

She began with a brief observation about AB 705:

When colleges pursue co-requisite and support models, it will be helpful to keep in mind that “one size does not fit all” for the students who are coming to us. Because students come with differences, we should have different models built-in to our approach.

As way of introduction to the San Jacinto College experience, she offered two observations:

They have reduced total credit hours in student life cycle from 96 to 85 units.

They have focused on achievement improvements without focusing on numerical targets. Instead, they have focused on continuous improvement without pre-determined targets.

How do you create a common vision in a multi-college district or a multi-campus college?

Everyone has to understand the strategic goals and annual priorities; and for the individual, how does my work relate to specific priorities (KPI).

She noted there are four components to redesign a San Jacinto College.

1. **Data:** dig deep, go to granular level
2. Define **Leadership** at each level, hold leaders accountable
3. **Organizational structure** needs to meet needs of students, not employees
4. Practice the art of **consistency with flexibility**

Data:

She explained that digging deeper means asking questions such as the following:

Disaggregate, e.g.,

- How well are Hispanic veteran students, ages 25 through 30, doing?

Look at who is not succeeding, e.g.,

- What are the characteristics of students who do not succeed in English comp?
- At one point in lab science courses do students begin to withdraw/disappear?

The answer was after the first test. This led instructors to contact students who did not do well after the first test and ask questions, such as how did you feel after the test? The effect of that inquiry was that of there were less students who dropped out from those who performed badly on first test; indeed, many more of them did very well that had previously been the case.

Faculty R&D teams: These teams examine proposed solutions and present proposals for feedback from other faculty in department and get more great ideas. But, if data shows the new idea is not panning out, then stop and try something else.

All leaders need development, from chancellor and president down to department chairs

Expectations for each leader

Leadership competencies need to be identified

- e.g., the ability to lead people through change

Need to develop leadership training based on the needs of our institution

Leadership based on shared values; basis for evaluation for all, including faculty

- We are here to help students succeed; **not** to help them fail, i.e., **not** to weed them out
- You have to learn how to teach the students you have, not the ones you wish you had

Leaders need continued development and reinforcement

Leaders must understand how to lead collaboratively and lead through change

Organizational structure

Need to determine when you need transactional versus relational functions and employees

This will help answer the question—where is leadership development most needed?

- Department chairs, were given more training and allowed to teach less classes, so that they can spend time leading, i.e., speaking with colleagues and having courageous conversations with faculty who need help so they may institute changes that could boost student success

No area is off limits

Art of Consistency and Flexibility

Best practices need to be institutional practices

- Don't keep doing what you know doesn't work.

Change must be intentional throughout the institution and accountability needs to be individual.

- **Communication plans** must be designed and timed; scripting messages so that everybody is saying the same thing

“Pockets” of excellence do not serve your students equitably. Every institutional touch point should be a touch of excellence.

Every course needs to be excellent. That's why leadership training is needed so that leaders can have those courageous conversations.

The focus on faculty advising was a challenge.

Scripted conversations b/w faculty advisors and students were developed which was an effective practice. However, the reach of faculty advising was limited for them because Texas does not allow college prep courses. The problem they are facing is how to scale up the faculty advising.

Depend on your Data

Disaggregate, disaggregate, and then disaggregate some more

- Meet with people at the department level, show them their data, and ask them are you satisfied?
- Dept chair meets with each instructor to go over trend data, over several semester, —the conversation should not be “bad dog” but how do we help, e.g., professional development

Don't let design be encumbered by mechanics and budget, figure out those things later.

- “Blue Sky” it

Create teams of faculty who will champion these initiatives

SJC experience: Bring the most resistant faculty to a training “institute” on campus and through it they may realize that this is about students. At SJC, they did this and those faculty members found it transformational for themselves and later, by implementing what they learned, for their students.

Rewards?

Steady increase in student success. At SJC, from 4,000+ to 7,000+ completions over 5 years.