Student Success Committee Meeting  
East Los Angeles College  
Approved Minutes  
1:30-3:00  
Wednesday, September 3rd, 2008

Present: Alex Immerblum, Adrian Banuelos, Gayle Brosseau, Janis Cavanaugh, Evelyn Escatiola, Ran Gust, Gisela Herrera, Veronica Jaramillo, Rin Kahla, Joseph Kazimir, Renee Martinez, Barbara Moore, Suzette Morales-Guerra, Richard Moyer, Adrienne A. Mullen, Daniel Ornelas, Leonor Perez, (virtual), Al Rios, Choonhee Rhim, Lydia Rudametkin, John Toutonghi, Dennis Villacorte, Linda Whitney, Mary E. Yepes.

Guests: Ryan Cornner, Jeff Hernandez, Helen Sarantopoulos, Angelica Toledo

Call to Order: Meeting began at approximately 1:36pm.

A. Approve agenda: No changes were made to the agenda.

B. Approve June 25th draft minutes: (M/S by R. Gust, O. Valeriano). Passed unanimously.

C. Review July 9th draft minutes: Corrections: L. Whitney, not L. Rudametkin, was the member who made the e-portfolio statement on page 2. The minutes need no formal approval because it was not an official meeting (lack of a quorum).

D. Review August 6th draft minutes: Postponed.

E. Public Speaker/Announcements: A. Immerblum asked the committee to introduce themselves to the new members and announced that L. Perez had sent him conference workshop information from the Center for Urban Education which would be emailed to everyone.

R. Moyer announced the Escalante Program was recognized with an Honorable Mention and would be acknowledged in Houston later in the month.

F. Opening Day: Feedback

S. Allerson indicated she liked Nancy Ibarra’s presentation, though there was negative feedback from the larger group. Responses on the breakout sessions were positive. J. Hernandez stated he had gotten feedback from instructors on the presentation profile on Basic Skills students and wondered if there was more detailed information. R. Cornner responded there was much more accurate and detailed information available. R. Moyer thought the CAHSEE data (California High School Exit Examination. Students) had not been presented very clearly. R. Cornner responded that A. Mullen would know the number of students in that program. R. Martinez informed the Committee that ELAC’s CAHSEE program, which helps students pass the exam and gain a diploma, is being run by Jessica Cristo.
L. Rudametkin thought the majority of faculty had no idea what reading level LS 16 and reading 20 were and she would have liked R. Cornner to more clearly define what we are looking at in terms of the range of students within each of those levels and letting faculty know how it affects everyone on campus. J. Hernandez observed people relating and paying more attention to R. Cornner’s presentation, the writing and math samples and the Poppy Copy. He noted a need to be focused on where our students were and noticed the workshop on posting syllabi on the Web was well attended. M. Yepes stated she attended the “Basic Skills Students” workshop that focused on ways to get students to be more responsible, and noted a lot of interaction during the breakout. She thought one of the studies needed was a survey of best practices on campus.

R. Gust felt the day went well, but had thought there would be additional workshops and professional development that would occur to follow up. S. Allerson wanted to know if there was a list of attendees available so they can contact faculty who attended. E. Escatiola responded they were accumulating a list from the sign out sheets. E. Escatiola thought perhaps, because the fall opening day has been increasing in attendance, ELAC should consider adding a winter flex day to continue the healthy dialogue. L. Rudametkin liked that the “Reading across the Curriculum” workshop where faculty had two examples to read, one of which was chemistry. She thought the idea that the faculty was participating and there was discussion as a group was a great idea. A. Immerblum asked that further comments or ideas be emailed to Evelyn.

L. Perez discussed the Alliance Network Benchmarking project and noted Estela Bensimon had established a process to help facilitate college’s compliance with the state framework while allowing them to use the data to define problems and develop measures in a systematic way and acknowledged that the September 26th Benchmark Equity seminar was the one the committee members were being asked to participate in. A. Immerblum stated there were three dates announced and he would distribute that information. L. Perez mentioned the seminar was available with cost to fifty people on a first come, first served basis. A. Immerblum stated he would circulate Leonor’s email and attachment and anyone interested in participating should alert her, him, or R. Cornner. L. Perez added that even if only one person could go, it would be beneficial to get a sense of the initiative and to begin future discussions.

