STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Present: Graciella Casillas-Tortorelli, Richard Duran, Maria de la luz Flores, Cynthia Herrera, Lisa Hopper, Linda Kama'ila, Bola King-Rushing, David Lopez, Ross Fontes, Letty Mojica, Lilia Ruvalcaba, Karen Sutton, Diva Ward, Richard Williams and Della Newlow

Guests: None

Meeting Date: **10/02/12**	Approval of Meeting Notes for: **09/04/12**	Recorded By: **Karla Banks**

AN = Action Needed	AT = Action Taken	D = Discussion	I = Information Only

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS

I. Called to Order	I	The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m.
II. Welcome/Introductions	I	Dr. Durán thanked everyone for accepting the attending the first Student Success Committee meeting of the 2012-2013 academic year. The Committee members introduced themselves.
III. Review of Student Success Committee Charge	I	Dr. Durán stated that last year this was a standing committee and the Committee agreed to look at becoming a PGM committee. The Academic Senate reviewed and approved the recommendation for Student Success Committee to become a PGM. The PGM Manual is currently being revised and included in the PGM is the definition of the committees, the role of the constituent groups, Brown Act information, etc

L. Kama'ila stated that the Student Success Committee stated that the Learning Outcomes Team would no longer be a PGM committee. She also stated that there would be changes to the SSC membership - she is stepping down as co-chair as she is finding she has too many committee meetings to attend, we also want to ensure every areas is represented on the committee.

Dr. Durán distributed a copy of the draft SSC description from the current PGM. The Committee members reviewed the draft and briefly discussed the following item(s): will need to add a sentence explaining how this Committee falls under 10+1; purpose of the committee should state that we are the institutional effectiveness committee of the campus; last year management

developed implementation matrix of SSC recommendations;

the Committee made recommendations to the President – it is the role of Committees to make recommendations and it is management's role to work on implementation (strategies and processes) of those recommendations; with last year's data we tracked student progress and discovered barriers and now need to assist them in succeeding in their course work and in getting them through their program of study, we need to support our own standards of what we are asking students to achieve; *membership* – will work on obtaining more faculty members; reviewed the Committee goals, activities and outcomes as stated in the PGM; reiterated the goals of the Committee representatives - they are to report out the their respective constituent groups what is taking place at the meetings as we are trying to improve campus-wide communication; and *meeting day and time* - meetings will be the first Tuesday of each month at 2 PM in the President's Conference Room.

	AN	**Karla will revised the SSC membership list.**
	AN	**Karla will add an item on the agenda called "Public Comments" and will ensure the agenda is posted timely.**
IV. Membership (New Co-Chair)	I	L. Kama'ila stated that she would like to designate Lilia Ruvalcaba as the co-chair of Student Success Committee for 2012-2013.
	AT	**The Committee agreed by consensus.**
	I	Dr. Durán stated that the SSC agendas are created by the co-chairs and will be forwarded a few days prior to the meeting. If anyone would like to add an item to the agenda, please forward the request to the co-chairs and cc Karla Banks.
V. Updates from FY2011-2012	I	Dr. Durán distributed the SSC recommendations produced last year. He stated that we used VFA measures when reviewing our data. He explained that the goal of the VFA was to set national measures of student success and to have community colleges using these measures. We utilized reviewed three areas – 1) Developmental Education; 2) Two-Year Progress Measures; and 3) Six-Year Outcomes – for which we reviewed data and then came up with recommendations.

L. Hopper stated that basically the framework looks at

two points in time – two-year goals and six-year goals. We looked at persistence and transfer rates. At the next level we will be looking at demographics.

Dr. Durán explained that the data was taken and summarized in narrative and we discussed how to make improvements.

- Section #1 – we came up with four recommendations which we have begun implementation on. The Math redesign was done last year.

- Section #2 – looked at fall 2009 cohorts; were looking at success and retention rates for cohorts, how many students were retained from spring to fall terms; how many students were completing certs, transfer or still enrolled; pg 4 item #4 indicates that only 3.4% of our students are completing in two years; you will see it is taking our students longer – why is it taking our students so long to get through; with financial aid changes you will begin to see our students pressured to get through so we came up with three recommendations for improvements in this area.

- Section #3 – looked at unduplicated outcomes for total cohort and credential seeking; students who come in and get going are more likely to be successful over a six-year period; over 50% of the students who left the college of total cohort did not complete and are no longer here (we don't know what happened to them); data item #1 indicates that only 8% completed an Associates w/o transfer; how does this statistic compare to other colleges?

Dr. Durán stated that the data tells you clearly that students who have a goal are successful and that lifelong learning is disappearing.

R. Fontes briefly discussed the "1st Year Experience" that Student Services has developed. The process includes assessment, matriculation, development of an education plan, etc.

| VI. Goals for FY2012-2013 | I | Dr. Durán distributed a copy of the 2012-2013 SSC Recommendations to the President's Cabinet for review. He said that the Cabinet members developed goals for accomplishing the SSC recommendations – action steps |

to determine how we will accomplish goals, responsible party for ensuring follow through on actions steps, timelines, etc. He said that as progress is made we will begin to fill in the columns and at the end of the semester we will review the matrix and fill in the status/outcomes, evidence, etc. He will bring it back to the SSC after the end of the semester (in January) to give a report.

I   <u>VFA Achievement Gap</u> – Dr. Durán stated that this year the one of our fundamental goals will be to drill down the data we already have by gender, ethnicity, etc. and determine what achievement gaps exist within our student body.

L. Hopper distributed Developmental Math VFA Cohort data. She stated that she has begun to go through and put in demographics for the cohorts; can see ethnicity, gender, Pell status, age group, college ready/not college ready, enrollment status, etc. Dr. Durán said that the purpose of this data is to see if there are achievement gaps on this campus. He believes we will come up with another set of recommendations based on our review of this data. He said he hears a lot about the low achievement rates for Latino and Black males – this is the kind of data that will help us see if that is true on our campus.

VII.   CCSSE Executive Summary – 2010 Findings

I   Dr. Durán distributed and briefly discussed the CCSSE Executive Summary. He said two items were included - the Executive Summary of the 2010 Findings and the 2012 Key Findings for OC. He encouraged the Committee members to review the materials.

L. Hopper discussed the following items related to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement: this year almost 660 students participated; it included various components of student engagement (students working with other students, students working with faculty, doing things in/out of class, etc.); they come up with standardized means for comparisons with other colleges in a national cohort; working on comparing three years and trying to do some trends – it will be interesting to see where we've changed from 2010 to 2012 in some areas; we have met certain benchmarks based on this survey; as a District we are more inclined to go with "student satisfaction" data; the District Institutional Research Committee consensus is that we do not want to do this again; we have not done the Student Satisfaction Survey in approximately three years and there is institutional effectiveness data that is similar to CCSSE data. She

stated that the CCSSE documents are available on SharePoint.

L. Kama'ila expressed concern that there has not been a way to hear back from Student Services on how they are utilizing this data.

VIII. PGM 2012-2013 Calendar of Meetings	I	Dr. Durán distributed and briefly discussed the 2012-2013 PGM calendar of meetings. He noted that the next SSC meeting is on October 2 at 2 PM in President's Office.
IX. Future Student Success Meetings		o October 2, 2012 o November 6, 2012 o December 4, 2012 o February 5, 2013 o March 5, 2013 o April 2, 2013 o May 7, 2013
X. Adjournment		The meeting adjourned at 3:43 p.m.

