

**SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL**

**May 30, 2007
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
A218C**

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Friedlander, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, J. Sullivan, P. Partee, D. Cooper,
I. Alarcon, K. Molloy, L. Auchincloss, M. Guillen, C. Ramirez

ABSENT: P. Buckelew, S. Broderick [Alarcon proxy], T. Garey [Molloy proxy], G. Thielst

GUESTS: K. McLellan, Judy Meyer (for G. Thielst)

1.0 Call to Order

Chairperson Jack Friedlander called the meeting to order.

1.1 Approval of the minutes of the April 17th and May 1st CPC meetings.

M/S/C [Guillen/Molloy] to approve the minutes of the April 17th CPC meeting.

M/S/C [Cooper/Sullivan] to approve the minutes of the May 1st CPC meeting with a correction as follows on page 4:

The original motion as amended was voted unanimous [1 abstention] to put the Athletic Trainer position ~~about~~ above the DTC/ITC Initiatives.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 EC concurs with CPC's recommendation on the ranking of critical resource requests.

Joe Sullivan told the Council he would provide to them a revised spreadsheet as the one distributed indicated that the Dual Enrollment Coordinator position was on the list to be funded and it should not have been. The estimated cost to fund the proposals is \$1,742,987.

Jack Friedlander said that John Romo asked to communicate the following two decisions to the Council: (1) he and EC endorse the list; and (2) his intent *not* to take it to the Board study session until such time as the state budget is signed, our budget for 2007-08 is known, and our end-of-year budget for 2006-07 is finalized. Dr. Friedlander added that we may not know have the information John Romo said what is needed before he takes his recommendation for funding of the CPC priorities to the Board until September or October. The consequences of this delay on when a decision by the Board would be made on the funds it will commit to pay for the ranked resource requests is that the recruitment process to fill those positions it approves may not take place until October. Thus, at best, the employees selected to fill the new positions may

not be in place until December and funds to purchase items on the recommended resource request list may not be available to October.

2.2 Proposed allocation of the projected under-designated balances from the 2006-07 budget.

Mr. Sullivan said that from the list provided to the Council for proposed General Fund allocations the Board approved the funding of four of these items. The Major Maintenance Priority 1 Projects are still on hold. He said that we will receive a \$1.2m authorization on July 1st of which \$540k comes off the top for ongoing 5000 accounts which is used for ongoing maintenance/grounds projects/upkeep on an annual basis. The Board approved funding the following at the May Board meeting:

Major maintenance Health and Safety Projects
Physical Science West Wing
Photovoltaic System for the Sports Pavilion
Parking lot 2C and 3 resurfacing.

Kathy Molloy indicated that some of the Major Maintenance, Prior 1 Projects items need to be funded so that they could be completed this summer. Mr. Sullivan said that if the items are not “health and safety” items then they are not going to be done over the summer. Dr. Friedlander inquired about the IDC Building as it was a priority for John Romo. Joe Sullivan said that if he wants to authorize the funding for that item, he can do so. Although President Romo committed to that funding, the Board did not commit to it. He said we can request that IDC be done this summer, but with the starting of the PS Building, the ECC remodels, the repaving of parking lots 2C and 3, and all of the health and safety items it would be a challenge to do so this summer.

2.3 Update on faculty hiring and the two Dean, Educational Programs positions for which interviews were held last week.

Jack Friedlander said we went through the process of hiring the two dean positions. He doubled the size of the representations on the hiring committee because of the two positions. Guy Smith and Doug Hersh, who will be new to the college, were selected to fill these positions and will start their assignments in July. Dr. Friedlander anticipates a high degree of collaboration between Mr. Smith and Mr. Hersh as well as with the other deans.

3.0 Information Items

3.1 Governor’s proposed 2007-08 budget for community colleges based on the May Revise

Jack Friedlander provided the Council a chart that compared the Governor’s May revise budget with what was recommended by the Assembly and Senate. He said where there is agreement between the Governor, Assembly and Senate on the amount of funds to be allocated to a line item in the budget, the items are likely to be approved by the governor and not subject to additional negotiation unless there is a change in the amount of revenue and/or expenses in this years state budget that is discovered between the information upon which the May revise budget is based and the end of the fiscal year. Where there is disagreement between the Governor, Senate and/or Assembly budget proposals, the items are forwarded to the Senate/Assembly

Conference Committee to try and resolve the differences. Those items in the budget for which consensus cannot be reached are forwarded to the Big Five (Governor and two representatives from the Senate and Assembly) to negotiate. The final agreed upon budget is then submitted to the Senate and Assembly for approval. The budget they agree to is then sent to the Governor for approval.

3.2 Proposal to expand membership of Matriculation Advisory Committee

Keith McLellan joined the meeting to explain the recommendation to expand the membership of the Matriculation Advisory Committee. The reason it is coming before the Council is because this is a college-wide committee. Mr. McLellan said that Matriculation, by the *Education Code*, has eight components to it. We have had a highly functional Matriculation Committee for the last two decades that has in recent years been infused with new funds. Based on state-wide and local priorities to increase student success, the Matriculation Committee voted endorse the recommendation to CPC to add three members to this committee: one for the orientation component; one for follow-up component; and one for the research and planning component. This will provide appropriate representation for each of the eight components of matriculation and it would help the college prepare for the technical site visit next year. It was clarified that there is no new money involved in adding these committee members.

M/S/C [Auchincloss/Alarcon] to move item 3.2 to action.

M/S/C [Auchincloss/Guillen] to approve the expansion of the Matriculation Advisory Committee by three people.

4.0 Discussion Items

4.1 P2 Enrollments and State funded FTES as of P2 and projected FTES targets 2007-08

Jack Friedlander remarked that Darla Cooper has done a good job of estimating our FTES for this current year. He said we are not only are on target of meeting our FTES growth cap but we will be able to pay back the 127 FTES we borrowed from the prior summer. Our actual growth in credit is 2.9% in resident students and 3% in out-of-district/international students. In non-credit, the growth was minimal. He said the most significant percentage is that we grew 4.5% in non-resident/international student enrollment. We grew 2.9% in credit enrollment. As a college, we will just be a few FTES over what we will be allocated making us on the credit side less than one-half of one percent right on our target.

Dr. Friedlander said what is significant for next year is the projected FTES target for 2007-08. He said considering the state budget, we should focus our growth on 1.33%. In order to reach the growth of 1.33% in resident FTES for 2007-08, we have to grow 47.04 credit FTES and 32.05 non-credit FTES for a total of 79.10 FTES. He said we are up 7.2% this summer and he is confident we will be able to generate 100 additional resident FTES this year. Jack Friedlander said that after this year, he is hopeful that the Student Success initiatives will affect retention and persistence which will help get us through in future years.

4.2 Proposed College budget for 2007-08

Joe Sullivan provided a handout and discussed the major budget assumptions for 2008-07 which itemized revenue, expense, transfers and fund balance items.

- 4.3 Update on SoMA Building and on the plan that is being evaluated for relocating facilities during the following modernization/new building projects: Administration Bldg, Drama/Music, Humanities/ PS – Phase 1 and 2 and SoMA.

