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

Present: Sara Alkire, Sharon Allerson, Janis Cavanaugh, Karen Daar, Rebecca Estrada, Danelle Fallert, Gisela Herrera, Alex Immerblum, Rin Kahla, Joseph Kazimir, Renee Martinez, Barbara Moore, Adrienne A. Mullen, Daniel Ornelas, Choonhee Rhim, Armando Rivera-Figueroa, Lydia Rudametkin, Timothy Snead, John Toutonghi, Dennis Villacorte, Linda Whitney.

Guests/Alternates: Ryan Cornner, Jeff Hernandez, Kim Misa, Helen Sarantopoulos.

Call to Order: Meeting began at approximately 1:39pm.

A. Approve agenda: (M/S by S. Allerson and R. Estrada) to approve the agenda with no additions or changes. All were in favor.

B. Approve October 8th draft minutes: K. Daar clarified quotes attributed to her under section a. (Organizational/Administrative Practices) “K. Daar pointed out that the college revised its mission statement, but did not yet revise its values and visions statement.” On the second page at the top, “K. Daar stated that since the SLO committee had a mission statement describing its focus, it was suggested that the Student Success Committee also have a mission statement describing its focus.”

K. Daar questioned J. Hernandez’s quote regarding sources. It was requested the quote be removed. The quote attributed to A. Immerblum regarding sharing information was removed. G. Herrera requested her quote on page 5 regarding computer training be removed, as it had already been worked on. Spelling corrections for J. Kenny and R. Cornner’s names were noted. On page six the acronym IGETSE needed to be corrected to IGETC. (M/S by L. Whitney and S. Allerson) to accept the minutes with corrections. All were in favor.

C. Approve November 5th draft minutes: R. Martinez requested the line under section b. (Approving the Associate Dean of Student Success Announcement) on page two be rephrased to state “it should be noted on the job announcement that the position is a Specially Funded Program (SFP).” (M/S by B. Moore and K. Daar) to accept the minutes. All were in favor of accepting the minutes with the change.

D. Public Speaker/Announcements/Future Conferences/Articles: None.

E. Scheduling future meetings and dates: Objections were raised regarding the schedule of the next regular meeting on January 7th, 2009, which coincides with the
beginning of winter intersession. This prompted discussion which resulted in moving the next meeting to January, 14th, 2009 at 1:45pm. Subsequent meetings for spring were tentatively scheduled for February 11th, March 4th, April 1st, May 6th and June 3rd from 1:30pm to 3:00pm.

F. Action/Discussion Items:
   a. Approve the official Interim Associate Dean of Student Success Announcement

The announcement was passed around for review. The current rate of pay was discussed and it was determined the salary should verified as it has increased. S. Allerson suggested crossing out the words “when and” from the last line of the first paragraph. It was suggested the last word on the first page, “non credit” should be one word. L. Rudametkin questioned the words “reasonably related” with regards to the Master’s Degree requirement. K. Daar explained this was boilerplate qualification language. A. Immerblum stated his concern that he had forwarded some suggestions to Dr. Moyer, but couldn’t recall if they had been incorporated and noted he would have to verify this. J. Toutonghi suggested omitting under Salary and Benefits either the word “yearly” or “annually”. L. Rudametkin suggested the correct spelling of “PhD” should be “Ph.D.” R. Martinez stated her staff would correct the errors. S. Allerson wondered whether to use the word “assess” or “evaluate” for line 14. R. Cornner stated he would choose “evaluate”. A. Immerblum requested a formal motion to accept the announcement with corrections. (M/S by S. Allerson and G. Herrera) All were in favor.

J. Toutonghi inquired about the date the applications would be due. K. Daar stated generally the district fixes this. The minimum requirements for posting were discussed. J. Hernandez led a discussion on posting. R. Martinez stated she’d sent in the staffing request and that she could be emailed for status. A. Immerblum suggested leaving the January23rd deadline date to file as is, noting the date could always be changed if there wasn’t a sufficient number of a qualified applicant. G. Herrera suggested putting a comma after the last “and” on line 13 of the announcement. A. Immerblum requested email notification of any further changes.

   b. Review/Begin Implementation plans

The implementation plans were distributed. A. Immerblum explained what had occurred at the last meeting and encouraged members to call or email him if they needed clarification. He felt the goal was to take the action plans and develop a strategy for implementing them, which included the timeline, possible budgets, and the people who were going to lead the actions. He asked that the committee look at Section A and comment on what he’d done as to content and the way it was set up to see if it would work for sections B, C and D. He stated that on the very last page E. Escatiola had turned in a
priority list of items, which was helpful, but they still needed to identify timelines and budgets.

**A. Immerblum** sought clarification as to whether the groups needed to spend more time going over each detailed action with the A section team getting together when it could to discuss what he’d presented in terms of a plan. **R. Martinez** was concerned about whether the teams needed more time to finish. **L. Whitney** thought the teams could use some help from the A section team. **R. Martinez** thought if the groups didn’t meet or have some time to meet on their own; the work might not be done when the committee returned which would impact the budgetary expenditures and the submission deadline. She felt very strongly that the other actions should be done on the time line.