Oxnard College
STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE

ORDER OF THE AGENDA
FOR THE MEETING OF
TUESDAY, October 2, 2012
2:00-4:00 P.M. in President's Conference Room

I. Call to Order

II. Review of Meeting Notes

III. Review SSC Charge

IV. CCSSE Data Review and Discussion

V. Remaining 2012-2013 SSC Meetings
- November 6, 2012
- December 4, 2012
- February 5, 2013
- March 5, 2013
- April 2, 2013
- May 7, 2013

VI. Adjournment

STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Present: Richard Durán, Lilia Ruvalcaba, Mark Bates, Karen Engelsen, Maria de la luz Flores, Ross Fontes, Karen Gorback, Cynthia Herrera, Lisa Hopper, Bola King-Rushing, David Lopez, Letty Mojica, Della Newlow, Linda Robison, Karen Sutton, Deborah Tyson, Diva Ward and Richard Williams

Guests: Chris Horrock

Meeting Date: **12/04/12**	Approval of Meeting Notes for: **10/02/12**	Recorded By: **Karla Banks**
AN = Action Needed	**AT = Action Taken** **D = Discussion**	**I = Information Only**

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS

I. Called to Order	I	The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. Dr. Durán introduced Dr. Karen Gorback, the interim Liberal Studies Dean. The Committee members introduced themselves.
II. Review of Minutes	I	The Committee members reviewed the minutes from the September 4, 2012, meeting. ✓ Dr. Durán distributed the updated Student Success Committee charge from the 2012-2013 OC PGM ✓ Karla will insert item #2 "Public Comments" on all future agendas ✓ The Committee agreed to make votes by consensus There were no changes or additions to the meeting minutes.
III. Review of Student Success Committee Charge	I	Dr. Durán distributed the revised Student Success Committee charge. The Committee members briefly discussed the following item(s): decided last year our institutional effectiveness would be measured using the Voluntary Framework of Accountability data; Committee falls under 10+1 sections 4 and 5; and the SSC membership as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE GROUP	NAME(s) of REPRESENTATIVE
President	Richard Durán
Co-Chair	Lilia Ruvalcaba
Academic Department Representatives	Richard Williams (Auto Tech) ; Karen Gorback (English); Marlene Dean (Math)
Dean of Student Services	Karen Engelsen
General Counseling	David Lopez
Categorical Programs	Letty Mojica (CalWORKs); Ross Fontes (EOPS); Della Newlow (EAC); Maria Flores (Matriculation)
Institutional Research	Lisa Hopper
Institutional Support areas	Bola King-Rushing (Instructional Technology)
Academic Support areas	Diva Ward (Library Learning Resource Center)
Transitional Studies Manager	Karen Gorback
Transitional Studies	Mark Bates (Math)
Business Services	OPEN
Classified Rep	OPEN
Admissions & Records	Deborah Tyson (Assistant Registrar)
Associated Student Government (ASG)	OPEN
Financial Aid	Linda Robison (Financial Aid)
Ex Officio – Grant Director	Cynthia Herrera

	AN	Karla will complete the revisions and forward to the Committee members for review and approval then we will forward to the Academic Senate for approval and incorporation into the Oxnard College Participatory Governance Manual.
IV. Student Success Act of 2012	I	Dr. Durán distributed and briefly reviewed the Implementation and Planning Timeline for the Student Success Act of 2012. The SSA 2012 takes effect in January 2013. Additionally, he distributed and briefly reviewed the structure and communication plan of the SSA 2012.
V. CCSSE Data Review and Discussion	I	L. Hopper distributed the CCSSE data. She stated that this data has also been posted to SharePoint. She said we have participated in 2008 and 2010 surveys and that we completed the 2012 survey last May. We send information about which classes we offer, when they meet, etc. to CCSSE. They selected samples of classes. We send surveys to faculty and ask them to administer the surveys in their classes. We then send the completed surveys back to Texas for processing. The purpose is to determine how engaged our students are in the classes selected, what services they use, and what

they think of the services we offer. CCSSE's come up with five areas of student engagement (active and collaborative learning; student effort; academic challenge; student-faculty interaction; and support for learners). The whole District participates in CCSSE and each college paid their share (our portion was paid from our Title V funds).

L. Hopper also distributed the OC Decile Placement report. The report shows how we compare in the following areas: Benchmark – Standardized Means; Deciles – Total Cohort; Deciles – Medium Colleges; and Deciles – Urban Colleges. She said that the interesting points were although we are above the means in most areas there is only one area where we have increased over the past three years which is the Student-Faculty Interaction category. We are going down a little bit in all other areas. We have gone from being in the 90th percentile to the 70th percentile in the Support of Learners category. We have also gone down significantly in the Student Effort category – our students are not making the effort to engage in the institution.

The Committee members briefly discussed the following item(s): amount of reading and writing a student does has decreased – students not reading assignments before coming to class, student not preparing drafts of paper assignments before turning them in, etc.; how often do the students use the services at this college (peer tutoring, peer labs, computer labs, etc); we are less than the mean from other similar colleges; there is more of an effort to increase their computer lab action, we are working on it but we are a little behind the curve, we anticipate it will increase as we have more programs that involve computer-based learning; incorporating technology into the classroom - faculty tend to say our students are not ready for that, we need to try to push past it, we want to promote it as students are going to need to know how to use computers in 2012; do we have data on how many students have computers at home – (Mark Bates indicated that the trend is increasing in his class, over 85% indicate they have a computer with internet access while Karen Sutton stated that the majority of faculty in English 96 still have to take students to the Library and show them how to use the computers) our goal is to try to introduce our students to computer use; we need to determine what kinds of questions we want to carry over on our new Student Survey; we have to take into account external things – our students have to work so that effects how much time they have to

dedicate to school work; it is encouraging to see more engagement of faculty and students online – we are showing an improvement from two years ago, changes in Financial Aid regulations are causing many faculty to be more pro-active; we need to work on ways of getting students excited and engaged – need to identify the factors that keep them from being engaged (i.e. inadequate study skills, lack of motivation, economy, etc.), some students may be taking too many units but taking less may affect their livelihood, we need to keep students engaged on campus; faculty have begun having small weekly workgroups with students; develop a true First-Year Program, (Karen Engelsen stated we have a good First-Year Experience programs but we don't have the teeth, for instance, orientation – is suggested but not required), we need to be able to show that when you do these things there is an effect – a positive outcome; possibly have career speakers visit to campus who can inspire students; students need to know the plethora of jobs/careers that are out there, students need to develop a goal; students need to see a direct connection between their livelihood and their education; students need to understand the benefit of unpaid internships (gives you good experience and references for an employer); we need to begin to build in policies to block registration for students that don't take orientation and we have to have the support in place to see it through – this type of initiative may get some teeth when the Student Success Act of 2012 is implemented (Santa Monica's orientation is online, this may be something we can look into); and is the growth of online learning making students feel more isolated?

Academic Challenge –has fallen as a standardized mean but we are still a little higher than medium colleges and other Hispanic serving colleges; breakdown between first generation and non-first generation students is listed on page 13; it appears that a lot of our students are finding our work challenging at the college; Transitional Studies Committee concern is that with ESL classes many students were being placed too low.