Joe Sullivan said we are now in the process of going through a redesign of the proposed SoMA Building. As a result, the look and feel of the building will change dramatically. He reported that the Finance Office at the Chancellor's Office said we need to do two things: (1) maintain the integrity of the programmatic intent; and (2) keep the same assignable square footage. It will become a long, two-story above-ground building. He said at the Facilities Committee meeting and the Study Session in June it is hoped to have preliminary artist's sketches and a new estimate of the cost of the building. The intent is to take \$15m out of the cost of the building by reducing the square footage by about 15% and also by bring it above ground. This will give us a much better opportunity to fund the building. Right now we would receive about \$30m from the state. However, the estimate to build it is \$50m. Mr. Sullivan said the building will be functional and have the ability to accommodate the programs we need into that building. July 2009 is the target date to break ground for this project.

- 4.4 Need to update General Information section in the College Catalog

President John Romo has communicated a need to update the "General Information" portion of the College Catalog. It had not been updated since the college embarked on its Project Redesign initiative 10 years or so ago. What needs to be added to the "General Information" section is a clear statement of what our Institutional Student Learning Outcomes are and how they are taught and/or reinforced in all of our core college processes. Jack Friedlander asked that a small subcommittee be formed to look at the language and bring back a proposal to CPC. Tom Garey [in his absence] and Darla Cooper were asked to volunteer. After some discussion, the Council decided that at its next meeting it will devote significant time to determine what has changed in terms of the college's values and assumptions. With this guidance, a subgroup would then meet to work on the new language. Jack Friedlander also proposed setting a special CPC meeting to focus on the process for developing the next three-year College Plan. The timing for this review fits nicely with the college's need to complete its self-study in 2008-09 in preparation for the site visit the following year. The accreditation site visit evaluation team will assess our process for reviewing the mission for the institution.

5.0 Other Items

There were no further summer CPC meetings set. CPC will resume their meetings for fall semester beginning on Tuesday, September 4th.

6.0 Adjournment

Chairperson Jack Friedlander adjourned the meeting upon motion by Liz Auchincloss.

Jack Friedlander - Fwd: Budget Update--August 24

From: Joseph Sullivan
To: Exec Com
Date: 8/24/2007 1:50 PM
Subject: Fwd: Budget Update--August 24

FYI

Joe Sullivan
Vice President Business Services
Santa Barbara City College
721 Cliff Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93109
(805) 965-0581 x2910
sullivanj@sbcc.edu

>>> "Skinner, Erik" <eskinner@CCCCO.EDU> 8/24/2007 1:20 PM >>>

Dear CBO Colleagues:

The Governor just signed the 2007-08 Budget Act into law and released his vetoes. With that, the Controller now has authority to process overdue Advance Apportionment payments.

The following items were vetoed from the CCC budget:

- \$33.1 million for the Basic Skills Initiative. The Governor set these funds aside in anticipation of legislation enacting the CCC Student Success Initiative. We are still awaiting further details and explanation of this action, but expect that such legislation would be drafted and enacted in the next couple weeks, before the Legislature adjourns. We will provide additional information on this matter as it develops. The following description was included in a Department of Finance overview document:

“The Budget sets aside \$33.1 million Proposition 98 General Fund for the Community Colleges in anticipation of legislation that would appropriate this amount to increase the rate of successful outcomes for students who are not adequately prepared for college-level work. Many students enter college without the requisite basic skills necessary to succeed in college. Despite the availability of remedial courses, most of those students do not persist long enough to complete a meaningful outcome such as attainment of an Associates Degree, a skill certificate necessary to enter a high-paying career, or completion of the required courses necessary to transfer to a four-year postsecondary institution. This circumstance threatens our future economic competitiveness and under-optimizes the potential of many of

California's young adults. In order to address this situation, especially for students transitioning from high school, the Administration proposes funding to enhance counseling and other student services, including improved aptitude assessments, development of a meaningful academic plan for each student, and hands-on tutoring, as necessary, to ensure these students complete that plan. This funding would be distributed in a way that provides front-end accountability incentives for improving those success rates, thereby eliminating the need for tedious reporting on each college's choice of expenditures.”

- \$13.8 million to further increase funding rates for Career Development/College Preparation instruction (enhanced non-credit). The Governor’s veto message states that additional accountability measures and evidence of improved student achievement are necessary before he would support additional augmentations for this purpose.
- \$4 million in one-time funds for Part-Time Faculty Health Insurance.
- \$1.5 million in one-time funds for a Construction College pilot program.

Erik Skinner

Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Policy

Chancellor's Office

California Community Colleges

1102 Q Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-6511

www.cccco.edu

phone: 916-323-7007

fax: 916-322-4783



S TATE BUDGET UPDATE

UPDATE #12 • AUGUST 24, 2007

A status report on the actions, discussions, and rumors in Sacramento related to the community colleges' state budget for fiscal year 2007-08. This update is distributed to all chief executive officers for distribution to trustees, administrators, faculty, classified, public/governmental relations officers and student leaders.

Governor wields his "blue" pencil

This afternoon, Governor Schwarzenegger signed the 2007-08 State Budget, which provides an ongoing increase of \$377 million in Proposition 98 state general funds for our community colleges.

The League is very disappointed the Governor vetoed \$13.8 million to provide a rate increase for Career Development and College Preparation and \$33.1 million to support the "Basic Skills Initiative". Both augmentations address long standing priorities of the system. The Governor's veto message:

"I am reducing Schedule (1) by \$13,786,000 and Schedule (2) by \$33,110,000 to delete the legislative augmentations for a noncredit course rate increase and a basic skills student funding increase, respectively. However, I am setting these funds aside for legislation that appropriates these funds for improving outcomes for at-risk students in a manner more consistent with the priorities of my proposed Student Success Initiative (\$33,110,000) and the remainder for other more compelling Proposition 98 funding needs.

The Legislature's proposed \$13,786,000 augmentation to support a second consecutive noncredit rate increase is premature and inconsistent with the agreement reached in last year's compromise on Chapter 631, Statutes of 2006 (SB 361). As part of that agreement, my Administration indicated that any future noncredit rate increase would be subject to improved student outcomes from last year's initial investment of \$30,000,000. To date, no accountability measures have been developed to evaluate this investment, nor has my Administration received a comprehensive list of courses and programs that have been approved by the Chancellor's Office for funding from the 2006-07 increase. While I cannot sustain this augmentation, the budget does provide a 4.53-percent COLA, which, when combined with the ongoing \$30,000,000 increase from 2006-07, provides for a 23-percent increase in per student funding for selected noncredit courses since the 2005-06 fiscal year.

I cannot support the Legislature's \$33,110,000 redirection of funds proposed for my May Revision's Student Success Initiative because the accompanying control provisions do not contain the appropriate accountability and distribution mechanisms necessary to ensure this investment improves student outcomes, particularly for at-risk students transitioning from high schools. With this reduction, the community colleges still retain \$33,110,000 in unspent current year funds that carryover for expenditure in the budget year to address strategies for improving basic skills instruction. My Administration is prepared to work with the Chancellor's Office to reinstate the ongoing funding pending agreement on revised accountability and distribution provisions that address my priority for improving meaningful outcomes for students transitioning from high school."

The Governor also vetoed \$4.0 million for the Part-time Faculty Health Insurance program, a long standing system priority, and \$1.5 million for Construction College.

