



CPC Meeting
February 18, 2016
2:30 – 4:30 PM
T-1046
Summary Notes

Present: Eloy Oakley, Eva Bagg, Terri Long, Ann-Marie Gabel, Greg Peterson, John Downey, Shauna Hagemann, Kenna Hillman, Christina Moorhead, Jorge Ochoa, Jeri Florence, Colin Williams, John Pope, Jennifer Holmgren

Absent: Karen Kane, Lou Anne Bynum, Rose DelGaudio, Dina Humble, Michelle Shih, Brittany Lieberman, Adrian Novotny, Suzanna Scholz, Thomas Hamilton, Therese Wheeler, Haley Nguyen

Guests: Lauren Sosenko, Janét Hund, Miles Nevin, Hussam Kashou

1. The Summary Notes from December 3rd were accepted with corrections.
2. Student Success Research Brief
 - L. Sosenko gave a presentation on the research brief titled “Student Performance in Basic Skills.” She explained that a majority of our students place into basic skills courses and that their throughput is very low. She discussed how faculty in the math, reading, and English departments are addressing this challenge. Many members posed questions about the brief.
 - i. J. Downey asked if there are differences in basic skills success between students that are coming directly from high school versus those who re-enter the college a year or more after high school. L. Sosenko said that this was not examined in this brief, but could be looked at in the future.
 - ii. G. Peterson said that 26% of students who start in math 130 complete a transfer level course in math. He mentioned that it would be interesting to look at how many times they attempted math 130. L. Sosenko said that the research focused on a three year time-period with a specific cohort of students and that it did not look at how long it took all of the students included to get through the basic skills course sequence.
 - iii. K. Hillman said that it would be interesting to disaggregate the data by student educational goals. She noted that Read 82 is only required for graduation and not for transfer, while English 1 is required for transfer. She said that looking at nuances like student educational goals can make a difference in the data. L. Sosenko said that for this brief, they only looked at the goal of transfer, but noted that there are other completion points that should be examined. E. Oakley said many questions arise when thinking about what course sequences make the most sense to students and noted that the questions that members have brought up are the kinds of questions that LBCC should be asking.
 - iv. In regard to the ALEKs math courses, English compressed courses, and accelerated reading courses that faculty are currently piloting, G. Peterson asked if the success rates are the same for students that are enrolled in these courses for the first time versus students who failed the course and attempted it again. L. Sosenko said that with the ALEKs courses there is evidence that students who successfully completed a course in the sequence also passed the next course in the sequence at a higher rate. E. Bagg said that the data had not been disaggregated in the way that G. Peterson mentioned, but that we could examine this in the future.
 - v. When L. Sosenko mentioned that regardless of where this cohort of students was in their basic skills sequence their success rates in transfer level courses did not change, E. Oakley said that he has seen data from across the country with the same results. He noted that the college should have discussions about what really makes a difference in a student’s ability to reach an educational goal.
 - vi. G. Peterson noted that it would be interesting to disaggregate the data to see if basic skills students are doing well in all transfer level courses or if there are certain transfer level courses that are more challenging for these students. L. Sosenko said that in the study, course difficulty was controlled for, but agreed that the data should still be disaggregated in this way.

- vii. A member asked whether the skills that students are gaining from basic skills courses are aligned with the skills that they need to be successful in transfer level courses. E. Oakley said we assume that students will do better in transfer level courses after passing basic skills courses. He noted that this research brief leads us to think about what course sequences are the best for students. He said that there is a lot of work occurring to assign co-requisites to courses instead of pre-requisites.
- viii. K. Hillman said that curriculum is in the process of developing an implementation plan for pre-requisites and co-requisites across disciplines. She said that based on this data, she wonders if this is the right direction. E. Oakley said that discussions about pre-requisites are difficult, but he believes that the college should have more conversations on whether pre-requisites or co-requisites are best for students. L. Sosenko reminded the committee that the data presented in the brief represents only a small amount of basic skills students. She said that we need to look at data on all students enrolled in basic skills. E. Oakley said that in the future it would be beneficial if we could predict which students need pre-requisites or co-requisites.
- ix. G. Peterson asked where this conversation could continue. E. Bagg said that this data should inform the college's strategic plan. K. Hillman said more conversations should occur with those involved in Promise Pathways. S. Hagemann said that this data should also be shared with the student equity subcommittee. T. Long noted that once the Adult Education Subcommittee begins having meetings, these conversations should occur there as well.

