Charge: *The Student Success Committee (SSC) is the participatory governance committee responsible for student success and related initiatives. The SSC integrates and aligns student success efforts into a cohesive strategy through on-going evaluation of data. SSC makes recommendations to close achievement gaps and continuously improve student success outcomes in accordance with State guidelines and the Ventura College Master Plan.*

Agenda Items	Discussion Notes	Action	Date	Who
1. **Call to Order**	Meeting called to order at 2:05pm.			
2. **Public Comments**				
3. **Approval of Minutes** • 2/27/19	V. Allen motioned to approve minutes. Yes: A. Rodriguez , H. Alawadi, V. Allen, T. Lawler, R. Fernandez No: P. Muñoz and B. Herrera Abstain: M. McDonough, L. Morales Minutes approved.	**Vote**		
4. **Civility During Meetings**	"Be the change that you want to see in the world" D. Bell asks that we all be the change we want to see on this campus. Only two chair members present at the meeting as the third tri-chair resigned due to various reasons. D. Bell asks the committee members for feedback on what the "norm" should be of committee members during meetings. D. Bell facilitates discussion regarding how the committee can work to move forward cohesively with each other to close achievement gaps and better student success efforts on our campus. C. Salas apologizes for being late and she had not been at the prior meeting but heard from others and stated one personal expectation she has for committee would be to not take things personal or get defensive when information is asked for. C. Salas believes this information is beneficial in serving our students. D. Bransky states his personal experience was that he left last week's meeting with a sense of discomfort, part of which being the tone that seemed to open a door of divisiveness. D. Bransky states the meeting was not comfortable and the challenges we face are more complex than any one person's agenda. He states one challenge faced among the committee is bringing out perspectives of other members and he hopes for a greater sense of collaboration among members who may see things differently.	**Discussion**		

	A. Rodriguez states from observations that the committee may be lacking a clear purpose and starting point to build from. It's not a one-size fits all and tension builds when things are done on campus without research and digging deep to look into our student populations. L. Morales agrees with Alma's statements. Committee members are in agreement that semester is almost over and nothing has been done. D. Bell clarifies what he believed to be the focus of where the committee was going and that it was to go slow and figure out specifically what we wanted to do based on the research and data that had been analyzed instead of jumping into ideas. Planning for the future instead of modifying things that had already been in motion. H. Aguailar states communication is a massive breakdown on campus with people working in silo's and not sharing and listening to others on campus who are working on those ideas and then building from that together. Committee members believe a possible retreat would be good in order to create solutions and work on these issues. L. Morales believes one conflict among the committee is because member's have various versions of how "student success" is defined to them. D. Bell again opens discussion to committee on how to move forward while other programs may already be in motion. A. Rodriguez suggests leaving things as status quo, such as dual enrollment, while it's analyzed instead of adding on to initiatives that may not be working. Once initiatives are looked at and ideas made then Executive Team can find the dollars to support those ideas. D. Bell states again that this was the course the tri-chairs had and where they were going but they hadn't gotten there yet. V. Allen also agrees that this is what we had agreed on as a committee focus. H. Aguailar suggests forming a list in SSC committee of programs and initiatives happening on campus. One frustration among committee members is dual enrollment and the needs that weren't met in order for the dual enrollment program to be successful. Hearing that dual enrollment is back-up is discouraging considering the faculty needs that still have yet to be met and discussions that have yet to be had in order to fix the issues that had the negative outcomes, such as the handbook that had been promised.			

	D. Bell asks where else on campus issues can be brought up or addressed as things arise or if historically it has always been brought to student success committee. C. Salas requests a protocol in requesting information. R. Fernandez believes a report at each meeting of "we are here, we are going here, this has been funded, or this is happening" would be good so members of the committee are aware and feel sense of purpose. He believes when members don't feel heard it creates tension. Discussion had amongst committee members and the need to figure out the direction as some members and tri-chairs thought we were going away from budget and gearing towards efforts/workgroups to research and analyze data in closing achievement gaps. L. Morales would like to do both; look at the budget while also working to towards the gaps.			
5. **SEA Budget**	Budget handed out to committee members. P. Munoz believed when changing charge, what we were letting go of was the RFP process, not looking at the budget all together. Tri-Chairs were trying to listen to the presentations and then bring in the budget to look at what we could do to help some of those areas for the future. R. Fernandez believes budget should be a standing item to review what's being spent. B. Herrera reads one part of charge and asks committee members for their interpretation of "cohesive strategy through on-going evaluation of data", her interpretation is looking at what was funded and the data to show it had made progress in closing achievement gaps and that initiatives aren't being continuously funded without purpose or data to show they are working to close those gaps. B. Griego gives brief description on BSI, 3SP, and Equity RFP's funded from last year. B. Herrera asks that the committee look at the RFP initiatives funded from last year as a starting point and then Faculty can take the fight elsewhere for positions being funded out of SEA. A. Rodriguez states that this should all come through the committee or else there's contradictory work being done which would trump and conflict with the hard work being done by the committee. Question raised by committee of how to measure if positions being funded for staff and faculty are closing achievement gaps.	**Discussion**		

	Rollover money from last year was used to fund RFP initiatives. Majority of SEA budget is being used for faculty and staff salaries and benefits. Question raised what process these positions have gone through in order to be funded. Discussion regarding flaws in the progress review process. Program Review lacks the option to hire people on an "urgent need" basis. L. Morales asks if SSC committee could review when these decisions are made, such as urgently needed positions, so that the committee is aware. B. Herrera asks what the next steps will be for budget at next meeting. D. Bell clarifies the requests of the committee and confirms they would like to 1) Review status of last year's RFPs, what was funded, and update/data on initiative and 2). Report of positions being funded out of SEA by department and category. Committee members confirm those are the two requests for next meeting.			

6. **Future Agenda Items:**
    a) **Taskforce Workgroups AB705/AB1805**
    b) **Campus Compass**
    c) **Presentations: Foster-Youth Low-Income**				

7. **Open Comments/Announcements**				
8. **Adjournment**	Meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.			