Action/Discussion Items:

1. Revised Faculty Co-Chair responsibilities:
A. Immerblum submitted a draft of the updated version of the duties and responsibilities with some of the responsibilities deleted. He asked that the Committee members review the draft for future discussion.

2. Basic Skills Coordinator/Administrator- A. Immerblum stated the plan was to get the Committee’s feedback on the proposed administrative position and take those responses to the Academic Senate and Shared Governance Council. He thought there might be a need to blend some of the responsibilities between the two samples attached to the agenda. S. Morales requested the word “them” under the third bullet be removed. C. Rhim asked what the difference was between a faculty coordinator and faculty co-chair. A. Immerblum explained that coordinating the Basic Skills Initiative effort was a big task, beyond the scope of
the co-chair who is responsible for managing the Student Success Committee. The position should not be seen as a side job. J. Hernandez compared the two positions and thought the phrasing of the Student Success Coordinator position was broader and more involved as compared to the faculty co-chair position. He thought the Associate Dean position language as it related to implementation was different, so the idea of melding the language of the two sample positions made sense. He suggested reviewing both announcements and deciding which responsibilities should be left to a coordinating position. A. Immerblum thought the larger discussion was to acknowledge the need to have such a position on campus. He explained the funding differences between coordinator and associate dean. R. Martinez stated funding source would need to be verified but the cost for either position would be the same.

R. Moyer explained the difference between a dean and ISA (Instructor Special Assignment) and expressed a preference to see an administrator do the job. A. Immerblum thought the Senate might not agree with that. R. Moyer thought it was more difficult to monitor progress and accountability when overseeing a faculty coordinator rather than an administrator. R. Gust asked if it was one or two positions. A. Immerblum stated it was initially one, but could develop into two. R. Martinez stated her understanding was the request was made to Mr. Moreno for an Acting Associate Dean. A. Immerblum stated Mr. Moreno actually initiated the request. J. Hernandez thought having a point person with sensitivity to our concerns was necessary, but did not discount the use of an administrator. He felt what was being sought was someone who has certain organizational skills which were not necessarily inherent in a faculty member. He thought the pool of applicants who have that experience would be larger if hiring for an administrative position rather than a faculty one. R. Martinez felt it needed to be advertised broadly. A. Immerblum raised the issue of whether making it a dean position would encourage more faculty to apply. R. Moyer stated one of the difficulties of getting people to cross over to administration is that a lot of faculty are nowhere near those salaries and are fairly new in their community college careers. R. Martinez stated if we only want the administrator to focus on Basic Skills then she thought an associate dean position would be appropriate because a dean would get additional assignments. J. Toutonghi asked if the acting associate dean was a one year position. A. Immerblum verified that the position would be announced for one year and did not have to be renewed. J. Toutonghi asked if our plan was several years out and a person is coming in only for one year, how would it work? A. Immerblum stated the idea of the announcement was to test and re-evaluate the person and the position at the end of the year. R. Moyer and R. Martinez noted the clock doesn’t run out in terms of inadvertent tenure as long as there’s money available in SFP (Specially Funded Programs). R. Gust inquired what type of power an associate dean would have over a faculty member. R. Martinez responded it was not power per se, but access and ability to work through the system. E. Escatiola added it would also help to institutionalize the program. A. Immerblum asked for an official motion to formalize support for the hiring of an acting associate dean’s position for student assessment of Basic Skills. (M/S by R. Moyer/R. Gust). All were in favor of the motion; none opposed.

Technology Master Plan Task Force Report/Request for input: (Wendy) R. Gust reported the survey was conducted with only 70 responses received and they were waiting for more. J. Hernandez stated he thought Wendy mentioned going to different committees and departments to obtain input. He thought the item should be postponed to another meeting because it was a very good session. R. Martinez stated there were also classified surveys,
different from the faculty ones, and noted how the focus on use of technology varies from office to office. A member responded that as a faculty she was not only teaching, but in charge of other programs and there were two different perspectives on that. A. Immerblum stated the committee would meet again in a month and to talk about this. R. Gust suggested meeting again in two weeks, or with possible assistance from R. Vanterpool, K. Misa and himself, taking the input and forwarding it to Wendy then meeting again in September.