The League strongly encourages the Community College Budget Task Force reconvene and/or Consultation Council meet to disseminate the veto message and determine the next course of action.

Education Trailer Bill

The Education Trailer Bill (SB 80) has not yet been signed; however the ONLY community college appropriation contained in the trailer bill is the "\$200 million deferral" which is scheduled for allocation in the 2008-09 fiscal year. The deferral has been a component of the community college budget since the 2003-04 fiscal year and it is NOT anticipated this will change until it is retired with one-time or ongoing Proposition 98 funds. It should be noted ALL one-time funds are listed in the budget bill (SB 77) under item 6870-486.



**COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA**

Item	2006-07 Final Budget	2007-08 System Budget Request	2007-08 Governor's Proposed Budget	2007-08 Governor's May Revise	2007-08 ENACTED BUDGET
General Apportionment					
Base Apportionment (Incl: GF, P-Tax, Fee)	4,920,252,000	5,416,585,000	5,423,341,000	5,423,341,000	5,423,341,000
Apportionment reduction for unused growth	-85,000,000	-	-	-	-
2007-08 Budget Deliberations reduction unused growth	-	-	-	-80,000,000	-80,000,000
Student fee reduction (to \$20 full-year)	40,000,000	40,000,000	33,245,000	33,245,000	33,245,000
	4,875,252,000	5,456,585,000	5,456,586,000	5,376,586,000	5,376,586,000
Cost-of-living adjustment (categorical COLA incl. below)	294,387,000	281,500,000	224,855,000	248,431,000	248,431,000
Growth for Apportionments	97,508,000	164,000,000	109,132,000	107,532,000	107,532,000
Apportionment increase for remediation/exit exam	10,000,000	-	-	-	-
Equalization	159,438,000	-	-	-	-
Career Development & College Preparation	30,000,000	30,000,000	-	-	-
Realignment of nursing item (technical issue)	-10,000,000	-	-	-	-
Total General Apportionment	5,456,585,000	5,932,085,000	5,790,573,000	5,732,549,000	5,732,549,000
Categorical Programs					
Academic Senate for the Community Colleges	467,000	490,000	467,000	467,000	467,000
Basic Skills and Apprenticeship	48,338,000	50,599,000	15,229,000	15,229,000	15,229,000
Baccalaureate Pilot Program	100,000	100,000	100,000	-	-
Career Technical Education	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Child Care Tax Bailout	6,540,000	6,986,000	6,804,000	6,836,000	6,836,000
Disabled Students Programs and Services	107,870,000	115,430,695	114,472,000	115,011,000	115,011,000
Economic Development	46,790,000	48,790,000	46,790,000	46,790,000	46,790,000
EOPS & CARE	112,916,000	120,805,000	119,827,000	120,391,000	122,291,000
Equal Employment Opportunity	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000
Foster Care Education Program	4,754,000	5,079,000	4,754,000	5,254,000	5,254,000
Fund for Student Success	6,158,000	8,358,000	6,158,000	6,158,000	6,158,000
Full-time Faculty: Increase Positions	-	45,000,000	-	-	-
Matriculation	95,481,000	116,149,000	134,436,000	144,913,000	101,803,000
Nursing	16,886,000	16,886,000	25,886,000	25,886,000	22,100,000
Part-Time Faculty Compensation	50,828,000	100,828,000	50,828,000	50,828,000	50,828,000
Part-Time Faculty Health Insurance	1,000,000	8,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Part-Time Faculty Office Hours	7,172,000	12,172,000	7,172,000	7,172,000	7,172,000
Physical Plant and Instructional Support	27,345,000	27,345,000	27,345,000	27,345,000	27,345,000
Professional Development	-	10,000,000	-	-	-
Special Services for CalWORKs Recipients	43,580,000	46,714,000	43,580,000	43,580,000	43,580,000
Student Financial Aid Administration	52,593,000	55,115,500	51,308,000	51,640,000	51,640,000
Telecommunications / Technology Svcs / C.V. U	26,197,000	40,497,000	26,197,000	28,097,000	26,197,000
Transfer Education and Articulation	1,424,000	1,424,000	1,424,000	1,424,000	1,424,000
ON-GOING VETO SET-ASIDE					46,910,000
<i>Ongoing Funds Subtotal</i>	6,134,772,000	6,790,600,195	6,496,097,000	6,452,317,000	6,452,331,000
One-Time Funds (Prop. 98 Reversion & Settle-up)					
General Purpose Block Grant	100,000,000	-	-	-	-
Amador COE	100,000	-	-	-	-
Funding Formula Reform - One-time Costs	19,710,000	-	-	-	-
Internet access for offsite centers	1,446,000	-	-	-	-
Electronic Transcript Exchange	700,000	-	-	-	-
Strategic Plan Implementation	500,000	-	-	-	-
Physical Plant and Instructional Support	94,144,000	50,000,000	-	47,500,000	8,084,000
Mandate reimbursements	40,000,000	20,000,000	-	-	0
Career Technical Education SB 1133	-	-	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
Nursing Equipment / Allied Health Equipment	-	-	-	50,000,000	8,084,000
Career Technical Education	-	-	-	50,000,000	0
Nursing & Allied Health - 24hr State facilities	-	-	-	-	0
Outreach for parolees	-	-	-	-	0
Nursing (startup)	3,000,000	-	9,000,000	9,000,000	-
Part-Time Faculty Health Insurance	-	-	-	-	4,000,000
Part-Time Faculty Office Hours	-	-	-	-	0
Professional Development	5,000,000	-	-	-	-
Textbook Assistance	-	-	-	2,500,000	-
Student Access to Transit Initiative	-	-	-	-	-
Construction College	-	-	-	-	-
Technology Items	-	9,650,000	-	2,700,000	0
Accreditation Assistance	-	-	-	-	0
Cal PASS	1,000,000	-	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Basic Skills (06-07 funds; available one-time)					Included in 06-07
ONE-TIME VETO SET-ASIDE					5,500,000
<i>One-time Prop 98 Funds Subtotal</i>	265,600,000	79,650,000	42,000,000	194,700,000	58,668,000
Miscellaneous (Non-program) Items					
Mandate reimbursements (suspension continues)	4,004,000	16,000,000	4,004,000	4,004,000	4,004,000
Fiscal Crisis Management Assistance Team (FCMAT)	-	570,000	350,000	570,000	570,000
STRS Payments for CCC Employees	83,013,000	83,013,000	81,979,000	81,979,000	81,979,000
Lease-Purchase Bond Payments	63,960,000	63,960,000	59,401,000	59,401,000	59,401,000
Lottery	155,293,000	155,293,000	155,293,000	155,293,000	155,293,000
Total State-Determined Funding	6,706,642,000	7,189,086,195	6,839,124,000	6,948,264,000	6,812,246,000
Funded FTES	1,139,921	1,174,119	1,174,119	1,174,119	1,174,119
Prop 98 (Local) Ongoing Funding per FTES	5,382	5,784	5,533	5,495	5,495
Prop 98 (Local) One-Time Funding per FTES	233	68	36	166	50
Funding per FTES	\$ 5,883	\$ 6,123	\$ 5,825	\$ 5,918	\$ 5,802

Santa Barbara City College Partnership for Student Success Year One Evaluation 2006-2007 Overall College Performance

Introduction

In spring 2005, President John Romo asked the Academic Senate to assume responsibility for researching and implementing a Student Success Initiative to increase the academic success of SBCC students. The Senate accepted this responsibility and that summer formed a Task Force to make plans for the Initiative. This divisionally represented Task Force included representatives from all divisions, as well as students, deans, and directors of successful SBCC student support programs. One of the results of this Task Force effort was a call for student success proposals across the campus. The Task Force continued to meet throughout the fall and, in spring 2006, presented the Senate with an integrated plan that addressed the various teaching and learning priorities articulated in the proposals submitted by the SBCC faculty, staff, and administration. These proposals offered a wide range of solutions, from departmental and cross-departmental projects to broad institutional initiatives. All were worthwhile and all demonstrated a clear desire to help our students achieve their goals. The Senate reviewed these proposals and recommended the implementation of seven institutional proposals and a number of departmental proposals. This recommendation became known as SBCC's Partnership for Student Success (PSS).

