The meeting began at 2:30 p.m.
The minutes of September 14, 2011, were received and approved. (Pracher/Russell)

Discussion Items

Basic Skills Funding Report: T. Russell
Reports were distributed and reviewed. The Basic Skills Plan was approved.
(Pracher/Foster)
The issues of tutoring cost analysis per student served and tutor effectiveness were planned. Tutor effectiveness is a planned action for the Basic Skills Plan for the coming year. There should also be clarification about how the participants from learning communities are identified in the records of tutors, especially in the HLRC.
There is a need to explore other instructional software for the HLRC.

Report Faculty Cohort Best Practices Conference, Santa Monica College: F. Esmaeili
The conference concluded that learning communities are effective for achieving academic gains with students. A model that was presented was similar to UMOJA.

California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success, Draft Recommendations: C. Norris
Sections of the report were assigned for summary briefs by committee members and discussion at the next meeting. The one page or less, briefings will be sent to J. Friedman for distribution prior to the next meeting on November 2.

Assignments:

Part I 1-13  J. Friedman, C. Norris
Chpt. 1 14-16  S. De Bord
Chpt. 2 17-26  P. Banday, V. Valle
Chpt. 3 26-34  D. Hall
Chpt. 4 35-37  Karen Quitshau
Chpt. 5 38-44  T. Russell
Chpt. 6 45-50  M.J. Apigo
Chpt. 7 51-59  A. Foster
Chpt. 8 60-71  M. Pracher
Student Success Committee Minutes from 3:05 PM - Adjournment at 4:10 PM on 10/05/11

Agenda Item #5 – Achieving the Dream and Leadership Retreat

• Adrienne Foster reported on the Kick-Off event in Seattle last week.
• Tim Russell reported on the change in name for this committee, intended to improve clarity for students about its purpose; he also reported on breakout sessions attended, including one that explored ways to allow students and faculty to obtain data without going through the (previous) request process.
• Mary Jo reported that the Coaches were exciting and the Focus Groups excellent, providing many good ideas.
• Adrienne reported that many positive ideas were generated by the breakout groups for assessing what we do well; what's next for West Los Angeles College will be a thorough look at what students do well and how we can support their success.
• Clare reported that there would be two (2) teams working on the AtD initiative – a Data Team and a Core Team, working with a faculty lead.
• Adrienne discussed the objectives of AtD aligned with existing WLAC processes for student success - housing AtD with the Student Success Committee so that it isn't a separate line or program. A faculty lead is needed, so the discussion turned to identifying and determining appropriate release/reassignment time for this individual.
• Clare share some items from the sample job description for a lead faculty person for AtD:
  o Working with Coaches
  o Fielding calls
  o Collaborating with administrators/administration
  o Executing grant and grant budget
  o Working with both the Data Team and the Core Team
  o Working with senior members of the initiative
  o Staying on top of developments in the field of Basic Skills
  o Drafting reports in collaboration with individual constituents

Significant discussion ensued regarding the Achieving the Dream Project Director and the reassignment time that will realistically be needed; the committee agreed that identifying a person for this position needs to be driven by the Senate and that the position will probably require a total release. The budget and work plan for this initiative were actually due by August 30, so a person needs to be placed in this position yesterday! There is a Strategies Institute in February 2012 on the data collection, and we haven't even started on that data collection at this time.
A formal motion was put forth by Adrienne and seconded by Norma proposing that a regular (FT) faculty member be identified for reassigned time to work with the Student Success Committee to implement the Achieving the Dream initiative for 2011-2012, with subsequent years subject to modification. The committee approved this motion unanimously.

Clare then shared the four (4) principles guiding the AtD initiative:

1. Committed leadership
2. Use of evidence to improve programs and services
3. Broad engagement
4. Systematic institutional inclusion

The kick-off event at other campuses took place on the Flex Day; we will hold our kick-off at the Leadership Retreat later this semester. Fran reported an important date change for the Leadership Retreat – it has been moved from November 18 to December 2 in order to accommodate the attendance of Lead Coach Don Cameron. The positive “sync” between Learning Resources and the Achieving the Dream initiative was discussed. Both showcase Best Practices and a self-assessment approach, in sync with broader student success efforts. The retreat theme this year is Celebrating the Best in West, so focusing on a culture of achievement further links the two events (Leadership Retreat and Achieving the Dream kick-off).

Agenda item #6 – the Achieving the Dream Work Plan

Mary Jo, Clare, and Adrienne distributed hard copies of the AtD work plan, then asked everyone to partner up to review sections and report back to the group. The committee was reminded that the fundamental goal of the AtD initiative is getting students complete whatever their goal is (certificate, degree, transfer, etc.), and responses to the work plan from the group were as follows:

- **Objective 1**: clarification was requested about who the participants are of the “faculty interest delegation,” as well as the membership of the Core Team. The question was asked about whether it’s an *ad hoc* committee, not under the Senate, in order to expand faculty participation
- **Objective 2a**: the target date for identifying additional data needed was changed from “Oct/Nov 2011” to “Prior to Retreat”
- **Objective 2b**: it was recommended that the clarification, “collected by the Data Team,” be added to the end of the activity description, “Analyze problems suggested by disaggregated data,” for clarity; the parenthetical “Oct/Nov 2011” was deleted after “Leadership Retreat” under the When? Column now that the 12/02/11 date has been set
- **Objective 2c**: reviewers felt that this particular objective is too vague regarding who is involved
- **Objective 2e**: reviewers expressed concern with making sure that the right voices in the community are heard (for example, Crenshaw as well as Culver City, etc.) and that the core group is “pure representation” of the student populations we serve. The question was asked about who would lead the focus groups with community
leaders and K-12 institutions, as well as how collaborative focus groups would be coordinated

- **Objective 2f**: “wait time” in the parentheses after Assessment test was clarified to mean time before students could actually take their assessment tests, and questions were raised about “conjunction with SEP” → we need to clarify the situation with Student Educational Plans because it’s a little like the chicken-and-the-egg: do students need to take the Assessment tests before a realistic SEP can be developed or does the SEP include scheduling when to the Assessment tests? Helen expressed concern about the risk of depersonalizing the counseling process and the committee agreed that the language here was misleading. The intention was to link Student Educational Plans and Assessment tests as parts of the matriculation process (without making SEPs mandatory). Further concern was raised about the fact that most policies and practices specific to objective 2f are district policies/practices, rather than institutional.

- **Objective 3**: the reviewers proposed adding an overt cue about sharing information with the broader college community while the setting of priorities, goals, and measurable outcomes is still in formative stages

- **Objective 4**: the reviewers pointed out that “data team” needed to be added to the column on who will lead the work to align it with the activity to its left that said strategies would be discussed with both the core team and the data team

- **Objective 5**: the deadline for Draft 3 needs to be clarified as to whether it is due in April or May; under “issues to be resolved/challenges expected,” readers asked for clarification of several items. “Fire storm” was explained as the kind of “immediate fires” such as resistance or insufficient funding; the reviewers requested that the reference to Student Educational Plans be defined more specifically, in light of the discussion of Objective 2f earlier.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 PM.
Respectfully submitted,
Sue de Bord, Ph.D.
Language Arts Learning Skills