**A. Immerblum** discussed what course of action to take with the group since there were very few items left in the report. **L. Rudametkin** stated group C had a discussion about setting priorities and the problem in terms of the budget was they didn’t know what to assess where she thought doing the timeline was the most difficult set of priorities and the issue for them was budgetary. **A. Immerblum** inquired how to address this since they didn’t quite know how the budget matched up with what had already been done. He thought if the groups could just do the prioritization, timelines and note the people responsible, his group could help them line up the budget. **A. Mullen** stated they’d already put the budget in; all they’d have to do is get the column to drop down for that item. She stated if the groups did the other parts; she and the ad hoc budget committee members could just drop line up the budgetary items because a dollar amount has already identified. **J. Hernandez** thought that on section C there might be difficulty coming up with the timeline without participation from **E. Escatiola**. **A. Immerblum** thought the groups could manage to do this knowing the committee chairs were aware of the budgets. He noted a need to talk to **E. Escatiola** to make sure she supported the groups with the budgetary figures.

c. **Update budget and funding issues related to the BSI.**

**A. Immerblum** stated his concern regarding the deadline to spend one of the BSI budgets by June 30th. He thought it was even more important to get the implementation plans completed because of this deadline.

**Highlight changes to the Ed Plan, Goal 2: Student Success.** **A. Immerblum** stated they were replacing the current place-holding language of the Ed Plan, Goal 2, Student Success, with the four goals of the action plans. The specific action plans, not the goals, will be added as an appendix in the Ed Plan. **K. Daar** shared the revised Ed Plan at Shared Governance Council last Monday. It will put before a vote to adopt at the next SGC meeting.
d. Begin a discussion about course syllabus: establishing a standard for our college.

A. Immerblum circulated an article called “An Examination of the Integrity of the Syllabus” for use as a point of discussion. He stated G. Brosseau distributed an article to the new faculty at the New Faculty Institute. He thought in addition to the Academic Senate, the Student Success Committee should examine and begin addressing the issue of the syllabus to discuss the ideas around defining aspects of an effective syllabus. He asked the committee to read the article and identify at least three or more topics or areas of interest that caught their attention for future discussion and points to address. R. Martinez noted that Ms. Brosseau had provided sample syllabi from different departments and this was just to supplement them and she thought that should be included. L. Whitney stated COAT had provided a syllabus and she used the article for follow up to new and other faculty for comparison to their own syllabi. They would be following up in spring and were going open it up to interested staff and have the same kind of discussion on how to develop a student centered syllabus using the Basic Skills funding for courses to broaden it out. A. Immerblum stated his plan was to eventually have the SSC forward recommendations to the senate about the syllabus so that they could empower our faculty and what is expected of them and what the committee supports.

J. Toutonghi questioned whether these would be recommendations or requirements because the language concerned him. A. Immerblum suggested he could possibly reword it, but recommended reading the article first and identifying areas of interest for further discussion at this point. J. Toutonghi requested clarification of the goals in terms of the faculty as a whole and whether these recommendations were mandatory or more of an option. J. Hernandez agreed there were some ramifications as to where the discussion would go at some point if the SSC concluded there were certain principles that were to be found in syllabi that should be universalized throughout the campus and that should go into recommendations to the senate for that type of discussion. He suggested the article be read with a critical mind. A. Immerblum stated his goal at this point was simply to launch into a deeper discussion for January. L. Whitney noted that before Jan 3rd Title Five on ELAC page now has a website and she was planning on displaying models of syllabi from other campuses and ELAC including the one from Gayle. R. Martinez stated she would rather they use the words “best practices” or “effective models”. L. Whitney agreed they would be those syllabi that meet the guidelines.

G. Professional Development updates- R. Martinez stated she was sitting on the district’s Full Time Professional Development task force and they were collecting copies of the schedules that address our progress toward student success. She noted
other colleges were sharing their faculty handbook, which we also have; however, our handbook needs updating, after which she would start sharing information with Evelyn. She added there is supposed to be some District Professional Development that will be available to everyone.

**Financial Aid Report- R. Martinez** announced that Cal State had sent out a notification to students that they were going back to the semester system beginning in 2012. A Rivera-Figueroa stated they were including scholarship information on the campus’s Financial Aid site.

**H. Items from the Floor.** For the remainder of the meeting **A. Immerblum** suggested the members break up into groups for implementation. He stated he and A. Mullen needed the plans by Dec. 17th. He stated he would contact any chairs who were absent from the meeting.

Next scheduled meeting, Wednesday, January 14th, 1:45-3:00pm

Meeting adjourned 3:39p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rahmani Vanterpool
Administrative Secretary, Student Services

And

Alex Immerblum, Student Success Faculty Co-Chair