The College Planning Council and the Board of Trustees approved funding for the Partnership in May 2006. Throughout this time, EVP Jack Friedlander worked with Senate leadership to ensure the implementation of the PSS in fall 2006. At the same time, a PSS Steering Committee was formed to include members from the original Task Force and those responsible for leadership for the institutional initiatives. Working with the EVP, the group developed an evaluation plan to measure the progress of the PSS. The first year evaluation has been completed, and this report summarizes the results of this evaluation from the leaders responsible for the Gateway to Success Program, the Writing Center, the Math Lab, the Online College, and the Athletic Achievement Zone. As the following reports indicate, SBCC students are taking advantage of the expanded support services provided by the PSS, and this support is making a positive difference in their academic success.

In brief, these reports show that the number of Gateway courses has increased substantially, particularly in the English Skills and ESL areas. At the same time, EOPS staff has been successfully encouraging EOPS students to enroll in Gateway classes, resulting in an increase of at-risk Gateway students. Yet even with this increase, basic skills students in Gateway classes are demonstrating strong success rates. Similarly, the Writing Center and Math Lab are reporting large increases in student use, and course completion rates of students making regular use of these services are substantially higher than those of non-users. In addition, increased use of online

instructional aides (OIAs) in online classes is resulting in higher success rates for students in those classes. Finally, the Athletic Achievement Zone has been expanding its hours and support services and encouraging student athletes to make regular use of the assistance available from Gateway tutors, the Writing Center and the Math Lab, increasing the success rates of these students as well.

The PSS also included one time funding to continue the SLO Project and widen faculty participation and to encourage participation of adjunct faculty and entire departments. As of this date, most of the SBCC faculty has participated in the SLO Project and/or training. In addition, the PSS established annual student success grants to encourage faculty to continue the development of proposals to help students achieve academic success. Administered by the Faculty Professional Development Committee, the first of these faculty grants were awarded in spring 2007. Furthermore, a number of department and cross department initiatives were funded through the efforts of the Foundation, the President, and the EVP, Educational Programs. Among these were funding for testing materials to assist students in the Vocational Nursing Program and the ADN Program; the establishment of a MESA Program at SBCC; an interdisciplinary seminar on Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) and the development of a WAC Guide for all SBCC faculty.

Our SBCC community can rightfully be proud of its efforts to improve the academic success of our students. Many of our community college colleagues have been involved in such efforts, but few have undertaken the kind of campus wide initiative that we have at SBCC. Now the State Academic Senate has completed its Basic Skills Initiative aimed at researching best practices for increasing student success, especially among the under-prepared student population, and the state has reallocated funds that were set aside to pay for growth in basic Skills enrollments to support college-based initiatives such as our PSS to increase the success rates of students in need of remediation.

Once again, Santa Barbara City College is at the forefront of this movement. We recognize that we have much to learn as we work to make our strong programs even more effective, but as those responsible for the State Senate Basic Skills Initiative conclude, this is a moral mandate for community colleges, and we all need to be in this for the long term. Changing the culture takes time, but the rewards are great.

Increase the number of Gateway Sections from 50 in Spring 2005 to a minimum of 150 class sections in Spring 2007.

As evidenced by the data in Table 1, the objective has been achieved. The number of Gateway sections has been increased from 60 in Spring 2006 to 150 in Fall 2006 and 200 in Spring 2007. Much of the growth in the number of Gateway sections offered was in the following basic skills areas:

- ESL
- English Skills

- o Reading & Writing
- o Personal Development 100 (College Success class)

Table 1 – Increased in the number of Gateway Sections

Semester	Number of Gateway Sections
Spring 2006	60
Fall 2006	150
Spring 2007	200
Fall 2006	???

The dramatic increases in the number of Gateway to Success sections that has occurred in the past year can be attributed to the recognition of faculty, counselors, student support staff and students themselves of the value of the additional assistance provided in the Gateway sections. This is particularly true for students needing extra help to improve their core academic competencies, study skills, and/or motivation and self-confidence required to succeed in their courses.

A higher percentage of students with below college-level skills in reading and in writing will be enrolled in Gateway class sections than those in non-Gateway sections of the same courses (no numerical goal was established for this objective).

Table 2 and 3 show that there was a significantly greater percentage of students in Gateway versus that placed below college level in reading (75.5% vs. 69.7% and writing (73.3% vs. 61.2%).

Table 2

Reading Level	Gateway		Comparison Group	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Below College	607	75.5%	1029	69.7%
College Level	197	24.5%	447	30.3%
Total	804		1,476	

Table 3

Writing Level	Gateway		Comparison Group	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Below College	589	73.3%	904	61.2%
College Level	215	26.7%	572	38.8%
Total	804		1,476	

The disproportionately higher percentage of students with pre-college skills levels in reading and writing in Gateway compared to non-Gateway sections of the same courses is a result of the concerted efforts by faculty, EOPS/CARE staff, counselors, Athletic advisors and staff to urge students in need of remediation to enroll in Gateway classes.

The successful course completion rates of students that enter Gateway classes with below college level skills in writing will be least 5% higher than those that enrolled in non-Gateway sections in the same courses.

This objective has been achieved.

The successful course completion rates of students enrolled in Gateway classes in need of remediation with their writing competencies were substantially higher than those that enrolled in non-Gateway sections of the same courses (91.8% vs. 84.1%). This information presented in Table 4 shows that: (1) Successful course completion rates of students in Gateway sections that took the college's assessment test in writing were significantly higher than those enrolled in non-Gateway sections of the same courses for those that placed below college level writing (91.8% vs. 84.1%) and for those that placed in college level writing (96.2% vs. 90.3%); (2) The successful course completion rates were dramatically higher for students with placement levels in writing than those that entered the same courses without a placement level regardless of whether they were enrolled in Gateway or non-Gateway classes. (Similar findings were observed for students that did not have placement scores in reading or in math) and; (3) The successful course completion rates of students that entered Gateway sections without a placement level in writing were higher than those in non-Gateway sections of the same courses (59.9% vs. 55.4%).

Successful course completion rates in Gateway classes will be 3% higher I 2006-07 compared to comparable group of non-Gateway students.

This objective has been achieved.

