

LACCD Student Success Initiative Steering Committee

February 9, 2006

Minutes

Attendees: David Beaulieu (ELAC), Gary Colombo (District), Deborah Harrington (LAVC), Chini Johnson-Taylor (LATTTC), Daryl Kinney (LACC), Leon Marzillier (DAS—LAVC), Joy McCaslin (LAPC), Edward Pai (WLAC), George Prather (District), La Vergne Rosow (DAS—LAVC), Rebecca Tillberg (LACC), Carlie Tronto (LAVC), Maria Elena Yepes (ELAC)

Absent: John Clerx (District), Audre Levy (LASC), Susan McMurray (LAHC), Abbie Patterson (LAHC), Hector Plotquin (LACC),

Placement Data—G. Prather shared English and math placement result data from 1991 to 2005 with the committee. During the ensuing discussion of English placement data, the following observations were made:

- That roughly 40-60% of all first-time, full-time students (excluding concurrent secondary students and those in special programs and contract ed.) are assessed each year and that only about 45% of that group place into either college-level English (English 101) or into pre-collegiate English (English 28);
- That the number of students placing into English 101 and 28 has been growing over the past 3-4 years, while the number of students placing into ESL has been trending downward;
- That students sometimes opt out of the ESL placement test because they resist categorization as “non-native speakers” even if they are relatively recent immigrants who might benefit from ESL instruction;
- That the percentage of students assessed varies significantly by college, with ELAC posting figures as high as 80% while Southwest and West have sometimes assessed only 46-48% of all first-time students;
- That variations in assessment rates may reflect changes in student services at the local level, and that variations in placement level may reflect changes in local cut scores;
- That orientation, assessment, and other stages of the matriculation process are often seen as “obstacles” to student enrollment by campus officials.

In addition, it the following points were generally agreed upon:

- That college researchers need to compare these data with numbers at the local level;
- That we should compare enrollments in various levels of English with placement numbers to determine, if possible, how many students are entering classes without assessments;
- That we need to follow up by tracking assessed students more closely to determine 1) when and where assessed students actually enter the English/ESSL

sequence; 2) to what extent assessment levels correlate with demographic, socio-economic, educational attainment, home language, citizenship and other factors; and 3) how their assessed level of proficiency and their point of entry into the English/ESL sequence correlates with educational outcomes—measured in terms of English/ESL course completion, degree & certificate attainment, and or eventual transfer.

During discussion of the math placement data, the following observations were made:

- In general, only 4-6% of all students place into college level math, while the majority place into math classes two levels or more below first-year college math;
- Large numbers of full-time students never take the math assessment test; thus, assessment itself might be seen as presenting an obstacle to student success.

Overall, committee members agreed that, as a District, we need to re-examine our assumptions about the purposes of the matriculation process and consider re-designing matriculation in a way that would genuinely promote student success. We also need to develop a consistent and on-going feedback process that allows us to track students individually and in cohorts so that we can measure the success of our matriculation processes. Committee members asked that Dr. Prather provide data on the last four years broken out from the data from '91-'05. It was also agreed that college SSI committees need to address campus assessment statistics on their own—ideally sometime before the March 3rd workshop.

March 3rd Workshop on Student Engagement

G. Colombo confirmed that both the Chancellor and Board President Sylvia Scott-Hayes will participate in the March 3rd workshop. In addition, the Chancellor's Cabinet meeting will be postponed so that college presidents can also attend.

Committee members discussed and reached agreement on the following aspects of planning for the March 3rd SSI workshop, titled "Building a Culture of Student Engagement":

- Recommended participants should probably include the following:
 - College presidents
 - VPs of Academic Affairs & Student Services
 - Deans of Academic Affairs & Student Services
 - College researchers
 - Directors of Admissions, EOP&S, DSPS, etc.
 - English/ESL and math chairs
 - Counseling chairs
 - Other interested faculty & staff
 - Two students
- Each college should bring about 15 participants to the event

- Colleges will send lists of participants to G. Colombo before the event
- C. Taylor-Johnson will reserve the Cafeteria at LATTC, order refreshments, and work with the planning sub-committee to make physical arrangements for the event;
- G. Colombo will contact Dr. Mike Bosley to find ask if he will bring PR materials and if he would agree to videotaping his presentation.

Committee members reviewed and approved the draft agenda and for March 3rd. It was recommended and agreed that an alternative be found for the graphic on the draft flier. The planning subcommittee will meet on Wednesday, February 15th at 10:00 a.m. in room 802 at District to make final plans for the event.

CCSSE Proposal

The Committee discussed a planning sub-committee proposal to administer the Community College Survey of Student Engagement as a follow up activity to the March 3rd student engagement workshop. It was noted that some of the questions covered by the CCSSE also appear on the District Student Survey, and questions were raised about whether the CCSSE would detract from the District's survey efforts. R. Tillberg suggested that the CCSSE could alternate with District and local college surveys in order not to disrupt current data gathering. It was agreed that R. Tillberg would ask the District Research Committee to review the CCSSE and offer its recommendation on the issue. G. Colombo shared a similar survey with the committee—the Community College Student Experience Questionnaire (CCSSEQ)—which is currently in use in the Riverside Community College District, and will follow up by exploring the costs of both survey instruments.

Diversity Scorecard Proposal

The Committee discussed a proposed presentation by Dr. Estela Mara Bensimon on USC's Diversity Scorecard project. While it was generally agreed that the SSI should focus on ethnicity as an important element of student success, the Committee felt that the the colleges would not be ready at this point to expand the SSI beyond current projects.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the SSI Steering Committee will be held immediately after the March 3rd workshop, from 12:30 until 2:30 p.m. in the LATTC Cafeteria.