Student-Faculty Interaction – increased email exchanges between students and instructors was the reason for the increase; we would need to take a survey of faculty as to what their motivation is for pursuing an increase in their interaction with students – something salient and personal to the faculty; student/faculty interaction has increased in the STEM area where faculty are engaging in group workshops for student; how many faculty

members participate in other campus events?; what is the percentage to the entire faculty population?

Richard Williams said that for CTE, in general, everyone is walking around on eggshells because when cuts come CTE is the program on top. They are always wondering what they can do to survive. He suggested we need to look at how we are measuring program success.

Dr. Durán stated that we need to do a better job of directing our students – emphasize the need to attend the orientations and ensure students are declaring majors.

M. Bates briefly discussed the strategies/format used for the Transitional Studies Committees survey of faculty - looked at 25 randomly picked faculty, tracked them down and asked them personal questions about how they use early alert, etc. He suggested we need to have some staff, deans, etc. go to the offices and ask faculty the questions.

VI. Remaining 2012-2013 Meetings

- o November 6, 2012
- o December 4, 2012
- o February 5, 2013
- o March 5, 2013
- o April 2, 2013
- o May 7, 2013

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Oxnard College
STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE

ORDER OF THE AGENDA
FOR THE MEETING OF
TUESDAY, November 6, 2012
2:00-4:00 P.M. in President's Conference Room

I. Call to Order

II. Review of Meeting Notes

III. Committing to Quality: Guidelines for Assessment and Accountability in Higher Ed *(New Leadership Alliance)*

IV. Development of Logic Model
  o Brad Phillips

V. New Business

VI. Remaining 2012-2013 SSC Meetings
  o December 4, 2012
  o February 5, 2013
  o March 5, 2013
  o April 2, 2013
  o May 7, 2013

VII. Adjournment

STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Present: Richard Durán, Lilia Ruvalcaba, Karen Engelsen, Maria de la luz Flores, Karen Gorback, Cynthia Herrera, Lisa Hopper, Bola King-Rushing, Della Newlow, Deborah Tyson, Diva Ward and Richard Williams

Guests: None

Meeting Date: **12/04/12**	Approval of Meeting Notes for: **11/06/12**	Recorded By: **Karla Banks**

AN = Action Needed	AT = Action Taken	D = Discussion	I = Information Only

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS

I. Called to Order	I	The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m.
		Dr. Durán introduced Dr. Brad Phillips, from the Institute for Evidence-Based Change (IEBC). The Committee members introduced themselves.
II. Public Comments		There were no public comments.
III. Review of Minutes		There were no meeting notes submitted for review.
IV. Committing to Quality: Guidelines for Assessment and Accountability in Higher Education	I	Dr. Durán distributed a publication entitled, "Committing to Quality: Guidelines for Assessment and Accountability in Higher Education." He said that he is just lodging the document with the Committee members today. He stated that as we will have to meet proficiency standards this type of information will help us. Eventually we will need to determine what our relationship will be to program review and other campus processes.
V. Development Logic Model	I	Dr. Durán stated that our primary business at today's meeting is the Development Logic Model. We have to have a logical way of looking at data and making it work for us. He said that the goal is to introduce a "manual of institutional effectiveness" on this campus to include information such as the data we use, how we use it, who uses it, etc. so that whoever is here will be able to use the model without having to reinvent the wheel. We need to start by identifying what is important to us and why. He also stated that there is another skill set we can gain – how we analyze the data (this is a skill you learn).
o Dr. Brad Phillips	I, D	Dr. Phillips thanked the Committee for having him at the

college and gave a brief introduction of himself which included the following: started CalPASS fourteen years ago; starting as a Director of Research and Planning at Yuba College; and has been working with "Achieving the Dream" for the last eight years.

Dr. Phillips discussed the Development Logic Model as follows: have a specific way in which data is looked at – it is not about the interventions you create but it is about changing the culture, culture shift is about using information to make decisions so that data really becomes how you make a decision; and CQI is about using information to make corrections as you move forward.

Dr. Phillips and the Committee discussed a few potential reasons why data is not used at OC; 1) data is hard to get and not in the right form; 2) not making the time to look at data properly; 3) what is the benefit of the data to the programs at the College; 4) fear and apprehension about what the numbers might say; 5) data has been used as a punitive rather than positive; and 6) confusion of what types of questions to ask – individuals are afraid of asking the right questions, we spend so much time looking at ethnicity, etc, while we should be looking at things like economic status, etc.

Dr. Phillips stated that asking the right questions is one of the first steps to gathering effective data. Endogenous things – ethnicity, age, etc., can't change them; exogenous things – things we can change, what might we look at when we think about access. He briefly discussed the following items related to data collection *(see the attached PowerPoint presentation for details)*: top ten reasons why data is not used; using data in education; assumptions about data use; must move from data centric to user centric; Elizabeth Kubler-Ross's Five Stages of Data Use; IEBC Theory of Data Use; technology and research expertise (analytics); data review templates; organizational behavior; human judgments and behavior; basic tips for increasing data use; and using data to understand the student experience.

Dr. Phillips offered the following guidance: in order for the use of data collection to be successful the college community needs to understand the group is non-partisan – the only agenda is to improve the community it serves; leaders must focus first on creating the conditions for integrating student outcome information into day-to-day practices of faculty and staff – an organizational habit around the use of data and improvement must be

developed; culture is so hard to change – have to change culture from within not without; need to focus on the consumer and less on the data – we are in the knowledge business not the data business, it's about improvement, particularly, in instruction; data cannot be seen as punitive rather it needs to be seen as a tool; a protocol for using data is important – must build capacity for practitioners to inquire and use data; grades are the most important indicator – if students don't get an A, B, C or credit, they don't persist; don't jump to changes too quickly, get all of the information as the cost of mistakes are high; when collecting data simplicity is best; what you count tells the college community that this is what is important and how it is counted matters; focusing on a few key metrics is key for this Committee (key performance indicators is a good way to look at this data); establishment/use of data coaches – faculty members that get a small stipend of release time, work with faculty on problems identified and how we can make it better; always start meetings on a positive note – start with good stuff so people are willing to listen to what the data shows (when you bring people to discuss data – feed them, good mood and cognitive ease is the equivalent of safety and familiarity); the messages in the data must be clear – tell a relative story and/or give examples, show photos and videos, make a connection; every gathering includes a brief write up on member's position of an issue after viewing data; and allow the minority opinion in this process. The best way to help students and staff improve their performance is to provide feedback. Well designed systems tell people when they are doing well and when they are making mistakes.

B. King-Rushing asked how we tie grades and SLOs together. Dr. Phillips suggested we start with SLOs – what you want students to know and do.

K. Gorback asked if Dr. Phillips was familiar with a movement based on competency-based transcipts as opposed to grades. Dr. Phillips indicated that he was and suggested the Committee read an article entitled, "*Cracking the Credit Hour – Treatise on Competency-Based Instruction.*"

ARCC Framework
L. Hopper stated that there are four categories: 1) student progress and achievement (degree/certificate, transfer); 2) student progress and achievement (vocational, occupational, workforce development); 3) pre-collegiate improvement (basic skills and ESL); and 4) participation rates.

Dr. Durán explained that the ARCC report findings have to go to the Board for discussion/interaction.

L. Hopper briefly discussed the following items: one problem with the data is that is only looks at students with 12 credits or higher which excludes part-time students; data done annually; purpose is to improve our quality; state Chancellor's Office generates the report, we review it and then it goes to the Board for interaction; believe that it is being used as a building block for state-wide student success intiative. Her charge was to look at every piece of data we had at our disposal. Additional areas to look into include:

- Is CCSSE data something we want to continue?