As shown in Table 5, a higher percentage of students enrolled in Gateway than in non-Gateway sections of the same courses earned a grade of "C" or better (successful course complete rate) in the Fall 2006 (68.5% vs. 65.5%) and in the Spring 2007 (67.6% vs. 63.9%) semesters. It is important to note that the higher successful course completion rates in Gateway sections were achieved even though a greater percentage of students entered those classes with below college level competencies in reading and writing than those in the non-Gateway sections of the same courses.

Table 5

	Fall 2006	Spring 2007
Gateway	68.5%	67.6%
Non-Gateway	65.5%	63.9%
Difference	3.0%	3.7%

This objective has been achieved.

As shown in Table 6, the successful course completion rates of students entering Gateway class sections with below college level skills in reading and/or writing had higher successful course completion rates than those in need of remediation who enrolled in non-Gateway sections of the same courses in Fall 2006 (63.8% vs. 60.5%) and Spring 2007 (65.3% vs. 58.6%) semesters.

Table 6

Successful course completion rates of students that entered Gateway and non-Gateway sections of the same courses with below college level skills in Reading and/or Writing.

	Fall 2006	Spring 2007
Gateway	63.8%	65.3%
Non-Gateway	60.5%	58.6%
Difference	3.3%	6.7%

Additional measures of the effectiveness of the Gateway Program to increase student success.

In 2007-08, data will be provided on the semester-to-semester and year-to-year persistence rates of students that were enrolled in Gateway sections compared to those enrolled in non-Gateway sections. We need to wait until next year in order to allow sufficient time to elapse for the data needed for these analyses to become available.

Comparison of successful course completion rates in Gateway classes by course placement level and by whether or not these students took the college's assessment tests.

The instructive finding in Table A, is that students that were enrolled in Gateway classes that took the assessment test in writing were much more likely to receive a successful grade in their classes than those who were enrolled in the same courses but did not take the college's assessment test. In fact, whether or not they took the writing course placement test was a much more important factor in determining whether or not they did successfully complete their Gateway courses than the level of writing in which they were placed. Similarly, findings were obtained for students that did and did not take the college assessment tests in reading and math.

Plans for enhancing the effectiveness of the Gateway Program to increase student success.

This past year we recognized that too many students were finding ways to circumvent completing one or more of the following core components of the college's matriculation program: (1) orientation, (2) assessment, (3) advisement and (4) course selection. Given the importance of these services, we will implement the revisions of our policies this year that will make it difficult for students (other than those taking classes for personal enrichment) to circumvent the college's matriculation process.

The Gateway to Success Program has made significant strides this past year, developing a prototype that will continue to evolve over subsequent years on what are now solid foundational elements:

- We established the co-directorship in 2006-2007, enabling Gateway to grow and develop as part of the campus-wide, faculty-driven, Partnership for Student Success effort.
- We presented the Gateway program to all Faculty at Fall 2007 in-service.
- We established a clear Gateway presence in Catalogue, Website, Print Schedule, with all Gateway classes visibly designated on web schedule.
- Gateway now has a broad advertising presence across campus in the form of Program banners, presentations at department meetings, classes, and community outreach.
- The 150 Gateway sections in Fall 2006 was increased to 200 in Spring 2007.
- The new Gateway Center for Student Success (ECC-33 Building) opened in late January 2007: over 1,000 students visited the center for tutoring during its first semester in operation.
- We hired a clerical assistant to staff and coordinate the Gateway Center.
- During two forums in Spring 2007, we queried Gateway faculty to share ideas and establish "best practices" which led to the development of the Gateway Faculty Handbook.
- We coordinated the employment and timesheet management systems, enlisting existing services within the LRC.
- While Gateway serves all students at all levels, we have chosen to emphasize basic skills at this formative stage, to achieve the greatest potential for maximum impact at a foundational level; basic Skills includes ESL classes, English Skills classes, and English 100.

- Attended the Foothill/DeAnza Learning Community Conference in Fall 2006, and established connections with other Community Colleges across the state.
- In Fall Semester, we are running our first Gateway Learning Community, "A Field of Green: Are We Eating Our Future?", exploring how food interconnects with water, energy, land use and toxicology and linking classes in English, Environmental Studies, Philosophy, and Psychology.
- In Fall 2007 we are piloting another Learning Community between the Nursing and English departments.
- In Spring 2007, we developed Directed Learning Activities (DLAs), based on the Chaffey College model, with a focus on English Skills classes. We will be piloting these DLAs in Fall 2007.
- Our DLA effort directly supports the campus-wide SLO initiative.

Evaluation of the Writing Center

Number of students receiving assistance in the Writing Center will increase by 15% in 2006-07 and by 2.5% in 2007-08.

This objective has been achieved. As shown in Table 7, there was an 80.7% increase in the number of students in the Writing Center from Fall 2005-06. Moreover, the number of separate visits made by students to meet with the tutors and staff in the Writing Center increased by 147.3% in Fall 2005 versus Fall 2006. The data on in-class and student usage of the resources in the Writing Center was even more impressive for the Spring 2007 versus Spring 2006 semesters. More specifically there was a 114.7% increase in the number of students who received assistance in the Writing Center and 225.8% increase in the number of separate visits made to the Writing Center.

Table 7

Number of students that used the Writing Center services and the number of times they visited the center in 2005-06 compared to 2006-07.

Semester	Fall 2006	Spring 2007
Fall 2005	1,035	586
Fall 2006	2,560	1,059
% Difference	147.3%	80.7%

Semester	Fall 2006	Spring 2007
Spring 2006	869	510
Spring 2007	2,799	1,095
% Difference	225.8%	114.7%

Users of the Writing Center will have a course completion rate 5% higher than non-users.

This objective has been achieved. As evidenced in Table 8, the course completion rates for student who used the resources in the Writing Center were 18.8% higher in Fall 2006 and 17.5% higher in Spring 2007 compared to students enrolled in the same classes that did not take advantage of the assistance provided in the Writing Center.

At least 70% of students with 5 or more visits in the Writing Center demonstrated improved skills as measured by course completion.

This objective has been achieved. The data in Table 8 shows that students who used the resources in the Writing Center three or more times had higher course completion rates than those who availed themselves of these services on one or two occasions during the term. The successful course completion rates for students that used the services provided in the Writing Center one or more times were substantially higher than the objective of 75% establishes for this objective.

Table 8

Visits	Fall 2006	Spring 2007
One	84.2%	82.7%
Two	87.9%	79.4%
Three to Four	92.2%	92.5%
Five to Nine	85.8%	89.1%
10 or more	92.0%	96.0%
All Users	87.6%	85.8%
Non-Users	68.8%	68.3%
Difference	18.8%	17.5%

Plans for enhancing the effectiveness of the Writing Center to increase student success.

