

Rio Hondo College

Title V Implementation Group Meeting

Minutes

May 2, 2013 Room LR 101
2:30-3:30 p.m.

Present: Barbara Salazar, Hector Molina, Katie O'Brien, Michelle Bean, P.Marcell Gilmore, Robert Graham, Sergio Guzman, Song Le Graham

Project Director's Report – Barbara recommended that the language for the Objectives and Performance Indicators for the remaining years of the grant remain as is (with the exception of revisions of language for objectives & performance indicators as previously approved by the Program Officer). The rationale is that although some of the language has been problematic or perplexing, it is the purview of this group to establish its own interpretations and parameters for measuring the objectives and performance indicators as long as they are reasonable, congruent with the overarching goals of the grant, and consistently applied and compiled.

Grant Objectives & Performance Indicators – Group's Working Interpretations & Parameters

3.1 No concerns

3.2 (Jim) For the Performance Indicator, it was proposed that "complete required courses" will be defined as *complete placement-level course and next level course in Reading, English, and Math as required for graduation and/or transfer.*

3.3 No concerns--more BSI funds were allocated to Gateway tutoring

3.4 (Song) For the Objective, "completed their academic goal" could be defined as *being CSU transfer-ready (having 60 transferable units in 100+ level courses and 2.0 GPA), or having earned an A.A. or A.S. degree, or having earned a certificate.* (Also recommended that Sergio increase counseling support for FYE students, e.g., to develop Ed. Plan.

3.5 (Song) For the Performance Indicator, it was suggested that although CSU-impaction might likely continue, the increase in AS-T and AT-T degrees (more so than articulation of courses) eventually will/should lead to an increased number of CSU transfers (by 15)

3.6 (Katie) For the objective, it was proposed that "student services workshops" could include any non-instructional staff workshops (e.g., Unconscious Bias training, Mental Health workshop, Strengths Quest, etc.). For the performance indicator, it was proposed that information regarding "faculty...describing behavior about how they use new technology, teaching and learning assessments" could be culled from completed workshop evaluations/surveys (2011-current). Regarding the measure of the number of faculty who "have been involved in one or more student success programs," it was proposed that this could be determined by comparing the list of workshop attendees and the list of student success program participants.

3.7 No concerns

3.8 No concerns

3.9 For the Objective, it was proposed that “first-year students” will be defined as the broader population of students (unduplicated number) who are enrolled in basic skills as well as non-transferable courses. For the Performance Indicator, it was proposed that “student who utilize the Learning Assistance Center” refer to the currently enrolled students but only the “persistence/retention” rate can be measured for this group in the next year; also it was proposed that “success” rates be an added measure for this group. On the other hand, it was proposed that “graduation and transfer rates” might be measured only for the first cohort (2010-11) of students, but this would depend on students self-reporting such information, which is highly unlikely.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes Prepared by Barbara Salazar