- Can we get stats for students with less than 12 units? *(L. Hopper said that she wants to do this but inconsistent data impedes the completion of the report.)*

- How do we count multi-college students?

D. Newlow suggested we look at having a committee structure where we have less committees and the committees we have meet more often.

Dr. Phillips asked what is the common denominator for how data is gathered for the District – to what degree does it capture a realistic picture of the students that we serve? Dr. Durán responded through CCSSE participation. He stated that we looked at data last month. We have three years of data and could get trend data. He said that we have not adequately used data yet. L. Hopper stated that within the District Research Committee there is not a lot of enthusiasm about participating in the CCSSE again. Dr. Durán stated that part of the problem with our District is we do not have a District-wide Researcher. He also stated that the VCCCD Board is just now pushing us to have a District-wide Effectiveness Level.

Dr. Durán said that we can continue our participation in the CCSSE as a college if we want to pay for it. Dr. Phillips said that the CCSSE, if it is done well, is really helpful. The idea is that it will get drilled down to faculty. The thing about data is – what do we do with it, how is it used, and to what degree are we all in.

R. Williams asked for clarification on the hiring of Dr. Phillips to assist us with data collection/review. C. Herrera

explained that today he is here "gratis" but we have the intention of hiring him, through from the STEM grant, to help us. R. Williams expressed his concern regarding the College's spending money on hiring a consultant during these difficult budgetary times.

Dr. Durán stated that this is an accreditation issue for the campus. When it is all said and done our campus must have an institutional effectiveness model set up and working - our CQI process must be working. He explained that there is limited expertise in this room and said that the point is we need outside expertise to help us facilitate and institute our CQI culture.

VI. New Business — There was no new business.

VII. Remaining 2012-2013 Meetings
- December 4, 2012
- February 5, 2013
- March 5, 2013
- April 2, 2013
- May 7, 2013

VIII. Adjournment — The meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Present: Richard Durán, Lilia Ruvalcaba, Joel Diaz, Karen Engelsen, Maria de la luz Flores, Ross Fontes, Karen Gorback, Cynthia Herrera, Lisa Hopper, Bola King-Rushing, Letty Mojica, Della Newlow, Linda Robinson, Diva Ward and Richard Williams

Guests: None

Meeting Date: **02/05/13**	Approval of Meeting Notes for: **12/04/12**	Recorded By: **Karla Banks**

AN = Action Needed	AT = Action Taken	D = Discussion	I = Information Only	CR = Committee Referral

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS

I. Called to Order	I	The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m.
II. Public Comments		There were no public comments.
III. Review of Minutes	I	The Committee reviewed the meeting notes from the October 2 and November 6, 2012, meetings. There were no corrections to the October 2 and November 6, 2012, meeting notes.
		Dr. Durán commented that since Prop 30 passed there will be no mid-year cuts this year. He also said that for the 2013-2014 budget we will not have to discontinue any programs, services nor athletics. He explained that the passing of Prop 30 does not mean that we will have money to restore anything that we have lost to-date. The budget we have this year will be carried over for 2013-2014 – to maintain, not restore. He said that it is projected that in two years we will begin seeing restoration to core funding that may enable us to grow back what we have lost.
		R. Williams inquired as to whether we still need to add an instructor for to meet our FON. Dr. Durán replied that we do need to add one faculty member for our FON and that we will go out for an EMT instructor which is a backfill from last semester.
		Dr. Durán added that currently the EMT program is being sustained totally by adjunct faculty. He said that we are trying to place full-timers into successful programs that do not currently have full-time faculty as we cannot run a good program with all part-time faculty.

L. Mojica asked if we would be adding courses for the Spring semester? Dr. Durán replied that we may add a little bit. The core to all of this and our mission is to provide courses so students can complete their programs so he and the EVP are working strategically to ensure core courses are offered.

I   L. Ruvalcaba reminded the Committee that the 3/5 "parking lot" cards are available for members to lodge comments/ideas/discussion topics, etc. She stated that we will bring the "Parking Lot" items back for discussion at the next meeting (02/05/13).

IV. Changing Course: A Planning Tool for Increasing Student Completion in Community Colleges	I	Dr. Durán distributed the document entitled "Changing Course: A Planning Tool for Increasing Student Completion in Community Colleges." Dr. Durán stated that this is for "holiday reading." This provides us a framework on what we should look at for student success. He encouraged the Committee to look at it as it provides a good overview of what we have been trying to do on this campus over the last few years. Topics include a walk through the students life, developing systems for the student from day one through completion, trying to document and make data-based decisions on making improvements by identifying barriers that students encounter, etc. When we get back this will be an excellent framework for us to begin with. The document will also be available on SharePoint under "Student Success Committee."
V. Data Assessment of Value	I	Dr. Durán distributed the "Data Assessment of Value" rubric. He stated that we talked about the need to have a rubric to assist us in evaluating our data as not all data is meaningful. We need to determine which data is meaningful to us. So he asked Dr. Brad Phillips to provide us a framework. He said that today we will select a couple of these data sources and then we will evaluate it using the rubric. We will then add and average the results to see if we can come to a consensus and get feedback on the rubric to determine if it is telling us what we want to know.
		Dr. Durán stated that Cynthia and Bola have offered us the use of the clickers so we will be able to capture how we evaluated the data electronically. Then we will have a systematic way to show what instruments were used and how we got our results.
o Review of the Criteria		Dr. Duran distributed and the Committee briefly reviewed the Criteria for Data Use form. The following items were

briefly discussed: we can agree as a Committee on those criteria that are not applicable; the evaluation documents have been posted on SharePoint; our evaluations will be accessible online; eventually we will be able to use clickers to do our evaluations; it may take us a few meetings to go through them all but when we are through we will have what we need to establish guidelines to develop a campus manual; would be nice to have an open ended spot on the evaluation form; ARCC data is supplied by the State Chancellor's Office, the ARCC data comes from MIS data which comes out of Banner and is submitted every term to the State Chancellor's Office; the ARCC report gives us information on student progress.

The SSC members evaluated the ARCC and CCSSE reports using the Criteria for Data Use form. The scores are as follows:

SURVEY	AVG POINTS
ARCC	23
CCSSE	27

Dr. Durán stated that from these evaluations we need to determine which data sources were are going to use as our evaluation tools to decide which of these would best suit our needs then we will begin to discuss costs, etc. What do we want to use the data for because different surveys will be relevant to specific areas (student, faculty, administration, campus life, community, cost, etc.).

VI. New Business

o AACC's Accepting the College Completion Challenge: A Call to Action

I, D   Dr. Durán stated that he was in Washington DC last week for AACC Commission and that both he and Chancellor Moore are on the Commission. He said that President Obama put out a Call to Action for community colleges to double their number of graduates by 2020. For 2009-2010, OC had 500 Associate degrees on campus so by 2020 we would need 1000 graduates. Community colleges are being called to meet the completion challenge. Dr. Durán said that he would like the Committee's input as to whether or not we want to participate in this challenge – would we recommend to our Chancellor to commit to the challenge and take it

forward for Board support. Dr. Durán read the AACC Call to Action in its entirety to the SSC.

R. Fontes asked if with our budgetary restraints it is feasible to take on the challenge? C. Herrera stated that it is based on percentages not numbers so even if our student population goes down, our percent of graduates can still increase. Dr. Durán also replied that our budgetary restraints do not stop us from moving toward student success.