- We hired two excellent LTAs, both with graduate degrees in English and backgrounds in tutorial pedagogy, Nicole Biergiel and Lisa Danhi.
- The LTAs have implemented many new policies and procedures facilitating and recording the flow of students into and out of the Writing Center.
- These policies and procedures required our hiring an office assistant to manage students, time, data, and this has freed up tutors to concentrate on tutoring.
- The LTAs have revised or composed support materials that tutors use with students to clarify challenging facets of the writing process.
- We instituted best practices for tutors that are reinforced daily on the floor by the LTAs and through evening training potlucks. These best practices are visible in nearly every one of the numerous documents composed over the past year.
- Best practices include set strategies that guide tutors and build independence and productive academic skills and habits in students.
- Students fill out a DLA (Directed Learning Activity) before seeing a tutor, which puts responsibility on the student, minimizes “please fix my paper,” and focuses tutorial session on student- and/or teacher-generated guidelines.
- The LTAs developed an interactive addendum to the CLRC Tutor Handbook as first step in new Writing Center tutor training, outlining pedagogical principles, personnel procedures, guidelines for managing time in a 30-minute tutorial session with diverse student populations, and resources available in

- the Writing Center and on campus. The Addendum is reviewed by all new Writing Center tutors with one of the LTAs prior to their first shift.
- LTAs function as mentors for the mandatory tutor training. All new tutors, regardless of their subject areas, navigate a three-hour interactive video-based sequence requiring short answer responses to key questions, which are then reviewed under the guidance of the Writing Center LTA.
 - We have changed and expanded the physical space for the Writing Center with a delineated waiting area (with suggested tasks for students to perform prior to their tutoring session through the DLA), a receptionist, and a larger more private tutoring area.
 - The LTAs designed a prototype outreach workshop, starting with Environmental Studies, offering a two-hour workshop on writing in the sciences. This was a great success, and we gathered as much information as we gave, which was very helpful to us in our mission of supporting the Writing Across the Curriculum project.
 - We met several times with an English department work group to update them on our policies, work out sticking points, and ensure that we are working harmoniously toward the achievement of common goals.
 - We have strengthened our ties with the CLAS tutorial program at UCSB, which has been of mutual benefit.

Evaluation of the Online Courses

Course completion rates in online classes will increase by a minimum of 5% in 2006-07 and 8% in 2007-08 compared to the rates in online courses in 2005-06.

This objective has been achieved. As noted in Table 9, the course completion rates in online classes increased by 2.2% from Fall 2005 to Fall 2006 and by 3.3% from Spring 2006 to Spring 2007. While the successful course completion rates for online classes were higher this year compared to last year, the objective of having them increased by a minimum of 5% was not achieved.

Table 9

Successful course completion rates in Online Classes in 2006-06 and in 2006-07.

Semester	Percentage
Fall 2005	54.3
Fall 2006	56.5
% Difference	+ 2.2

Semester	Percentage
Spring 2006	55.0
Spring 2007	58.3
% Difference	+ 3.3

Plans for enhancing the effectiveness of the Distance Learning courses to increase student success.

Instructors teaching online courses have determined that a major barrier for student success occurs at the beginning of the semester for many online students. Because students are not required to appear at a physical place at a specific time, some find themselves in difficulty before they have even begun to work on content. There are several pitfalls, especially for students enrolled in an online course for the first time:

- They may be dropped by the instructor because they never began the course or checked into the course during the first week of the semester;
- They may spend valuable time the first week addressing technical problems and learning how to navigate in the course when they should be working on assignments;
- They may not begin assignments until the end of the first week and find themselves behind and discouraged.

To address the challenge of engaging students during the first few days of the semester, we piloted a project in Spring 2007 to contact students in selected courses before the beginning of the semester. Online instructional aides (OIAs) emailed and telephoned students two weeks prior to the start of spring semester with information provided by instructors in scripts. Students were given specific instructions on how to set up their computers, how to contact their instructors, where to find information on the Online College web site and how to get additional assistance.

The data demonstrates an increase in student success in online courses, particularly in spring 2007. Perhaps if the pilot project had included all online courses, the target 5% would have been attained. However, faculty and staff are pleased with the gains and have a base to build upon.

In Fall 2007, contact with students before the beginning of the semester will be facilitated because all students are using the portal. For the 2007-2008 academic year, faculty and staff will focus student success efforts on course design and the infusion of new technologies to increase interactivity.

One of the major factors in hiring Douglas Hersh as a Dean of Educational Programs is his expertise and experience in distance learning and in effective uses of technology to increase student success in web-based courses. Douglas Hersh will be the administrator responsible for the Online College and for the Faculty Resource Center (FRC). He will work with the FRC to enhance the effectiveness of the training and ongoing pedagogical support it provides faculty teaching online classes.

Evaluation of the Math Lab

Objective 10.

Successful course completion rates in Mathematics classes will be at least 5% higher for those who take advantage of the Math Lab compared to students in the same classes that do not do so.

This objective has been achieved. As noted in Table 10, the course completion rates for students using the services in the Math Lab were 6.2% higher in Fall 2006 and 10% higher in Spring 2007 than those in the same courses who did not do so. The data in Table 10 also illustrates that: (1) students who used the services provided in the Math Lab on at least one occasion had higher successful course completion rates than those in the same courses that did not do so; and (2) students that took advantage of the tutorial assistance in the Math Lab on a more frequent basis during the semester (10 or more times) had substantially higher successful course completion rates than those that used the Math Lab less frequently.

Table 10

Successful course completion rates for students that used Math Lab services compared to those that did not do so.

Visits	<u>Fall 2006</u>		<u>Spring 2007</u>	
	Rate	Count	Rate	Count
One	56.5%	177	59.5%	173
Two	62.1%	95	64.5%	107
Three to Four	51.8%	114	69.2%	104
Five to Nine	52.7%	131	59.0%	105
Ten to 19	69.7%	109	72.5%	69
20 or more	79.1%	43	61.9%	42
All Users	59.3%	669	63.7%	600
Non-Users	53.1%	2,127	53.7%	1,723
Difference	6.2%		10.0%	

Plans for enhancing the effectiveness of the Math Lab to increase student success.

Prior to Fall 2006, the Math Tutoring Lab was open Monday through Friday. In Fall 2006, we opened the lab for four hours on Saturdays. It was staffed by a faculty member and one tutor in the fall. Due to the popularity of Saturday tutoring, we added an additional faculty tutor in the spring. The faculty members also served as the

Saturday supervisors. We were hoping that a minimum of 20 students per week would take advantage of the services offered in the Math Tutoring Lab on Saturdays.

Saturdays were well attended, with the last Saturday of the fall semester having an attendance of 54 students. The spring semester averaged close to 24 students each Saturday. This also allowed the computer lab to be open for Saturday use as well. As more and more instructors begin using ALEKS and other software and internet applications in their courses, it will be very helpful to students to have lab access on the weekend.

Faculty tutoring was also increased during evening hours when there has traditionally been no supervisor present and "peak hours" when the lab has large numbers of students and not enough tutors to service them all. The department is currently researching methods for evaluating tutoring effectiveness and will develop an evaluation plan to assess the tutoring provided to students in 2007-2008. One part of the plan is to keep track of how many students are using the lab, and to track students that use the Math Lab through their course sequences.

Anecdotally, the lab director had the following comments about the increased faculty tutoring:

"I feel the faculty presence in the math lab accomplishes several things."

"It is difficult for me to find tutors who can tutor the range of courses we offer. Faculty members can generally do that. Statistics is the exception."

"Having a faculty member who can tutor Statistics helps to relieve the shortage of tutors for that course. We always have a larger demand for Statistics tutors than we can meet."

