

Student Success Council

Meeting Notes

NAME OF COUNCIL/TEAM: Student Success Council			
OBJECTIVE OF MEETING:			
DATE: 04/01/2026 TIME: 1:00pm		LOCATION/ROOM #: Board Room CALL-IN NUMBER: https://lrccd.zoom.us/j/83032729059 CALL-IN CODE:	
FACILITATOR(S): Angela Kay Daroy, Dianne Cervantes, Neue Leung			
TIMEKEEPER:			
ASSISTANT: Bernice Foster			
MEMBERS PRESENT: Angela Daroy (Milano), Michael Crowder, Caterina Falli, Ramses Galvez, Neue Leung, Caitlin Zumalt, Kaira Bradley, Michelle Brock, Dianne Cervantez, Bernice Foster, Marilyn Garcia, Liz Geisser, Narinedat Madramootoo, Reyna Moore, Brenda Valles, Amanda Lewis			
SUPPORTING RESOURCES (ITEMS READ IN PREPARATION FOR AND/OR BROUGHT TO MEETING):			
UPDATES AND BRIEF REPORTS:			
Topic	Person(s) Responsible	Notes	
HOTEP: What were the research results?	Lauren Ford	<p>Lauren Ford presented HOTEP's Equity Assessment Key Findings</p> <p>Purpose: Assess current practices and provide recommendations for improvement. Methodology (Spring 2025): Mixed methods approach including document analysis, institutional surveys to students & employees and focus groups in 13 sessions</p> <p>Key Themes:</p> <p>Equity identified as a core value, but implementation is inconsistent across employee groups. Found uneven application at department ir program level due to lack of clear vision and alignment. Institutional bureaucracy acts as a barrier (e.g., slow hiring processes, outdated forms, unclear communication); systems prioritize compliance over flexibility. Strengths in student support: ARC and related services are diverse and supportive. Gaps remain in communication, consistency of services, and fostering student social connection.</p> <p>Questions and concerns raised by the council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys were the primary data source, supported by focus groups; limited faculty participation noted. • Council expressed the need for stronger student/faculty engagement and expanded future data collection. Communication issues reduced participation, with need for better outreach via leadership channels. • There was a question about the reported gap between equity values and practice, and reported misalignment with core values. Details were requested. HOTEP indicated that there was a clear desire to advance equity efforts but not be able to move forward with bureaucracy hurdles, and a push/pull expectation or lack of support or information on how to proceed. Lauren said she would send examples from the data. • Concerns were expressed about transparency and governance, including board-led process, consultant selection, and limited shared governance input. Counsel expressed a desire for more inclusive decision-making, despite Board's final authority. Angela responded that the Board has ultimate say. They have continued to support equity efforts but agreed that we could have had a different approach. 	
ACTION ITEMS:			
Question	Person(s) Responsible	Notes and Decision(s)	Next Steps
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview: Midterm report responds to prior ISER; institution previously received commendation + 2 recommendations. Accreditation is required for financial aid and includes annual reporting. • Process: Report developed collaboratively and shared across senates and councils for feedback; companion document allows comments.

ARC Accreditation: What is SSC's feedback?	Brenda Valles	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Focus Areas (2022–2026): Governance, curriculum/experiential learning, equity efforts, infrastructure, and holistic student support. • Progress on Recommendations: Improved standards processes and “closing the loop” practices (communication, response, resolution). • Distance Education: Enhanced regular substantive interaction (RSI) through training, staffing, and new data metrics (faculty practices + student experience). • Student Outcomes & Assessment: Ongoing monitoring via strategic plan; efforts to address achievement gaps through equity-focused initiatives; faculty-driven assessment of learning outcomes. • Data Priorities: Increased data disaggregation (race/ethnicity) and improved public accessibility of student success data. • Future Considerations: Potential impacts from AI, facilities, and legislative mandates. • Timeline & Next Steps: Feedback due early May (target ~May 3); report moves to Executive Leadership Team, then Board alignment, with final submission in October.
Dual Enrollment Charter: What are the suggested changes?	Angela Kay Daroy, Neue Leung	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback Process: Input gathered from Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Student Senate; additional time requested by Academic Senate for deeper review. • Key Concern: Language around “collegial consultation”—faculty want clearer emphasis on relying on Academic Senate input, reflecting past concerns about their voice being overlooked. • Next Steps on Language: Angela will work with senate leadership to revise wording and clarify which areas are “rely primarily” vs. “mutually agreed upon.” • Charter Scope: Establishes framework only; implementation and decision-making processes remain separate. • Approval Process: Academic Senate reviews/approves first → then Executive Leadership Team (ELT) final approval; all constituencies can provide feedback. • Timeline: Updated draft coming soon; expected to appear on next agenda, with continued discussion at upcoming council meeting (April 15).

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Question	Person(s) Responsible	Notes and Next Steps

ITEMS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION:

Topic	Contact Person
Neue suggested that the council could invite Melissa Fish to present on Dual Enrollment to walk through charter as a team for the last revision. It was also suggested that the Dual Enrollment Charter be shared with student senate.	