

LACCD Student Success Initiative Steering Committee

August 18, 2006

Minutes

Attendees: David Beaulieu (ELAC), Laurence Bradford (LACC), John Clerx (District), Gary Colombo (DO), Jack Daniels (LASC), Chini Johnson-Taylor (LATTTC), Daryl Kinney (LACC), Stanislav Levin (DO), Joy McCaslin (LAPC), Susan McMurray (LAHC), Ed Pai (WLAC), Hector Plotquin (LACC), Pat Siever (WLAC), Rebecca Tillberg (LACC), Scott Weigard (LAVC), Maria Elena Yepes (ELAC)

Absent: Marcy Drummond (LATTTC), Angela Echeverri (LAMC), David Jordan (LAMC), Tony Gamble (WLAC), Leon Marzillier (DAS—LAVC), Abbie Patterson (LAHC), Gary Prostack (LAMC), George Prather (DO), La Vergne Rosow (DAS—LAVC), Carlie Tronto (LAVC)

Minutes of 6/9/06

The committee reviewed and approved the minutes of the SSI Steering Committee meeting held on June 9, 2006 with minor revisions.

Update on Student Survey

D. Kinney updated the committee on the student engagement questions that have been developed for inclusion in the next district-wide student survey. At present, there are between 70 and 80 questions that are being proposed to the DRC's survey sub-committee. These may need to be refined and winnowed before they are included. Currently, the questions address the level of student engagement in classroom activities and out-of-class academic and extracurricular experiences. Questions are also included on students' time use, reading and writing habits, and perceptions of academic and personal growth. A complete draft of the new student survey will be ready in about a month. R. Tillberg promised to bring it to the SSI Steering Committee for review at that time.

Reporting on Student Success Outcome Measures

The committee reviewed the "basic" measures of student success that were agreed upon at its meeting on 8/18/06, and discussed how and when this information should be reported. J. Clerx noted that we can access all of this information from District databases, which may be more accurate than those provided by the State, particularly in relation to degree and certificate completion. He also noted that we can easily disaggregate this internal data, while this isn't possible with data from other sources. Committee members also discussed the possibility of reporting "transfer directed" students—those who complete transfer level English and math—as well as the total number of transfers to UC/CSU and the number of those who are "transfer prepared."

The committee then turned its attention to how student success outcomes data are used at colleges. It was observed that while success measures sometimes show up in Program Reviews, Ed Master Plans, and Equity Reports, they don't often lead to any appreciable or sustained change in institutional behavior. It was also noted that colleges frequently become "defensive" about reporting these statistics, and that this reaction thwarts any sober assessment of institutional strengths and weaknesses. As a result, while isolated units on campus take action to

improve student success, there is frequently little overall coordination of effort to address underlying issues or problems. In general, committee members agreed on the following:

1. We have the data we need on hand to produce regular reports on student success.
2. We need to report on these data in a way that is public and that leads to changed behavior at the campus level.
3. We need to continue refining the data we have to learn more about students' goals, their relative levels of preparedness, their motives, and the institutional obstacles that discourage them.
4. We must continuously examine outcomes for all major demographic groups to guarantee the equity and propriety of our efforts.
5. We must include qualitative data in our student success reporting efforts.

SSI Priorities for 2006-2007

The committee recommended that the following list of goals guide the District's SSI efforts over the coming year:

1. Establish committees or taskforces at every college in the District dedicated to advancing student success at the college level and to the improvement of all student success outcomes.
2. Ask all colleges to develop clear student success goals and action plans to guide their efforts over the next two years.
3. Help colleges align their efforts with future District Strategic Planning goals, by having them integrate student success measures and goals in all institutional improvement efforts—including those associated with Program Review (Unit Planning) and Strategic and Educational Master Planning.
4. Encourage all colleges to redesign their professional and staff development programs around the STARS model, which re-focuses such activities on issues related to student success and that opens them to direct student participation.
5. Initiate a District-wide discussion of ways to improve basic skills preparation and the math and English/ESL "pipelines."
6. Work with the District Academic Senate to re-invigorate District-wide discipline committees and to focus their efforts on student success and the improvement of student learning.
7. Initiate discussions with the LAUSD, the CSUs, and the UCs to align faculty expectations and curriculum standards.
8. Build college capacity for sustaining a systematic approach to improving student success outcomes by integrating research with teaching and student services.

9. Design a District-wide “triage plan” (in the form of a “Nurturing College” handbook and a special staff development workshop series) that outlines what all faculty and staff can do to enhance students’ chances of success during the first four critical weeks of every semester.

10. Feed the faculty so they won’t eat the students.

Next Meeting

It was agreed that the SSI Steering Committee would meet next on Friday, September 8th from 10 a.m. until 12:00 noon in room 803 at the District Office.