

LACCD
STUDENT SUCCESS INITIATIVE STEERING COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 30, 2011
SUMMARY/Draft Minutes

Present: Yasmin Delahoussaye, Deborah Harrington, David Beaulieu, Shazia Khan, Dave Humphreys, Leige Doffoney, Susan Mc Murray, Alex Immerblum, Kishan Bevil, Chelsea LaPierre, Adrienne Ann Mullen, Gary Prostack, Crystal Kiekel, Deborah diCesare, Seth Weigand, Lourdes Brent

Introductions

Pierce interns – Capstone project

Senate Summit and Achieving the Dream

David B. – report on Senate Summit 9-23-11. It was well-received and well-attended; evaluations are positive. Much was learned from the presentation of North Exeter, a leader college in Achieving the Dream. Their PowerPoint presentation will soon be up on the LACCD website.

Adrienne – Report on Bridge to College, a Pierce initiative. One hundred percent of students still enrolled, and will follow up to transfer. Using Basic Skills Initiative money to leverage and later institutionalize.

Yasmin – ATD breakout on data tools, led by M. Pearl and R. Conner, was very popular. There was much discussion on exit points. Pearl has downloaded the information onto a database. City, East, and Mission have done exit points surveys. Information from the other 6 colleges is needed, as this data can be used to leverage funds from the Irvine Foundation. The college researcher must validate the data. Colleges should get back to Yasmin within 2-3 weeks for funds for years 2-3 for Achieving the Dream.

David B. – The Summit served to allay initial misgivings regarding the Achieving the Dream initiative. Many faculty who had never been to the Summit attended this year. The audience was receptive.

Susan – ATD concerns initially were: 1) It seemed to be a top-down initiative; and 2) Unclear funding sources for participation in years 2 and 3 and for possible institutionalization of best practices.

Deborah H. – Further ATD concerns involve the time that is needed to research the data. All 9 colleges are in various stages in the accreditation process. Data used in ATD should also align with accreditation, program review, and SLOs. ATD is not an additional and onerous requirement, but a way to help align initiatives related to student success. Rob Johnstone, the RP Group, BRIC, and 3CSN are all means and venues for putting it all together. The intent is to move to a student-focused agenda. A web-based tool is expected in November which will disaggregate the data.

Leige – Harbor has used the ATD matrix to align current campus initiatives. Senate support has been good for campus buy-in.

Yasmin – ATD requires committed leadership. This is a big piece at ATD Leader Colleges. Y. Delahoussaye, D. Harrington, and D. Beaulieu offered to visit colleges to work with the college presidents and the faculty.

Susan – The faculty want the data to be accessible.

Alex – He shares the concern regarding campus leadership for ATD. This work is time-consuming. Focus groups, data teams, and core teams all need time. Is this really the job of the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness? Did the District settle on a model for all colleges to emulate?

Deborah H. – The configuration must be changed. For example, the SLO Coordinator could be using the ATD model for student-centered change or just be compliance-driven.

Alex – The conversation is not happening at the colleges. Are the college president and the faculty leadership able to initiate this conversation?

Crystal – The same 20 people cannot do the work.

Susan – There is no additional compensation. People pay attention to what we invest in.

Leige – That is why alignment of all of these initiatives is so critical. The colleges have been doing these things; it must be demonstrated.

Crystal – At Pierce, initially BSI money was used for a position and, later, that position was institutionalized.

David B. – There will be follow up in consultation with Chancellor LaVista.

State Student Success Task Force

Extensive report from Yasmin Delahoussaye
(see handout containing report chapter headings)

Chapter 1 – Increase College and Career Readiness

1.1 – Collaborate with K-12 to jointly develop common core standards for college and career readiness

Students are not prepared. New 12th grade norms cannot be at the 8th grade level as they are now. That ensures that students will not be prepared to enter the community colleges at AA readiness.

Chapter 2 – Strengthen Support for Entering Students

2.1 – Develop and implement common centralized diagnostic assessments

One common assessment is recommended. Also, students can brush up on their English and math skills and then take the assessment test. Cut scores would not be standardized.

2.2 – Require students to participate in diagnostic assessment, orientation and the development of an educational plan

Common assessment asked for by Matriculation Coordinators. Millions would be needed to hire enough counselors to implement this plan.

2.3 – Develop and use technology applications to better guide students in educational process

Possible technology would be LIFEMAP

2.4 -- Require students showing a lack of college readiness to participate in support resources

Students could take a college success course assisting in self-efficacy. The District can look at best practices. Entering students could take a two-week course before the beginning of the semester.

2.5 – Require students to declare a program of study early in their academic careers

Students would declare by the end of their second term. The consequence for non-compliance would be that students would move down in their priority enrollment.

Chapter 3 – Incentivize Successful Student Behaviors

3.1 – Adopt system wide enrollment priorities reflecting core mission of community colleges

There are access and diversity issues here. The District has cut 6,000 sections, and students of color have been disadvantaged unproportionately higher. Restoration of funding would aid access.

