MINUTES
SSB 414
May 8, 2014


1. Approval April Minutes (Action) – approved with corrections to item 3.
2. Approval of Agenda (Action) – no additions or changes. R. Tillberg introduced new assistant researcher, Sarah Doerrer.
3. Status of Proposed New Name, Charge & Membership (Discussion) – P. Braxton distributed document she submitted to College Council (CC) and their recommendations. CC requested that the EMC membership should not include any names and indicate other classified units for the sub-committees. CC wants the name, charge and membership to move forward to CC. The next CC meeting will be June 5th and this recommendation must go through the AFT Faculty Guild and Academic Senate since it’s a formal recommendation to College Council. If there are no further changes we will move forward with the name, charge and membership. O. Shewfelt presented picture of our committee organizational structure. R. Tillberg stated that there is a structure of how we organize committees however, it’s not being used. P. Braxton stated that there’s operation v. structure for shared governance.
4. West LA Scorecard report (Discussion) - 2004 scorecard for West reviewed, indicating our completion/unprepared rate rank difference is -14. The data reveals that students who have achieved at least 30 units are more likely to succeed. The Career Technical Education (CTE) results are very bad with a completion rate of 38.6%. The completion (SPAR) by rank of percent of unprepared students is 37.01%. The score card considers all students who took a class in English or Math below college level as unprepared. However, for Math they are going two levels down to Math 115. The completion outcomes – degree/transfer data indicates that students who take remedial classes complete in six years at the rate of 37%. Students are tracked state...
wide in our cohort. The percentage of unprepared students at West is 83.56% and we are ranked number 88 in the state for unprepared students. How can we correct the problem since it’s a six year tracking program. We may need another work group called scorecard improvement project where we can really bear down on this. There are so many details, possibilities and things that can be improved such as processing certificates, checking paperwork, working with division chairs, communicating with faculty, there are so many angles. This data reflects students that began in 2006 and we might have made the necessary changes over the past 8 years. Step one should be accessing how students who started in 2001 are doing. We need to create the impression that student must complete orientation, enroll in Math and English your first year. S. Duke – students take a test four weeks into semester at the momentum point, how do we keep those students motivated? S. Khoroooshi – creating cross course prerequisites for certain subjects. The impact of enrollment on prerequisites is a factor but a few instructors will be willing to pilot the project. M. Long-Coffee – we would need more sections of English 28 under cross course prerequisites. P. Braxton – the new SIS will require electronic logging of prerequisites and academic affairs have been trained to load the prerequisites that match the course outline. We can start blocking of the prerequisites now which is a state requirement. A. Foster – the senate made a recommendation that the division chairs get their schedules for the challenges during the summer to take the heat off counseling. P. Braxton – if the data shows that certain courses need a prerequisite, like a history course needs English 28, has the Senate had those discussions. A. Foster – yes, there was a recommendation for advisories but the faculty has been resistant to even putting advisories on their courses. E. Ichon – what if individual faculty members wanted it for their courses? A. Foster – the entire division would have to be on board. This recommendation for advisory has been out for four years. O. Shewfelt – we need to reorganize the way we do things here and hold hands with the students who are lost. It can’t just be the counselors or certain faculty it must be all of us. S. Duke – we should ask students directly what do we need to do to help them. These are the students who are hanging
out in front of café and president’s area. V. Braxton – we can do a student survey. C. Hunter – maybe an exit survey. M. Long-Coffee – one size college doesn’t fit the whole, we need to adopt the prep academy model. If you want to transfer you will have paired classes to keep the student moving. We can track students per their ability/interest. C. Velasco – Summer Bridge is one of the first changes towards this goal. We can reach these students early we will see a big change in the data. A. Foster – the transfer level in LEARN is exceptional, the cohort experience is working for those students. M. Long-Coffee – if you move them into a group you are better able to give them the services they need. You are helping them figure out which way to go. We need to institutionalize the small programs so that everyone benefits. C. Velasco – students on this campus need nurturing, if each of one of us reached five to ten students, it would make a difference. A. Viramontes – students must keep up with the timelines for services, which is a burden. It’s unpredictable when the student can receive an appointment for counseling or financial aid. We have a lot of services but we need a more intrusive process. If we are looking at success, let’s take the services to them and not wait for them. S. Duke – we have to take a radical approach as Olga stated. It may be controversial, but I tell students, “you are failing to realize that the community college is not set up for you to be successful” they look at me and say what do you mean? If you look at the services we offer in the college you can never get the services on time. Everything around the college is changing but the college isn’t changing and the students we are receiving are different every year. M. Long-Coffee – If you track them, you can adjust because every cohort you point to have a better success rate than students not in a cohort. The reason for that, you are adjusting to the needs of the group you are looking at, if we can break the students into more groupings. For instance, ACT was for older students with a unique set of needs, the program was set per semester. P. Braxton – trade tech is piloting a cohort based program with their vocational programs. We have LEARN, TRIO and EOPS that have great success rates statewide. Looking at some of the elements of these successful programs would be beneficial. B. Sloan – we should look at some of the other schools with successful programs for
best practices to emulate. P. Braxton – Pierce College has acceleration in Math, STATWAY, Summer Bridge, as mentioned some things are already being implemented. A. Viramontes – if we started looking at ourselves as proprietary schools (private schools) that may or may not provide a good education but thrive on students staying. If we approached it the same way when they assess we show them the next steps. E. Ichon – it’s like expressway. P. Braxton – the students are being assessed, directed into a pathway, the hard stop is 15 units which is state wide. C. Hunter – SB 1456 says you must do these three things, students are complaining that they can’t get the classes. We don’t have mandatory enrollment, some colleges have PeopleSoft SIS systems and we have to be prepared if the students don’t follow the educational plan. Some students are not ready to take math or English their first year. We could do some follow up if students haven’t taken the math or English after each semester. A. Viramontes – right now we need more bodies in Summer Bridge, the moment they walk into the office after assessment Mayra Perez will sign them up for the classes. We need to make it easy for them to get into the classes. C. Hunter – we need to get to know the students and develop a relationship with them. We need to make sure that we get beyond the discussion into action.

5. **CAI-Common Assessment Initiative (Discussion)** – handout – Common Assessment Initiative call to action from the State Chancellor’s office. West is looking at piloting the online education piece. May 15 is the deadline if we want to pilot the actual assessment. West is interested in the distance education piece and the common assessment. P. Banday is part of the assessment work group and the assessment standards state wide. Common Assessment Pilot College Information Page reviewed.

6. **Open House Report (Long-Coffee)** – recap of the April 19th Open House event scheduled every other year. We received over 2,400 hits on the website, 473 people RSVP with 350 attending. The Zumba event was very popular with over 75 rsvps. We walked away understanding that
parents want to be involved in the process. Information sessions are good but next year we want more programs involved for direct access. Several programs as Beyond the Bell and Ask to Know supported the open house with bus transportation for students. Total cost $32,000, so we need only eleven students to enroll from this event. O. Shewfelt – requested that the event days be known ahead of time so that the faculty can announce in the classroom. M. Long-Coffee – acknowledged the overwhelming response from ASO and Transfer Honors volunteers.

7. Future EMC Meeting Schedule (Action) – notification of the next meeting will be sent via email.