talk with Pearson.

O) Do we want to offer any self-paced courses (as options)?

This was mentioned briefly in the context of restructuring the Big 4.

P) Update from Roger Davidson on what he has found out about "Big Data" programs at CSU Chico and UC Davis.

All are encouraged to read the following and provide Roger with feedback.

On Feb 7, 2015, at 12:34 PM, Roger Davidson <rogerd@stanford.edu> wrote:

Hi John,

Here's a paragraph (or 2) about data science, my sabbatical, and what's happening at CSU Chico and UCD:

Roger Davidson is now in his 2nd quarter of study at Stanford University in data science. His first quarter

included machine learning (a field heavily tied to linear algebra and statistics that studies algorithms that "learn" or recognize patterns without explicit programming) and information and network analysis (a field based on graph theory and statistics that models and analyzes many types of networks such as social, electronic, language, proteins, etc.). He has learned new computer languages such as Python and strengthened skills in others such as MATLAB.

In addition, he is beginning to interact with Robin Jeffries (new faculty at CSU Chico) to determine what if any kind of partnership could exist between YCCD and Chico to support students interested in data science. A CSU Chico program in data science is in its infancy. Robin is experiencing challenges in linking related departments (such as computer science) to the new degree, and partnerships that are coming more easily (biology) could make the program initially more narrowly focused to biological applications of statistics and data science. An initial idea is that Yuba could support Chico by supplying online courses in fundamental areas of data science that her students would need such as Python, MATLAB, a more technical R-based statistics course, and an introductory survey course in data science. She and Roger are reaching out to Duncan Temple Lang at UC Davis who seems to have a more institutionally supported project (Data Sciences Initiative, <http://datascience.ucdavis.edu>) to build a data science curriculum at UCD. However, the focus at UCD appears to be from a PhD-level down, with a bachelor's degree some time away. As Roger expressed to Robin, it is likely that CCCs would want to support these programs and could, but it would be imperative that these courses transfer so that students would receive credit toward degrees in data science. Another path that Roger is considering is trying to create an industry advisory board for a data science technician program (similar to an engineering technician program that exists at many CCs for the field of engineering), but this would be a daunting undertaking, particularly without institutional support. However, such a program could be truly visionary and really put YCCD on the map as an innovative institution. Or it could be an utterly bad idea doomed to failure.

--R