3.2 -- Require students receiving Board of Governors fee waivers to meet various conditions and requirements

Conditions include identifying a major, a degree, certificate, career advancement, or transfer goal, and making satisfactory academic progress. California spends \$370 million in Board of Governors Grants. Task Force members suggest that money saved could return to the colleges for innovation. Los Angeles would get 13% of those funds. There would be a limit to the number of units covered by a BOGG.

3.3 – Provide students opportunity to consider attending full time

David Morse and Yasmin argued against this proposal in the Task Force; Nancy Shulock was for it. Seventy-two percent of students are part-time. Implementation would involve

financial aid offices packaging the students' financial aid and telling the students that they would receive more money if they were full-time.

3.4 – Require students to begin addressing Basic Skills deficiencies in their first year

This would have a tremendous effect on colleges' course offerings, enrollment management, and faculty hiring.

Chapter 4 – Align Course Offering to Meet Student Needs

4.1 – Focus course offerings and schedules on needs of students

Student education plans done on LIFEMAP would be used to build schedules that meet the needs of students (enrollment management).

Chapter 5 – Improve the Education of Basic Skills Students

5.1 – Restrict credit funding for basic skills coursework to two levels below collegiate level

After much discussion within the Task Force, this Nancy Shulock recommendation was removed. If implemented, the LACCD would lose \$7-12 million in apportionment. State Chancellor Jack Scott's proposal to treat all lower levels of English and math equally would have no regard for differences among community service, non credit, credit, and adult education. The issue of differing minimum qualifications was cited. Although this recommendation was removed at the time, one must stay vigilant that it not re-emerge. David B. saw this as an attempt to alter the California Educational Master Plan.

5.2 – Develop strategy for addressing Non-Credit and Adult Education in California

The California Community Colleges could take on adult education, but there is no additional funding for it. Alex observed that it was an attempt to squeeze more work out of faculty.

5.3 – Support the development of alternatives to traditional basic skills curriculum

This is an attempt to incentivize colleges to take to scale model programs.

Chapter 6 – Revitalize and Re-Envision Professional Development

6.1 – Create a continuum of mandatory professional development opportunities

Basic skills instructors would be targeted; adjuncts would be invited to participate. One hundred fifty-one million is being used to support FLEX. Funds would be re-directed.

6.2 – Direct professional development resources toward improving basic skills instruction and support services

Yasmin noted a New York Times article discussing the success of block programs

Chapter 7 – Enable Efficient Statewide Leadership & Increase Coordination Among Colleges

7.1 – Develop and support a strong community college system office

7.2 – Set local student success goals consistent with statewide goals

7.3 – Develop and support a longitudinal student record system

More Chancellor control is seen, possibly moving the community colleges to a K-12 model.

Chapter 8 – Align Resources with Student Success Recommendations

8.1 – Establish a new Student Success Initiative fund

8.2 – Consolidate select categorical programs

EOPS would not be in this block grant.

8.3 – Promote flexibility and innovation in basic skills through alternative funding mechanism

8.4 – Do not implement outcome-based funding

States which have implemented this model have not been successful. Be vigilant; this may return.

8.5 – Implement outcome-based accountability scorecard

Disaggregated data from MIS could be used in the LACCD.

Yasmin will forward the written report when available. Deborah H. will post on the SSI website. They both encourage putting feedback on the Chancellor's website and going to the forums across the state. Timeline: December – finalize Task Force recommendations; January – signed by the Board of Governors; March – legislation for implementation

3.E. ATD updates – formulation of Policy and Practice Advisory Group

Recommendations for advisory group composition: Nixon and Manning (LACCD ATD coaches); administrative and faculty ATD co-chairs; college constituent groups; VPSS; VPAA; Matriculation Coordinators; classified, especially Admissions and Records employees; Academic Senate; AFT Faculty Guild; students (not just ASO reps); college president. Leadership buy-in is very important.

David B. – Possible problems: 1) Non-faculty might make recommendations which are Senate concerns; 2) Centralization.

Yasmin and Deborah H. – 10 + 1 items would be referred to the Academic Senate

Deborah H. – A work group will identify advisory participants

FTLA flyers sent to all Senate presidents. There will be a Board of Trustees presentation on November 2nd. Shazia is part of leadership group.

- B. SLO alignment – group needs to review the Institutional Effectiveness System; SLO Coordinators to give input.
- C. No report
- D. Want to have 40 colleges with pilot programs in English and math acceleration. Pierce participating in STATWAY.

Deborah H. – RP Group – academic/vocational divide. Strengthening Student Success conference will be October 12-14.

Work groups

A. Follow up alignment conversation

B. (Front Door) - Work is going forward; will have recommendation at October meeting.

C. Planning second Math Summit which may include discussion of accelerated courses and a common assessment

Daryl Kinney in charge of ESL initiatives, 3CSN

D. Tools are coming

E. Shazia involved

AAOI – Leige will report out

Adjourn – 12 noon