***Education Committee Meeting***

**March 10, 2016**

**Berkeley City College – Fourth Floor**

Attendees: Antonio Barreiro, Joseph Bielanski, May Chen, Heather Dodge, Bob Frost,

Allene Hegler, Jenny Lowood, Cleavon Smith, Hermia Yam.

May (with PowerPoint slides): The state is asking us (and all community colleges) for a report by June on “goal indicators” focusing on four things: accreditation, fiscal viability, student performance, and compliance with state and federal guidelines.

 I want to focus today on student performance (achievement) indicators because we need work there.

 The state is asking for four sets of data for student performance: 1. Six-year completion rate (new students). 2. Basic skill students in math, English, ESL. 3. Six-year CTE completion rate. 4. Successful course completion rate.

 (Discussion of the benchmark numbers in the PowerPoint presentation—these incorporate five cohorts from preceding years.)

(Discussion.)

May: I want to propose three different models for our consideration—i.e., three different pathways to improving student performance; we will pick one of these:

 One model is called Progress (explanation of).

 Second is called Equity (explanation of).

 Third is called Aspiration (explanation of).

 Let’s examine how these three models could be applied to Course Success Rate. Over last five years our Course Success Rate has been a little flat, hovering at 63 percent. Let’s use 63 percent as benchmark. If we use the Progress model, in six years we would try to grow from 63 percent to 65 percent. If we use Equity model in six years we may go from 63 percent to 73 percent. If we use Aspiration model, we may grow from 63 percent to 79 percent in six years.

 (Further examination of data. Possible growth rates using the three models in different areas.)

 After looking at these numbers I felt we might want to consider the Progress model and the Equity model.

Question: When we arrive at 2022, from what point will students have been tracked?

May: From right now.

Question: Even though benchmark was tracking a more extended period?

May: Yes.

Comment: We don’t want to rely on six-year spans; we want to assess effectiveness of measures pretty close to when we’re doing them.

(Discussion.)

May: Reiterates the three models and their parameters.

 Student performance gap—wideness of.

 We will go to other committees with this presentation. Hopefully we can get a general consensus. We will make a recommendation to Roundtable.

 This process is required by state.

 We will publish data online.

Antonio: I would advocate for Equity or Aspiration. If we have integrity in Education Master Plan, and are leading with the expectation that we are here to eliminate the education gap, I don’t see how we can advocate for any other program. I would hope as institution we can get behind what we say in the master plan.

Heather: I agree with Antonio. Either Equity or Aspirational keep us true and lives up to our mission. And some of the guidelines are in place already for accomplishing the smaller steps.

Jenny: I think if we do either one of those, we should do Equity; I’m a little bit worried that Aspiration might be unrealistic. (Elaboration.)

(Discussion: Equity is aspirational. Etc.)

Cleavon: Which one will most radically change the culture? I have to reflect more to answer that. Who will rally? What conversations will we have on campus? Who’s at the table? How will each respective model drive our allocation? Just since we’ve had Basic Skills Initiative (BSI) we have kind of regulated and marginalized those kinds of discussions to our detriment; it’s always math, English, DSL carrying the burden in counseling and Student Services, that’s where the conversation is held. Maybe we can’t get to Aspiration goals in six years but I know we won’t unless full-court press—a total curricular reassessment and culture change vs. “Hey we can do something here and here and get our numbers”—I’m tired of that approach.

Antonio: Aspiration requires every member of community to be working on this.

 Equity goal feels to me like we’re hedging. I don’t have a good answer for someone who says, “You say in your Education Master Plan your goal is to eliminate the education gap, so why are you aiming below that?”

(Discussion.)

May: The trains of thought that I hear: what is realistic, what will create basic change. The good news is, it is up to us to set up goals; also, the state will not penalize if we don’t reach our goal. Also we can change goals at any point during those six years.

Jenny: It’s very difficult to make these numbers (from past cohorts) change unless you do something systematic.

May: I agree; I think that’s reflected in the consistent 62 to 63 percent numbers over a period of years.

 We are debating Equity and Aspiration.

(Discussion. Jenny, etc. Are there other ways of proceeding—for example, can we choose different models for different groups. What goals are realistic.)

May: This project will move through various committees. State wants data by June. I appreciate this opportunity to spend really serious time on this.

(Discussion. Cleavon, etc. Time frame and how it affects future allocation planning—i.e., the value of starting work on this quickly. We’re doing planning and budgeting for Fall 2016 right now.)

Jenny: Proposal for using mix of models.

(Discussion.)

May: Proposal on table that for Overall Completion (College Prepared) we use Progress (higher goal than Equity); for the rest we use Aspiration.

 Course Success Rate—Aspiration: we’re going to be in 79 percent in six years, from 63 percent. And for Equity we’re going from 63 to 73. For Progress it’s 63 to 65. How do we feel about this? (Discussion.)

Ally: Establishing goals is great but percentages are difficult because I have no idea of the plans to get to those goals.

Cleavon: Our goals drive our planning in this effort. Right now, unfortunately, our mandates are driving our planning.

(Discussion.)

Heather: Comment on the complexities of the budgeting process; how do we plan for six years knowing those complexities.

(Discussion.)

Cleavon: Our ability to reach these goals has more to do than with Sacramento budgets; it has a lot to do with internal priorities and communications.

(Discussion.)

Jenny: Comment on the planning/budgeting process.

May: Let’s summarize. We will aim high; state will not penalize; we need to begin to actively execute all of our plans. (Further summary. Putting plans online so community knows.)

(Going over notes from last meeting.)

(Discussion of old business.)

(Discussion of several topics including communications; i.e., getting information from our district CTE committee; examining and solidifying this process. Should BSI be a separate group. What items can only be done in meetings; what can be done outside of meetings. Weaning ourselves from meeting-based conversations and discourse; value of asynchronous conversations online.)

May: We will make a summary report to Roundtable about integrated planning. I will check into board policy on refreshments.
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