G. Budget (Adrienne Ann)

1. Review existing Basic Skills Initiative budgets:
   A. Mullen reported ASU picked up (55) fifty-five books to start the semester and their purchase order is in place.

2. Review/approve time-sensitive funding requests:
   A. Immerblum reported there was a tentative plan from the Budget Committee to fund unfunded or underfunded programs or projects, but nothing was official yet.

3. Year-long faculty orientation for probationary hires:
   A. Immerblum directed the members to the quick outline of the plan. E. Escatiola reported they were discussing helping probationary faculty develop more of a student success approach. She described Mt. Sac's program and hoped to expand the orientation for incorporating limited and long term subs. M. Yepes thought in order for orientations to succeed others could be invited, but the long term part of the plan needed to be the focus. A. Immerblum described a general fall and spring semester program plan. E. Escatiola stated Alex and Linda wanted to incorporate Susan Johnston’s teaching workshops, which would come under Professional Development money already put into the account and could cost up to $50,000. (M/S M. Yepes, S. Allerson) to approve $40-50,000 for the orientation. B. Moore inquired if an increase in the budget could be allowed if the costs grew. A. Immerblum responded the expenditure could always be revisited. A. Mullen wanted to see the budget broken down more and thought a price tag needed to be attached so that it was supported throughout the process and didn't get dropped. E. Escatiola agreed it should be approved conceptually as she and Linda worked on the budget. R. Martinez suggested going back to the budget already listed and labeled under Professional Development and if a budget change was needed to do that, but essentially focus on the next year that needs to be funded in order to avoid losing any money. It could be revisited and the Committee updated with that information, as long as the concept is approved. A. Immerblum restated the motion that the SSC supports the new faculty orientation for a projected cost of $40-50,000 but the budget will be broken down and continue to be reviewed, and if more funding is needed the issue can be revisited. It passed unanimously.

H. BSI Planning:
1. Progress report from the four ad hoc committees-
   A. Immerblum reminded everyone that the annual matrices for the state needed to be submitted along with a five year plan and are due on October 15th. He reminded the Committee they had broken into four different groups where each of the chairs of the groups were supposed to get started developing this year's plan, but that process had not occurred. To proceed he suggested the four chairs get together and talk about how to plan this report,
with the chairs meeting with their groups to further plan and develop draft matrices for the Committee to review.

2. Meeting the October 15th, deadline:
   **A. Immerblum** stated the chairs could meet immediately and work with groups within the next two weeks. **M. Yepes** suggested meeting on September 17th for both the technology plan input and devising the draft. **A. Immerblum** stated the two focuses of the meeting would be for the group to get together to develop the matrices action plan and to look at technology. **R. Cornner** reminded the chairs that Research had volunteered to participate on all four groups in the focus areas. **A. Immerblum verified they would meet on September 17th from 1:30-3pm at a venue to be determined.**

   He asked the four chairpersons to stay behind to decide how to prepare for the meeting on the 17th.

   **K. Calendaring Future meetings:** **A. Immerblum** pointed out the next Student Success meeting in October was scheduled during the week of the statewide conference and the district was having their planning meeting that week. He scheduled November 5th, December 3rd, January 7th as future meeting dates and asked everyone to mark their calendars for the first Wednesdays of month, stating he would get back to the committee about the October date.

   **L. Items from the floor:** **R. Gust** reminded all faculty to go to Survey Monkey for the IT survey. **R. Cornner** instructed us that if we are going on as an administrator we should just type “other” in the area section. Danny Telles would be sending out a message today. **C. Rhim** suggested rather than emailing we send the link.

Next scheduled meeting, Wednesday, October 8th, 1:30-3:00pm

Meeting adjourned 3:10p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rahmani Vanterpool
Administrative Secretary, Student Services

And

Alex Immerblum, Student Success Faculty Co-Chair