The Committee members voted by consensus to reply YES to that Oxnard College would like to accept the "AACC's Completion Challenge – Call to Action."

K. Gorback suggested we create posters and post our pledge around campus as we did our mission posters. She also suggested that we utilize the TV monitors around campus to market "success stories" (i.e. college transfer graduates, etc.).

M. Flores said that the ASG attended the assembly and would like to bring back what they learned to other students. They believe they should sign something similar as they want to help with initiatives like these.

D. Newlow asked if we have a form for students to sign pledging, "I will try my best to be honest, to be the best OC student, etc…" Dr. Durán stated that the college in his hometown (Pueblo) has a pledge that they have their students sign. He will get the information and share it with the SSC at the next meeting. Other suggestions included: an official ceremony with an invocation and President's address to the students; and/or have the pledge available at the Student Information Tables at the beginning of each the semester.

K. Gorback suggested having local businesses take a similar pledge to provide internships to our students. L. Mojica stated that CalWORKs students already do something similar and they are continually building relationships with community employers. Unfortunately, it is only being done for CalWORKs and it would be great to do it for our entire student population.

AN **Dr. Durán will take the SSC feedback to the Chancellor. He will also get the information from the Pueblo program and bring it back to the Committee in January.** We can review it over the Spring for a Fall implementation. Then we could have the Board Chair, Chancellor, President, Academic Senate President,

		Classified Senate President and the ASG President sign the official pledge document.
o	I	Dr. Durán distributed a copy of a document entitled "Criteria for Data Use." He briefly discussed the following item(s): last April when the 21st Century Commission came out and look at recommendations they made; Dr. Bumpus (President and CEO of AACC) is taking it to the next step - moving toward having others across the country take specific implementation steps; there are several implementation teams in place (Dr. Durán is on Implementation Team #4); read the tasks assigned to Implementation Team #4, and shared pictures of his team (Team #4); reviewed the Reclaiming the American Dream implementation team charges – the teams are to complete their work by April 2013; the Chair of Achieving the Dream - shared student success pathway exemplary institutions; reviewed "The Developmental Education Initiative" document – critical tools they can use to improve developmental at the college; we are up to 20 principles for redesign; and it gives us a good look at what we should be trying. Dr. Durán stated that what Cynthia is doing with STEM (documenting and evaluating her programs) has been helping us. He said that we are going to begin talking about how to institutionalize these processes. The problem is scalability – how do we scale up to impact the other students that are not getting the same services as our STEM, CalWORKs and EOPS/CARE students.
o	I	C. Herrera briefly discussed the evaluation of the STEM grant activities: She briefly discussed the following item(s): agilegrad, peer mentoring research, engineering pathways, integration of language arts and science; faculty hours and how they integrate with students; evaluation summary; then recommendations to institutionalize; the use of language and writing in science; with "can do" project we look at how we can take language concepts and use them in science; the report incorporated student, faculty, and industry evaluations - saw specific recommendations for these areas; there was a lot of information for year one but we are coming up with good ideas on how we can broaden our services, will force us to think outside the box, etc.; and the effort calls for a lot of collaboration and teamwork. She stated she may share a video presentation at the January SSC meeting. She also stated that everything STEM does is documented online the OC STEM website.

VII.	Remaining 2012-2013 Meetings	o February 5, 2013
		o March 5, 2013
		o April 2, 2013
		o May 7, 2013

VIII.	Adjournment	The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Oxnard College
STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE

ORDER OF THE AGENDA
FOR THE MEETING OF
WEDNESDAY, February 1, 2012
2:00-4:00 P.M. in President's Conference Room

I. Call to Order

II. Review of Meeting Notes

III. Math Cut-Score Validity Update

IV. Perception Survey Update

V. Review of Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) Data

VI. New Business

VII. Adjournment

VIII. Remaining 2011-2012 SSC Meetings
   o March 7, 2012
   o April 4, 2012
   o May 2, 2012

STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES

Present: Richard Durán *(Co-chair)*, Linda Kamaila *(Co-chair)*, Jonas Crawford, Joel Diaz, Karen Engelsen, Maria de la luz Flores, Carlos Gonzalez *(ASG Representative)*, Cynthia Herrera, Lisa Hopper, Bola King-Rushing, David Lopez, Gloria Lopez, Letty Mojica, Marjorie Price, Linda Robinson, Lilia Ruvalcaba, Ana Valle and Diva Ward

Guests: None

Meeting Date: **03/07/12**	Approval of Notes from: **02/01/12**	Recorded By: **Karla Banks**

AN = Action Needed	**AT = Action Taken**	**D = Discussion**	**I = Information Only**

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS

I. Call to Order		The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m.
	I	Dr. Durán welcomed Joel Diaz as a new member to the Committee.
II. Review of Meeting Notes	I	The SSC members reviewed the "Action Items" from the meeting notes of December 7, 2011. The following items were briefly discussed:
		✓ Dr. Durán stated that on June 30, 2012 we will be eliminating agilegrad and starting July 1, 2012 we will be implementing DegreeWorks.
		✓ Dr. Durán said that Oxnard College's ARCC Report would be brought to the SSC for input prior to submittal to the State.
		✓ L. Kamaila suggested we collect data on CalWORKS students in our environmental scan to ensure we are assisting students in getting placed into jobs. A. Valle stated that there is some matriculation data on the OC Institutional Research website.
		✓ Dr. Durán stated that at the last meeting Lisa presented basic data and that the SSC members agreed on the use of VFA measures for analyzing data.
III. Math Cut-Score Validity Update	I, D	L. Hopper stated that she is currently looking at the courses in which students enrolled over a four-year term vs. how they placed on assessment scores. She said it appears that the students who were placed do

better than students who weren't but she still needs to run the data to determine the significance of the difference. She will be working on gathering this data during the course of the semester.

M. Price stated that stated that the Basic Skills Committee has been working on the following: the validation of placement tests – faculty are taking the test to determine the level of complexity, they are looking at the questions and discussing whether the complexity is appropriate in relation to how students are being placed; they have distributed a survey to faculty and basic skills students (received an 80% response rate), survey included questions such as "Do you think you were placed too low, too high or just right?", etc.; they plan to compare the responses of the two groups; also working on finalizing OC's agreement with Oxnard Adult School – OAS will offer services for lower level ESL students and high- level ESL students will take classes at OC, OC will not offer anything lower than two levels below transfer level, OAS faculty came and took our placement test to determine how their students would fare; in addition to reviewing the placement test, the BSC is reviewing the placement process (any roadblocks to the process), the goal is to ensure students are placed properly and that they have an educational plan to follow; the BSC is working on the whole matriculation process – asked students a series of questions (i.e. are you making use of student resources, do you have an educational plan, have you declared a major, are you using the early alert system, etc.); and the BSC is looking at the length of time it takes the students to complete their basic skills courses.

M. Price stated that once all the BSC data is compiled she will share the findings with the SSC members.

L. Kamaila stated that we need to have a cross-campus dialog to ensure students are informed of course prerequisites and how Math and English courses relate to our other curriculum.

G. Lopez expressed concern as to whether the OAS has the funding to take on all of OC's lower level ESL students. M. Price stated that OAS is determined that the need is important enough to fund.

L. Kamaila suggested that the changes to ESL be discussed and documented at the Academic Senate. She stated that many faculty have no idea these

changes are taking place. She said information on OAS needs to be shared (i.e. name, address, etc.).