"Faculty tutors have a greater understanding of how to help students learn. They provide good models for the tutors as well as act as good resources for them. Communication between the staff and the faculty is valuable for all concerned."

"Faculty tutors draw more of their own students to the lab, thus increasing the usage of our service. "

The Math Department will continue to work on ways to improve tutoring in the lab, including incorporating Directed Learning Activities (DLAs) into the tutoring process. Several faculty members have been working on a library of activities by topic and will continue to do so over the coming year. The hope is to create a library of DLAs that instructors (and tutors) can go to when a student is struggling with a particular topic. The DLA puts the responsibility on the student and helps pinpoint precise areas of trouble for the tutors to zero in on.

Evaluation of the ALEKS Program to increase student success in Math 100 classes

Objective 11.

Successful course completion rates for Math 100 students in class sections that use ALEKS tutoring program will be at least 4% higher in the fall semester and 5% higher in the spring semester than those enrolled in non ALEKS sections of this course.

This objective was not achieved. As noted in Table 11, students who were enrolled in the Math 100 classes that use the ALEKS Program had lower successful course completion rates in Fall 2006 (-4.8%) and in Spring 2007 (-7.4%) than students enrolled in the Math 100 sections that did not use the ALEKS Program.

Table 11

Successful course completion rates in ALEKS compared to non-ALEX sections of Math 100.

	Fall 2006		Spring 2007	
	Rate	Count	Rate	Count
ALEKS	31.8%	148	39.8%	108
Non-ALEKS	46.6%	517	47.2%	411
Difference	-14.8%		-7.4%	

There are several factors that contributed to not achieving the desired higher course completion rates in the Math 100 sections that used the ALEKS Program. Interviews with students and faculty revealed that a serious shortcoming of the way in which we were using the ALEKS program was not having a close tie between the class assignments/homework students were required to complete in their Math 100 classes and the ALEKS program tutorials. This resulted in students either not investing the time required to get the benefits from using the ALEKS program and/or withdrawing from their classes because they did not see the value of investing the time in using ALEKS.

Objective 12.

Successful course completion rates for students who use the ALEKS program four or more hours will be at least 5% higher than those who invested fewer hours with this program.

This objective has been achieved. As noted in Tables 12 and 13, there was a strong relationship between the number of hours students used the ALEKS program and their successful course completion rates. More specifically, in Fall 2006 successful course completion rates for students who spent 40 or more hours using ALEKS was 62.3%

compared to 21.7% for those who invested between 4 and 9.9 hour hours using the ALEKS program. In Spring 2007, 73.1% of the students that spent 40 or more hours using the ALEKS Program received a successful grade in their Math 100 class compared to 58.1% of those who devoted between 20 to 39.9 hours using this program.

Table 12

Relationship between the number of hours students used the ALEKS program and successful course complete rates in Math 100 in Fall 2006.

Time Spent	Successful		Unsuccessful		Withdrawal		Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
None	0	0.0%	7	23.3%	23	76.7%	30	20.1%
Less than 4 hours	0	0.0%	10	52.6%	9	47.4%	19	12.8%
4 - 9.9 hours	5	21.7%	11	47.8%	7	30.4%	23	15.4%
10 - 19.9 hours	11	44.0%	11	44.0%	3	12.0%	25	16.8%
20 - 39.9 hours	19	57.6%	14	42.4%	0	0.0%	33	22.1%
40+ hours	12	63.2%	7	36.8%	0	0.0%	19	12.8%
Total	47	31.5%	60	40.3%	42	28.2%	149	

Table 13

Relationship between the number of hours students used the ALEKS program and successful course complete rates in Math 100 in Spring 2007.

Time Spent	Successful		Unsuccessful		Withdrawal		Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
None	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	18	94.7%	19	17.6%
Less than 4 hours	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	4	80.0%	5	4.6%
4 - 9.9 hours	0	0.0%	7	77.8%	2	22.2%	9	8.3%
10 - 19.9 hours	6	33.3%	11	61.1%	1	5.6%	18	16.7%
20 - 39.9 hours	18	58.1%	12	38.7%	1	3.2%	31	28.7%
40+ hours	19	73.1%	7	26.9%	0	0.0%	26	24.1%
Total	43	39.8%	39	36.1%	26	24.1%	108	

Students that spent 20 or more hours in a semester using ALEKS had higher successful course completion rates in Math 100 than the department average for this course in the Fall 2006 (59.6% vs. 43.6%) and in the Spring 2007 (66.1% vs. 45.7%) semesters.

Plans for enhancing the effectiveness of the ALEKS Program to increase student success.

The fact that so many students withdraw from the ALEKS sections may be due to the students' perception that ALEKS required them to do more work in their classes than

what they would have been required to do if enrolled in a non ALEKS section of Math 100. Several faculty members attended an ALEKS summit in which colleges that have used ALEKS with success shared their methods. Across the board, the key seemed to be to have it fully integrated into the course by taking students to the lab regularly and using it to determine a good portion of the grade. In the past, it was assigned as homework. This summer three faculty members integrated ALEKS into their course and took students to the lab almost daily. The plan is to do the same in the fall, where more instructors will be using ALEKS than in the past.

Another complaint students have had in the past with regard to ALEKS is that there were some topics assigned on ALEKS that were not covered during class. Several faculty members spent a significant amount of time in May and June to tailor the topics specifically to our textbook course and the ALEKS tutorial and then designed a course just for SBCC based on their work. It was piloted this summer and the faculty reported that the topics matched very well.

All three summer faculty members were new to ALEKS and were very excited to have a way to see how much knowledge students entered the course with and to see how much growth they made, even if they did not pass the class. For instance, one instructor commented that a student entered the course only knowing 7% of the material (most students enter with initial assessment scores near 20%) and improved to about 60% of the material. This is a great gain, but still not enough to pass the course. This is the kind of knowledge that has been unavailable to us in the past, in addition to having very detailed reports about how much time students are spending on task.

With a majority of Math 100 instructors using ALEKS in the fall, we are hoping to have more data to compare and to see more promising results.

The department is also working on short refresher courses for Math 4, Math 100 and Math 107. These courses are intended for students who have already completed these courses and need a refresher before taking the subsequent course; students who attempted a higher course unsuccessfully and need review of the prerequisite material; and students who are unhappy with their assessment level. ALEKS will be used in these courses as well and is offered at a 6-week price of close to \$20. The hope is to have these courses ready to go beginning Spring 2007. We plan to offer them twice each regular semester, so that students who begin in one course unsuccessfully would have a place to go to stay on track. This idea came from discussions with San Diego Mesa College which has been using ALEKS for five years.

Evaluation of the Student Athletic Achievement Zone (SAAZ)

Objective 13.

The course completion rates for student that used the Student Athletic Achievement Zone will be at least 5% higher than those targeted to participate in the SAAZ but did not do so.

The data needed to evaluate the success of the Student Athlete Achievement Zone (SAAZ) is not available at this time since the software program used to collect attendance data (ZULU) was not in place until after the start of the Spring 2007 Semester. In Fall 2006, 145 of student athletes that used the services provided in the SAAZ responded to a student satisfaction survey designed to assess their perceptions of the benefits of this program. The responses from 101 of the students that completed this survey are reported in Table 15.