3. Enrollment Challenges

- E. Oakley said that enrollment should be looked at strategically as the college moves forward. He said that community colleges tend to live in cycles and sometimes colleges' reactions to those cycles are not in the best interest of students. He noted that typically, when the college has enrollment declines there is a growth in community college advertisement and marketing. E. Oakley emphasized that while we can market the college strategically, what he does not want the college to do is abandon all current efforts to improve student success and focus only on improving enrollment instead. He noted that if we can improve student success, and students persist and graduate, then there will be a natural increase in enrollment.
- T. Long said that at the Department Head meeting she discussed that the college needs to be strategic in increasing enrollment. She noted that this will also be covered at the first Enrollment Management Committee meeting this semester.
- A. Gabel discussed concerns about the college's low enrollment. She noted that the college will be going into stabilization this year and looking at the 2016-17 budget, the college will not receive any growth funding. The only additional revenue for the 2016-17 year will be COLA. She said that preliminary estimates show the college with an 8.4 million dollar deficit in 2016-17, but it is still very early in the budgeting process. A. Gabel noted that it is imperative that we increase fill rates during the 2016-17 year.
- E. Bagg said that the college has been trying to increase enrollment and highlighted how Institutional Effectiveness worked with the Counseling Department to identify all students with Student Education Plans and encouraged them to enroll in spring 2016. She said that this is a strategic way to increase enrollment since it does not only fill seats, but encourages students to succeed. J. Pope noted that next semester this process needs to occur at an earlier time before the beginning of the semester. He said that if we can send these notifications out earlier students can use them to plan for the semester.

4. Update on Planning Process

- J. Holmgren discussed the results of the fall 2015 planning survey. The survey measured faculty, classified staff, and managements' attitudes toward the annual planning process. She noted that this survey was also conducted in 2012 and that the 2015 survey was used for comparison purposes. Seventy-eight individuals participated in the fall 2015 survey. The percent of management, faculty, and staff that participated in the 2015 survey was comparable to the 2012 survey. Overall, results indicated that faculty, classified staff, and management felt that the department, school, and VP level planning processes offered more opportunity for input, increased opportunity for communication, increased departments' abilities to get resources needed and to make program improvements, and created a more focused approach to prioritizing at the department, school, and VP levels compared to results from the 2012 survey.

- E. Bagg reminded members that the due date for VP plans is March 4th. On March 17th, the CPC will have a joint meeting with the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC). At this meeting the Vice Presidents will give summaries of their VP-level plans. The CPC will develop institutional priorities based on the VP plans and these will go to the BAC to be included in the budget assumptions.
5. Accreditation Follow-Up Report Update
- E. Bagg noted that the Accreditation Follow-Up Report is due March 15th. The draft of the report has been shared with Karen Kane and Terri Long for input and feedback. E. Bagg briefly summarized what is included in the report.
6. Business Process Review Update
- G. Peterson gave an update on the business process review. He noted that in fall 2015 two vendors conducted analyses, which entailed meeting with certain areas of the college for multiple days to map out their processes and systems. He noted that he is still waiting for the final analyses regarding Financial Aid and Academic Services since the vendor identified additional questions that need to be answered by these areas. He said that the analyses will provide feedback on what the college can do to improve its processes in these areas. Once he receives this information he will note what the college can do now without additional resources and what will require resources and will need to be prioritized for the future.
 - G. Peterson said that the business process review is in a transition right now since the previous consultant took a position at Chapman University. He noted that he is conducting interviews this week for a new consultant to replace the previous one.
7. Design Thinking Discovery Phase Update
- G. Peterson gave an update on Design Thinking. He noted that throughout the month of January additional focus groups and interviews were conducted. This week the investigation group is meeting again to analyze the findings.
 - i. S. Hagemann asked how the findings will be communicated. G. Peterson said that they will be communicated in a report through email.
 - ii. E. Bagg added to the update and mentioned that interviews and debriefs occurred every Friday throughout January and that the discovery phase group has learned a lot about various aspects of the college. E. Bagg noted that during the analysis of the findings this week, they will focus on how to integrate the design thinking work with student preparedness for financial aspects of college.
8. Strategic Plan Update
- E. Bagg announced that the follow-up retreat to the December planning retreat will be held on February 26th from 4:00 – 8:00 pm in the E Building Faculty/Staff Lounge and Saga Room. This second retreat will build off the work of the first one and will include the same people who attended the December retreat with the addition of the administrative assistants who participated in a similar set of activities in January.
 - E. Bagg also noted that she will be reporting back with a draft of the Strategic Plan to CPC later this semester.
9. Update: Flex Day Spring 2016 - Student Equity
- J. Florence gave an update on the spring 2016 Flex Day which will be held on April 15th. She noted that this Flex Day will be focused on student equity. Unlike previous flex days, J. Florence said that she will be running this one like a conference with an opening session speaker, lunch and speaker, and an end of the day speaker. She also noted that flex credit will not be promoted for department meetings that day to encourage a college-wide commitment to Flex Day. The invite for Flex Day will be sent out on Monday. J. Pope said that the invite will also be included in In the Loop each week leading up to Flex Day.

Next meeting (Joint Meeting with BAC): March 17, 2016