Dr. Durán suggested we allow the Transitional Studies Committee (BSC) to complete their work first then we will have a more informed discussion and determine what further actions should be taken.

IV. Perception Survey Update	I, D	Dr. Durán stated that initially we planned to do a community survey geared toward obtaining feedback on improving our marketing; since then as part of the accreditation plan we developed, we planned to conduct a new environmental scan for Oxnard College. The environmental scan will include two types of data (quantitative and qualitative) on Oxnard College's strengths and weaknesses. We plan to distribute the survey to community leaders, educators, business leaders, families and students. The data collected will be used in updating the Oxnard College Educational Master Plan. While the current OC EMP is good until 2015, the plan is based on growth and due to recent and pending budget reductions the projections are no longer relevant. He said we need to redefine our priorities in light of our current budgetary situation.
		Dr. Durán stated that the OC Marketing Committee is in the process of drafting they survey – input from the SSC members is welcomed and should be forwarded to Cynthia Herrera (STEM Grant Director).
V. Review of Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) Data	I	L. Hopper distributed and the SSC members briefly reviewed a copy of the data for the <u>VCCCD Overall Earned vs. Attempted Units</u> for >18 and <=18 units attempted.
	I, D	L. Hopper distributed a copy of the OC's VFA Data.

Dr. Durán stated that today we are not only looking at the data but also in the presentation and format of the information. He said that Lisa has all the back-up data, has reviewed it and has come up with these core numbers. He outlined the following steps for the SSC:

1) the SSC goals this semester is to look at the data and formulate a recommendation to the President's Cabinet based on the data

2) May 2012 the SSC will forward their recommendation to the President's Cabinet for review and to transfer into an implementation plan

3) the information will be shared with the campus at "All College Day"

4) Fall 2012 the information will be brought back to the SSC and we will begin work on data for the 2nd Cohort.

L. Hopper stated that we would be reporting on two cohorts – Fall 2005 and Fall 2009. The SSC members reviewed and discussed the following items:

➢ Section I: Student Cohort Tracking – *A. Developmental Education Progress Measures in the Fall 2005 Cohort* – the initial cohort consisted of 1,253 students (693 were assessed in Math, 827 were assessed in Reading and 830 were assessed in Writing) – these were first-time students assessed and then referred to classes; we lose approximately 1/3 of the students who choose not to follow their assessment referral – were the students assessed properly; of the students referred to both reading and writing most students chose to take writing only; some faculty feel that "assessment" is not the only way to evaluate the reading level of students; moving toward requiring students to go into classes they are assessed into; concern that high-level students are assessing and being placed into low-level classes (they get bored and stop showing up); possibly offering a test prep class (test prep packets, test prep classes and how to take tests on a computer); Matriculation asks students to bring a high school transcript and use multiple measures to make a placement recommendation; for the Fall 2005 Cohort we were not yet using COMPASS – the information is based on MDTP and ASSET; and suggest we begin using "Math across the curriculum".

➢ Section I: Student Cohort Tracking – *B. Two-Year Progress Measures Fall 2005 and Fall 2009 Cohorts* – definition of retained vs. successful (*retained* – a student here at the end of the term with a transcript notation of F, D, etc. other than W; *successful* – students who completed with C or better); 2009 Cohort started at higher levels and were more successful; students taking 12+ units at the beginning of the cohort are considered full-time

throughout the cohort; students with goals are doing much better than those without; does data factor in those students who started full-time and switched to part-time (many students drop to part-time due to financial reasons); we need to find ways to encourage students to be goal oriented (i.e. financial aid – students are being forced to come up with a major and some form of educational plan in order to receive financial aid); and Basic Skill Survey identified that the number one service students need is financial aid.

Dr. Durán suggested that the "N" under #B.1 be spelled out. He also suggested attaching a glossary of terms at the end of data document.

➢ Section I: Student Cohort Tracking – *C. Six-Year Outcomes Measures Fall 2005 including Credential Seeking Sub-Cohort* – definition of *credential seeking* is a student who earned 15 units or more over the first two years of coursework (two physical years); and students who got their general education at OC but their degree from another institution are captured on pgs. 2-3 (identifies students who got a degree anywhere in the District).

AN **Lisa will add the data including Non-Credential Seeking students under "*Section I: Student Cohort Tracking – Part B #4*".**

AN **L. Hopper will check on whether the data for "*Section I: Student Cohort Tracking – Part C #8*" reflects students who left OC or students who left VCCCD completely.**

VI. New Business

- IHELP Brief

I   Dr. Durán distributed copies of the Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy (IHELP) Brief to the SSC members for their review and information. The Brief discusses "the importance of helping community college students select and enter a program of study".

- New State and Federal Financial Aid Regulations

I   L. Robison reviewed the new State and Federal regulations for Financial Aid as follows:

✓ *Pell Grants* – beginning July 1, 2012, Pell Grant eligibility is being reduced from nine years to six years (pro-rated) – there will be no grandfathering

- ✓ *ATB* – beginning July 1, 2012, all new students must have a GED or high school diploma to be eligible for Financial Aid

- ✓ *BOG* – beginning July 1, 2012, students must have $1,104 of need to be eligible; also they are looking at requiring students to meet satisfactory academic progress (70% w/ 2.0)

- ✓ *Cal Grant* – Governor Brown is proposing to raise the GPA for Cal Grants eligibility from 2.0 to 2.75

- ✓ *Course Repetition* – current a Financial Aid student cannot be paid more than twice to take a passed class (passing with a "D" or above); if a student is on appeal they will only be funded for those classes that are on their education plan

She stated that OC Financial Aid is in the process of emailing students notifying them of the website they can visit to see how much of their Pell is used and/or remaining. She stated they will add a notification to "see a counselor".

	AN	**L. Robison will prepare a matrix outlining the new State and Federal Financial Aid Regulations.** **Dr. Durán stated that workshops will be held for faculty and students to inform them of the new regulations.**
• Accreditation	I	Dr. Durán announced that the ACCJC was mailing out their accreditation status recommendations today so we may know something as soon as Friday.
• Summer Institute for Teaching Excellence	I	B. King-Rushing announced an opportunity for faculty to attend the upcoming Summer Institute for Teaching Excellence (funded by Title V). He stated that all faculty and counselors are eligible to attend the institute and that participants will receive $1,000 in travel funding. He stated that to-date only three (3) OC faculty have applied for the institute.
• CCCSE	I	L. Hopper stated that we would be completing the CCCSE Survey again. Dr. Durán explained that this is a national survey of student engagement.
VI. Adjournment		The meeting adjourned at 4:18 p.m.