Table 15

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. My coach encourages me to participate in the Achievement Zone	58.4%	38.6%	2.0%	1.0%
2. Jason and Charlie were helpful mentors while I attended the Achievement Zone	49.5%	49.5%	1.0%	0.0%
3. Jason and Charlie created an atmosphere for learning	37.6%	60.4%	2.0%	0.0%
4. Jason and Charlie created an atmosphere for accountability	42.4%	56.6%	1.0%	0.0%
5. I received tutor assistance when I needed it	30.7%	51.5%	14.9%	3.0%
6. The video orientation topics helped me in my academic success	15.8%	44.6%	21.8%	17.8%
7. Before entering SBCC, I felt that I was prepared to do college level work	26.7%	55.4%	16.8%	1.0%
8. I feel that the Achievement Zone has helped me	36.6%	57.4%	5.0%	1.0%
9. I feel that the Achievement Zone has helped me to be more successful in one or more of my classes	38.6%	54.5%	5.9%	1.0%
10. I like the controlled Achievement Zone study environment	34.7%	57.4%	7.9%	0.0%
11. I like being held accountable for my academic success	37.6%	57.4%	5.0%	0.0%

The responses to the survey indicate that with one exception the video orientation topics helped me in my academic success, the overwhelming majority of the student athletes felt that the services they received in the SAAZ were helping them to succeed in their classes. The data on the course completion and college persistence rates of the students that used the SAAZ compared to those who did not do so will be available for the 2007-08 academic year.

Plans for enhancing the effectiveness of the Student Athletic Achievement Zone to increase student success.

The following activities have been initiated this past year to establish the SAAZ and to enhance its effectiveness to increase student success.

- Continue to implement a mentoring and tutoring program designed to increase the success of those students in subject areas that correspond to the courses the student athletes are taking.
- A large number of faculty have volunteered to assist with tutoring in Math and English in the SAAZ.
- Gateway tutors will be stationed in the SAAZ.
- Additional coaches will be compensated to monitor and provide assistance to the students in the SAAZ.
- Additional tutors will be available to assist students in the SAAZ.
- Create opportunities for athletes to attend Math Lab, Writing Lab and other specific tutoring sessions for 1-2 hours of their achievement SAAZ hours. Referral forms will be used to document student time spent in these labs.
- To better accommodate the needs to student athletes, the SAAZ will be open six more hours per week.
- A reward system and a probationary system will be implemented to increase student use of the SAAZ.
- The Cyber Center will be made available in the evenings for students using the SAAZ.
- More flexible schedule for student-athletes will be implemented.
- Increase the support and structure offered at-risk students who need support and structure more than any other students in higher-education by providing, (1) academic evaluation, (2) instruction in study skills, (3) peer tutoring and/or professional tutoring, (4) supplemental instruction, or course-related, systematic, and highly structured group tutoring, (5) cooperative learning demonstrations, (6) referral services to other programs and services on campus and (7) maintain close relations with offices that provide personal, financial, educational, and career counseling and provide training for peer counselors, faculty mentors, and advisors.

Coaches and student athletes are enjoying the benefits of our programs mission. We have been able to educate student-athletes about the campus wide resources available to them at SBCC and to teach study skills necessary to navigate through the challenges they will face in education and lifelong learning. We are also creating an environment of understanding and accountability.

Evaluation of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Initiatives

Objective 14.

Substantial progress will be made toward meeting the Accreditation Standards for developing, implementing and using student learning outcomes to document and improve student attainment of the desired learning outcomes at the course, program, certificate, degree and institutional levels.

This objective on target to being achieved. As of the end of the Spring 2007 semester, SLOs, measures/rubrics/checklists have been developed and used in at least 118 separate courses in 41 of the 55 departments. In addition, progress has been made in developing SLO and measures of their attainment for each of the college's student support programs (e.g., Admissions, Counseling, Financial Aid, EOPS/CARE, Library and Study Abroad). All of the faculty that have field tested SLOs in one of more the their classes and the vast majority of the students in their classes reported that the SLOs/rubrics/measures were helping students to attain the desired course learning outcomes (skills and competencies).

Plans for fully implementing the SLO Cycle.

At the Fall 2007 Faculty In-Service, all Educational Programs departments and programs will be asked to complete a plan to fully implement the SLO Cycle for all core courses and student support programs by Spring 2012. The SLO Cycle consists of the following components:

1. Develop SLOs, rubrics and measures for all core courses, state approved certificate and degree programs and student support programs.
2. Map the course SLOs to department certificate/degree, student support programs and institutional SLOs.
3. Collect and report data on student attainment of the standards established by the department for each of the course and support program SLOs, (Below Standard, At Standard, Above Standard).
4. Meet with members of the department on a regular basis to review the student performance data and to identify strategies to increase student attainment of the desired course, certificate/degree, program and institutional SLOs.
5. Repeat the SLO Cycle implementing the new and/or modified strategies identified by the faculty/staff to promote student attainment of the SLOs.

All departments will be required to implement the SLO Cycle for at least 25% of their courses (2 or more units) beginning in 2007-08 and will be expected to have completed the SLO Cycle for all courses and programs by the end of the Spring 2012 semester.

Faculty and student support programs staff will be asked to provide feedback on the draft of the six Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) that were developed

this past summer by the SLO Task Force. We believe that the final version of the ISLOs will be approved by the Academic Senate in September.

A plan for incorporating SLOs into existing Senate and Educational Program committees will be presented to the Academic Senate and to the Deans Council in August. The plan calls for these committees to provide the leadership for: (1) reviewing course, certificate/degree, student support program SLOs and the ISLOs; (2) reviewing student performance data on achieving the SLOs and ISLOS; and (3) identifying strategies and training for increasing the percentage of students that attain the SLOs and ISLOs.

Additional criteria that will be used to evaluate the Partnership for Student Success Initiatives beginning in the 2007-08 academic year

1. College course completion rates will be increased by a minimum of 2% in 2007-08 and 3% in 2008-07 compared to the rates in 2005-06.
2. College persistence rates over a four semester period will be at least 3% higher per term than those of students that enrolled in 2005-06.
3. Percentage of students in academic good standing will be at least 5% higher by the end of 2007-08 and 8% higher by the end of 2007-08 compared to the students in 2008-09.
4. Number of students that complete a degree and/or transfer to a four-year institution will be at least 5% higher in Spring 2008 than in Spring 2006.
5. Percentage of students that complete a degree and/or transfer to a four-year institution will be at least 5% higher in Spring 2008 than in Spring 2006.
6. College course completion rates in Basic Skills courses will be at least 3% higher 2007-08 and 5% higher in 2008-09 than they were in 2005-06.
7. Percentage of student in Basic Skills courses that enroll in the next courses in the sequences in ESL, English and/or math will increase by at least 3% in 2007-08 and 6% on 2008-09 compared to 2006-06.
8. Percentage of student in Basic Skills courses that successfully complete in the next courses in the sequences in ESL, English and/or math will increase by at least 3% in 2007-08 and 6% on 2008-09 compared to 2006-06.
9. Persistence rates of first-time students who enrolled in a Basic Skills class during the first semester at SBCC will be at least 3% higher in each of the following three terms than they were for a comparable group of students who entered SBCC in 2005-06.