

Achieving the Dream – Data Team

Notes

October 19, 2011

2:30

HLRC 4th Floor

Members: Celena Alcalá; Holly Bailey-Hofmann, Patricia Banday; Elizabeth Bell, co-chair; Betsy Regalado; Tim Russell; Matthew Robertson; Nancy Sander; Rebecca Tillberg, co-chair; Beraki Woldehaimenot

1. *Approval of draft Notes.* The notes were approved as submitted.
2. *Selection of co-chair.* Rebecca reported that Elizabeth had volunteered at the last meeting to serve as co-chair of the Data Team. The Team enthusiastically accepted her as co-chair by consensus. Rebecca commented that for the November 2 meeting when the Data Team reports our findings to the Student Success Committee she will not be able to be there, so Elizabeth will lead that presentation with the support of the entire Data Team.
3. *Final AtD Planning Year Work Plan.* Rebecca distributed final copies of the Work Plan. This is the final version that was submitted to AtD and provides some guidance for the work of the Data Team.
4. *Follow-up from last meeting: Primary Language of students.* The group felt we had discussed this issue sufficiently at the last meeting, considering the many additional topics we still need to discuss.
5. Discuss timing to review all data and report out at various times. Rebecca brought forward the concern that we won't be able to talk about all the available data prior to our presentation to the Student Success Committee; there was discussion about how to address this concern.
 - a. To keep discussion more focused on the topic at hand, use a '*parking lot*' to record issues of interest that we can follow up at later meetings.
 - b. Do some *preparation before the meeting* to speed up the discussions. Rebecca asked everyone to review the data in two reports prior to the next meeting: "WLAC Degrees and Certificates Awarded", and "Student Success Metrics". Both reports contain equity data. Each person is to make a few notes about data and trends that are notable, surprising, or important to address through intervention strategies.

Elizabeth asked if there is a way that we can communicate with each other about the things we notice in the data between meetings, sort of an on-going virtual discussion. We discussed the possibility of using a Wiki or discussion board to accomplish this idea. There are several possible platforms for hosting Wikis and discussion boards: Moodle, Etudes, Google Groups, etc. Several people on campus may be able to help in the research process and deciding which approach to choose, including Eric Ichon, Mary Jo Apigo and Juan Chacon. Patty Banday volunteered to do the research and report back at the next meeting.

- c. We will focus the presentation on the assessment/placement and successful course completion rate data that we have reflected on so far. Rebecca described a way to consider the full range of data that we currently have available, that is to use the matriculation model that tracks a student through their college career beginning with entrance to college including assessment/placement through successful course completion to completion of degrees/certificates and transfer. The Data Team can continue to meet throughout the year, but on a monthly basis, to consider the goal completion data in some detail, as well as other data that we want to collect, including tracking data and focus group data.

Discussion about challenges students face led to a number of questions we would like to address through focus groups: difference between genders in work ethic and study skills; explore dislike for math; reasons from dropping classes or simply stopping to attend; disability issues and prevalence of disabilities.

Other issues discussed:

- How can we increase the academic environment on campus and make it cool to be involved academically? Perhaps increased visibility for clubs could play a role here.
 - Concern about foundation skills courses and the low success rates in these courses. There was extensive discussion about PLATO and whether or not it is effective. We need more research on the impact of PLATO on student success across disciplines.
 - Support for disabled students. There was concern that there is insufficient support for and identification of disabled students since disability assessment has been reduced, and there is not learning disability specialist. It was suggested that we get data from LAUSD and Culver City on the number of students with IEPs (the individual education plans that students with disabilities develop).
6. *Identify gate-keeper courses.* Rebecca defined gate-keeper courses as first level transferable courses that have high enrollment and low success rates. The reason for identifying and focusing on gate-keeper courses is that addressing issues in these courses can have more impact in improving degree completion and transfer rates. Rebecca presented three years of data so the group could 'drill down' into successful course completion rates in order to identify gate-keeper courses. The over-all success rates for the possible gate-keeper courses was 59% for the 3 years included in the data. For example, Sociology 1 has high enrollment (over 1,700 in 3 years) and low success rates (47%); Political Science 1 also has high enrollment (over 3,600) but has higher success rates (57%). We looked at equity gaps in successful course completion by ethnicity, gender and age. In math, we found equity gaps by ethnicity but not by gender.
 7. *Parking Lot Items*
 - a. Enhance academic environment on campus
 - b. What if we controlled for mitigating factors of English 21 success rate by taking the entire class to PLATO?