VII. Remaining 2011-2012 Student Success Committee Meetings
- April 4, 2012
- May 2, 2012

Oxnard College
STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE

ORDER OF THE AGENDA
FOR THE MEETING OF
WEDNESDAY, March 7, 2012
2:00-4:00 P.M. in President's Conference Room

I. Call to Order

II. Review of Meeting Notes

III. Financial Aid Update – *Linda Robinson*

IV. Title V Grant Update – *Diva Ward*

V. Math Cut-Score Validity Update

VI. Review of Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) Data

VII. New Business

VIII. Adjournment

IX. Remaining 2011-2012 SSC Meetings
   o April 4, 2012
   o May 2, 2012

Oxnard College
STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE

ORDER OF THE AGENDA
FOR THE MEETING OF
WEDNESDAY, April 4, 2012
2:00-4:00 P.M. in President's Conference Room

   I.   Call to Order

   II.   Report Out from the Transitional Studies Committee

   III. Review of Meeting Notes

   IV.   Math Cut-Score Validity Update

   V.   Update CCSSE Survey/Promising Practices for Student Engagement and Success

   VI.   Review of Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) Data: *Dialog on Solutions*

   VII. Committee Self-Appraisal

   VIII. Moving to Participatory Governance Committee Status

   IX.   Adjournment

   X.   Remaining 2011-2012 SSC Meetings
         o May 2, 2012

3/30/2012

STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Present: Richard Duran *(co-chair)*, Linda Kamaila *(co-chair)*, Bola King-Rushing, Lilia Ruvalcaba, Marji Price, Mark Bates, Diva Ward, Cynthia Herrera, Erika Endrijonas, Letty Mojica, Gloria Lopez, Karen Engelsen, Lisa Hopper

Guest: Maria Elena Cruz, Hadar Bahara

Meeting Date: **05/02/12**	Minutes Approved: **04/04/12**	Recorded By: **Darlene Inda**
AN = Action Needed **AT = Action Taken**	**D = Discussion**	**I = Information Only**

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS

I. Called to Order	I	The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m.
	I	R. Duran said that one of the goals was to validate assessment scores in basic skills. This is supported from the basic skills grant from the state and we are now ready to see the findings from the committee. He added that we need to finish this now for the students coming in the Fall so we have good confidence to see the factors that indicate if the recommendations made are followed, students have a good chance of success.
II. Report out from the Transitional Studies Committee	I	M. Price introduced Mark Bates a math instructor whose background is statistics. He said that he is trying to align basic skills math courses.
	I	M. Bates went over the timeline of the project: - Fall 2010: TS Committee to focus on data. - Jan/Feb 2011: focus research on four areas; matriculation/student services, placement, early alert, and course progression (Math English). - Summer/Fall 2011: created and implemented student and faculty surveys. 1) Matriculation surveys – asked students about what classes they took, 2) Student Placement survey – how they felt they were placed, 3) early alert survey – spoke with 19 different faculty. - January 2012: received results. - February 2012: TS Committee began analysis on what was most important and what action items are needed.

| | I | M. Bates went through Matriculation/Student Services, Placement, Early Alert, and Course Sequence Progression and listed the following action items: |

MATRICULATION/STUDENT SERVICES

1. Discuss what is required before a student registers for first classes, and then <u>support</u> it.
2. Revise and clarify coding in campus databases, and standardize ongoing student surveys.
3. Communicate new rules regarding financial aid and repeatability with all students and faculty.
4. Explore strategies to increase student interaction with faculty during "office hours".

PLACEMENT

1. Continue to have faculty look at cut scores, especially in ESL.
2. Change placement results so students can place out of ESL sequence with sufficient score.
3. Discuss "culture" of students taking the placement test, with the intention of finding strategies to promote better results.

EARLY ALERT

1. Discuss strategies to increase student interaction with the portal.
2. Explore how faculty can increase interaction and communication with students over the portal.
3. Examine attendance policies used by faculty.
4. Discuss the role of intervention in strategies for student success.

COURSE SEQUENCE PROGRESSION

1. Explore different views of "success" between students and faculty (with different disciplines).
2. Examine whether limited course offerings play a role in persistence and success numbers.
3. Compare success and persistence numbers with state averages (and like schools).

III. Review of Meeting notes	I	No meeting notes to review
IV. Math Cut-Score Validity Update	I	R. Duran said that this must be done by May or June. EOPS and CalWorks should have cut scores to work with to make recommendations.
V. Update CCSSE Survey/Promising Practices for Student	I	L. Hopper handed out the Community College Student Report survey which was given to the students. There were some complaints about the time it takes to

Engagement and Success		complete but she's gotten back 9 of 38 that were sent out. She asked students about the kinds of things they're doing in and outside of the classrooms working with other students and their interactions with faculty. It looks at how we score in comparison to other "like" colleges. Once we get results from this year we will have 3 years of data. This is our 3rd and final administration of the survey. It will be interesting to see what's changed from last year. Some of results were interesting to see about where students were engaged. She added that the analysis will come back sometime in the summer and the results from the last administration of the survey are posted on SharePoint under Student Success Committee. Unfortunately, the first survey is not on SharePoint as we did not receive it electronically. R. Duran added that CCSSEE is part of a national institute who analyze it and send back a report on what this tells us about the level of engagement with students and will provide a holistic picture of what's going on with both sides of the house.
VI. Review of Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) Data: Dialog on Solutions	I	L. Hopper handed out the Voluntary Framework for Accountability (VFA) Glossary and Explanation of Benchmarks. She discussed the Student Cohort Tracking (Student progress and outcome measures) and said that we are looking at 2 different cohorts. The fall 2005 cohort looks at outcomes 6 years out and also a lot of basic skills info; the college preparedness section looks at how many students are being tested and what basic skills classes they are being assessed into and whether the students have attempted the basic skills class they are recommended to as well as where they attempted the class above or below what was recommended. E. Endrijonas asked if there is an overlap and L. Hopper responded that there is an overlap because most students come in and take reading, math and writing.
	I,AN	R. Duran discussed the narrative that was provided to understand what the #'s mean and said that we only have one more meeting left and wanted to start the dialogue today. He recommended between now and May 2 having a subgroup of volunteers to begin to look at the data and draft a set of recommendations to get out of to the committee before the next meeting to show what we want to do. He added that in the summer, we will take these recommendations to cabinet and craft what this committee has recommended. R. Duran asked for volunteers for the subgroup and K. Engelsen, L. Kamaila, L. Ruvalcaba, G. Lopez, D. Ward, L. Hopper,

			and M. Price volunteered. He would also like to invite an English instructor to come. R. Duran will Schedule a meeting for the subgroup to get together and requested that they bring their data with them.
VII.	Committee Self-Appraisal		R. Duran said we should be assessing our committee so when we return in May we will see what changes we need to make our committee better or more efficient. He said this also helps addressing the accreditation issues at the DAC. He added that we will get this electronically on Survey Monkey and are waiting for DAC to give it to us. He would like to get this data back by the next meeting in May.
VIII.	Moving to Participatory Governance Committee Status	I,AT	L. Kamaila said if we are going to move forward to become a PGM we need to look at our membership and goals. R. Duran replied that the Senate wants this committee to become a PGM but he just wanted to address it to this committee to see their thoughts. He asked for a formal action to move forward. L. Ruvalcaba made the motion to move the committee to a Shared Governance Committee, K. Engelsen seconded.

