



Behavioral and Social Sciences  
Guided Pathways Success Team

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> L. Alamillo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y. Farah	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C. Hurd	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> O. Teal
<input type="checkbox"/> T. Bailey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> C. Gold	<input type="checkbox"/> J. Jefferis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S. Uribe
<input type="checkbox"/> V. Casillas	<input type="checkbox"/> B. Goldenberg	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D. Miranda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N. Caraveo
<input type="checkbox"/> M. Delgado	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A. Hagan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K. Preciado	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D. Reed
<input type="checkbox"/> J. Melendez-Iglesias	<input type="checkbox"/> E. Garcia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N. Robinson	

**Meeting Minutes**  
**October 11<sup>th</sup>, 2021**

**Meeting was called to order at 2:03 PM.**

**Announcements**

The team welcomed a new member to the team, Meta Major Success Coach Noemi Caraveo. Noemi has already been hard at work communicating with students to help guide them to the resources and information they need, and she is a welcome addition to the team.

The Meta Major Success Communities Meeting (October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 11AM-1PM) was discussed, and an invitation was sent to all team members. The goal of the meeting is to update all of the Success Teams on the progress that Guided Pathways has made in constructing Success Communities, and to discuss the future of the Success Teams.

Dean Chris Gold updated the team on a study that Institutional Research and Planning are doing on the “best practices” of professors with especially low equity gaps.

**Discussion / Activity**

ECC Connect Liaison – The team continued discussion of adding a faculty member to act as co-liaison. The responsibilities would include attendance at the semi-regular meetings of the ECC Connect Liaison group, and helping to promote ECC Connect usage at department meetings. Several team members (Orion Teal, Sandra Uribe) expressed interest, and Dora Miranda promised to follow up with information on the Liaison groups meeting times. David Reed will follow-up with the potential co-liaison volunteers.

Gateway Course Identification Exercise – The team revisited the Gateway Course identification issue, this time applying a Gateway Course Exploration form developed by Institutional Research and Planning (IRP), which was given to the team by Data Coach Yara Farah (see Appendix 1).

We started with the courses that have the highest enrollment: POLI 1, PSYC 101, COMS 100, HIST 101, SOCI 101, HIST 102, ART 101, ANTH 1, CDEV 103.



## Behavioral and Social Sciences Guided Pathways Success Team

We then analyzed the data on the Gateway Course Dashboard with regard to: enrollment, abandon rate, withdrawal rate, rate of repeaters, success rate among 1<sup>st</sup> attempt students, equity gaps, and percentage of students majoring in the BSS Meta Major.

David Reed shared a list ranking the top five courses on each indicator, and suggested that the courses that appear on the largest number of these lists are the best candidates for Gateway Courses. The team discussed the data, and opted to stick with the initial designation of Psychology 101 as a Gateway Course, and to add Child Development 103.

Since there were a few other courses that also showed up on a lot of the lists for the key indicators, the team decided to request data on five courses total for further study (see “Proposed Data Request” below).

Proposed Data Request – The Data Committee (Yara Farah, Chris Gold, Chris Wells, and David Reed) met on Monday, September 27<sup>th</sup> to discuss the question of what data to request from IRP. The Committee concluded that while the IRP dashboards that were developed for the Success Teams have their utility, we really need to have spreadsheets of the relevant data so we can do our own analyses, and because some of the dashboards aren’t specific enough for the kinds of analysis we wish to do. The committee decided to recommend requesting the following data going back to 2017 to develop baseline measurements:

- Spreadsheets of data available on the [Guided Pathways Dashboard](#) (% of students in cohorts, % receiving student aid, % with an Ed Plan, 1<sup>st</sup> term units, and 1<sup>st</sup> year units) and the [Course Completion Dashboard](#) (success rates) by instructor going back a few years (2017-Present?)
- Equity gap data by course (we probably can’t get data by instructor)
- Equity gaps in degrees and certificates – the IRP Dashboard on Program Awards Degree and Certificates lists % of students awarded degrees and certificates by ethnicity, but not equity gaps.
- Fall-to-Spring retention by race/ethnicity
- Transfer velocity – there is some old data on the [Chancellor’s Data Mart](#), but nothing past 2014. We should ask if IRP can generate this kind of data for us.

The team briefly discussed the proposed data request, and agreed with the Data Committee’s recommendation. Data Coach Yara Farah will reach out to IRP to request this data.

**Meeting was called to a close at 3:00 PM**



## Behavioral and Social Sciences Guided Pathways Success Team

### Appendix 1 – Gateway Course Exploration Form

#### Gateway Course Exploration

Goal of activity: *Identify gateway courses in your department, and start to think about how to improve the completion rates of these courses.*

Instructions: *For the purpose of this activity, a gateway course is one in which many students struggle to complete and, as a result, prevents them from completing a program of study.*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department / Meta-major: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Before reviewing your data, which course(s) offered by your department do you believe might be a gateway course? (You may start with the document from career counseling).
2. Prior to section census, students may drop a course for a variety of reasons (to enroll in a different course, because the course material is too difficult, preference for another instructor, life events, etc.). Let's define the "abandon rate" as the rate at which students drop a course between the first day of class and section census and do not enroll in a different section of the same course. What abandon rate (percentage, 0-100) or above might concern you?
3. In every section, there are students attempting the course for the first time and there are students repeating the course. What proportion (percentage, 0-100) of repeat students in a course or above would alarm you?
4. What is the expected success rate for courses in your department among students attempting them for the first time? What 1st attempt success rate (percentage, 0-100) or below might concern you? [institutional standard is 64% below which would raise concern; goal is 74%; for goal-setting help, contact institutional research & planning—e.g. incremental goals to reach vision for success goals]

Instructions : *We will now review course enrollment data from Spring 2019 – Fall 2020 to explore and identify potential gateway courses in your department. Please go to the following link: [Gateway Dashboard](#).*

A course is a *potential* gateway course if any of the following is true:

- The course is a prerequisite for subsequent courses in the program.
- The course enrolls a high number of students.
- The course has a high abandon rate (drop before section census).
- The course has a high withdrawal rate (abandon rate plus drop rate after census).
- The course has a high rate of repeaters (non-first attempt) in the classroom.
- The course has a low success rate among 1st attempt students (default is 64% (institutional standard)).
- There is disparity in course success rates among groups of students (eg, ethnic groups).
- The course has a high percentage of students who are majoring in the meta-major of the course.



## Behavioral and Social Sciences Guided Pathways Success Team

1. Based on the dashboard, which courses are potential gateways? Why are they flagged as potential gateways? (See 1-7 above). Do these findings align with your intuition about these courses?
2. What metric, from the ones above, would you use to rank your choices? In other words, which one(s) has/have the most impact on students?
3. What additional questions do these results make you ask? In other words, what information would you like to know about these courses to better understand the results?
4. Now that you have this information, what action can YOU take to address your concerns within your department? What actions can you imagine your department take? The institution?
5. What are the incremental improvements you would expect to see if these interventions are applied to your course(s)?