L. Kamaila asked E. Endrijonas in relation to LOT can that committee be undone as a Shared Governance committee and have it be a sub-committee of this one? E. Endrijonas responded that she feels that LOT has served its purpose which was started 2 years ago. She thinks that we have woven SLO's into the fabric of the college so she would be fine with it and if it were a sub-committee and the President decides not to be co-chair she would be fine with doing it. Dr. Duran added that it's the role of the Academic Senate President and President to instruct and do the structure of the committees, therefore, he and R. Cabral are looking at other committees. He said they examined CUDS and the Technology Committee and added that we want to make them powerful committees on campus and the other ones are more operational. We need to look at the CORE of what 10+1 is and might end up with only 5 committees. |
| IX. | Adjournment | I | 4:00 p.m. |
| X. | Future Student Success Meetings | I | o   May 2, 2012 |

STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Present: Richard Duran *(co-chair)*, Linda Kamaila *(co-chair)*, Bola King-Rushing, Lilia Ruvalcaba, Marji Price, Mark Bates, Diva Ward, Cynthia Herrera, Erika Endrijonas, Letty Mojica, Gloria Lopez, Karen Engelsen, Lisa Hopper

Guest: Maria Elena Cruz, Hadar Bahara

Meeting Date: **05/02/12**	Minutes Approved: **04/04/12**	Recorded By: **Darlene Inda**
AN = Action Needed **AT = Action Taken**	**D = Discussion**	**I = Information Only**

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS

I. Called to Order	I	The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m.
	I	R. Duran said that one of the goals was to validate assessment scores in basic skills. This is supported from the basic skills grant from the state and we are now ready to see the findings from the committee. He added that we need to finish this now for the students coming in the Fall so we have good confidence to see the factors that indicate if the recommendations made are followed, students have a good chance of success.
II. Report out from the Transitional Studies Committee	I	M. Price introduced Mark Bates a math instructor whose background is statistics. He said that he is trying to align basic skills math courses.
	I	M. Bates went over the timeline of the project: - Fall 2010: TS Committee to focus on data. - Jan/Feb 2011: focus research on four areas; matriculation/student services, placement, early alert, and course progression (Math English). - Summer/Fall 2011: created and implemented student and faculty surveys. 1) Matriculation surveys – asked students about what classes they took, 2) Student Placement survey – how they felt they were placed, 3) early alert survey – spoke with 19 different faculty. - January 2012: received results. - February 2012: TS Committee began analysis on what was most important and what action items are needed.

| | | I | M. Bates went through Matriculation/Student Services, Placement, Early Alert, and Course Sequence Progression and listed the following action items: |

MATRICULATION/STUDENT SERVICES

1. Discuss what is required before a student registers for first classes, and then support it.
2. Revise and clarify coding in campus databases, and standardize ongoing student surveys.
3. Communicate new rules regarding financial aid and repeatability with all students and faculty.
4. Explore strategies to increase student interaction with faculty during "office hours".

PLACEMENT

1. Continue to have faculty look at cut scores, especially in ESL.
2. Change placement results so students can place out of ESL sequence with sufficient score.
3. Discuss "culture" of students taking the placement test, with the intention of finding strategies to promote better results.

EARLY ALERT

1. Discuss strategies to increase student interaction with the portal.
2. Explore how faculty can increase interaction and communication with students over the portal.
3. Examine attendance policies used by faculty.
4. Discuss the role of intervention in strategies for student success.

COURSE SEQUENCE PROGRESSION

1. Explore different views of "success" between students and faculty (with different disciplines).
2. Examine whether limited course offerings play a role in persistence and success numbers.
3. Compare success and persistence numbers with state averages (and like schools).

III.	Review of Meeting notes	I	No meeting notes to review
IV.	Math Cut-Score Validity Update	I	R. Duran said that this must be done by May or June. EOPS and CalWorks should have cut scores to work with to make recommendations.
V.	Update CCSSE Survey/Promising Practices for Student	I	L. Hopper handed out the Community College Student Report survey which was given to the students. There were some complaints about the time it takes to

Engagement and Success		complete but she's gotten back 9 of 38 that were sent out. She asked students about the kinds of things they're doing in and outside of the classrooms working with other students and their interactions with faculty. It looks at how we score in comparison to other "like" colleges. Once we get results from this year we will have 3 years of data. This is our 3rd and final administration of the survey. It will be interesting to see what's changed from last year. Some of results were interesting to see about where students were engaged. She added that the analysis will come back sometime in the summer and the results from the last administration of the survey are posted on SharePoint under Student Success Committee. Unfortunately, the first survey is not on SharePoint as we did not receive it electronically. R. Duran added that CCSSEE is part of a national institute who analyze it and send back a report on what this tells us about the level of engagement with students and will provide a holistic picture of what's going on with both sides of the house.
VI. Review of Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) Data: Dialog on Solutions	I	L. Hopper handed out the Voluntary Framework for Accountability (VFA) Glossary and Explanation of Benchmarks. She discussed the Student Cohort Tracking (Student progress and outcome measures) and said that we are looking at 2 different cohorts. The fall 2005 cohort looks at outcomes 6 years out and also a lot of basic skills info; the college preparedness section looks at how many students are being tested and what basic skills classes they are being assessed into and whether the students have attempted the basic skills class they are recommended to as well as where they attempted the class above or below what was recommended. E. Endrijonas asked if there is an overlap and L. Hopper responded that there is an overlap because most students come in and take reading, math and writing.
	I,AN	R. Duran discussed the narrative that was provided to understand what the #'s mean and said that we only have one more meeting left and wanted to start the dialogue today. He recommended between now and May 2 having a subgroup of volunteers to begin to look at the data and draft a set of recommendations to get out of to the committee before the next meeting to show what we want to do. He added that in the summer, we will take these recommendations to cabinet and craft what this committee has recommended. R. Duran asked for volunteers for the subgroup and K. Engelsen, L. Kamaila, L. Ruvalcaba, G. Lopez, D. Ward, L. Hopper,

			and M. Price volunteered. He would also like to invite an English instructor to come. R. Duran will Schedule a meeting for the subgroup to get together and requested that they bring their data with them.
VII.	Committee Self-Appraisal		R. Duran said we should be assessing our committee so when we return in May we will see what changes we need to make our committee better or more efficient. He said this also helps addressing the accreditation issues at the DAC. He added that we will get this electronically on Survey Monkey and are waiting for DAC to give it to us. He would like to get this data back by the next meeting in May.
VIII.	Moving to Participatory Governance Committee Status	I,AT	L. Kamaila said if we are going to move forward to become a PGM we need to look at our membership and goals. R. Duran replied that the Senate wants this committee to become a PGM but he just wanted to address it to this committee to see their thoughts. He asked for a formal action to move forward. L. Ruvalcaba made the motion to move the committee to a Shared Governance Committee, K. Engelsen seconded.

L. Kamaila asked E. Endrijonas in relation to LOT can that committee be undone as a Shared Governance committee and have it be a sub-committee of this one? E. Endrijonas responded that she feels that LOT has served its purpose which was started 2 years ago. She thinks that we have woven SLO's into the fabric of the college so she would be fine with it and if it were a sub-committee and the President decides not to be co-chair she would be fine with doing it. Dr. Duran added that it's the role of the Academic Senate President and President to instruct and do the structure of the committees, therefore, he and R. Cabral are looking at other committees. He said they examined CUDS and the Technology Committee and added that we want to make them powerful committees on campus and the other ones are more operational. We need to look at the CORE of what 10+1 is and might end up with only 5 committees. |
| IX. | Adjournment | I | 4:00 p.m. |
| X. | Future Student Success Meetings | I | o May 2, 2012 |

Oxnard College
STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE

ORDER OF THE AGENDA
FOR THE MEETING OF
WEDNESDAY, May 2, 2012
2:00-4:00 P.M. in President's Conference Room

I. Call to Order

II. Review of Meeting Notes

III. Student Success Committee Subgroup Recommendations

IV. Update on Status of Becoming a Participatory Governance Committee

V. Committee Self-Appraisal

VI. Adjournment

VII. Remaining 2011-2012 SSC Meetings

5/2/2012