



**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**  
**Learning Community Meeting**  
**Friday, March 17, 2017**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**LOCATION:** Council Chambers 2018  
**TIME:** 3:00PM – 4:00PM

ITEMS	TIME	TOPICS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	2:00 - 2:05	Spring Registration Update	Discussion
2	2:05 - 2:20	Spring Book Voucher Update	Discussion
3	2:20 - 2:40	Equity Programs Office Organization and Responsibilities	Discussion
4	2:40 - 3:00	Mentoring Programs Initiative Update	Discussion

**PRESENT:** Elaine Kuo, Donna Miranda, Kelaiah Harris, John Fox, Tracee Cunningham, Jue Thao, Justin Schultz

**1) SPRING REGISTRATION UPDATE**

Should learning community students need to be registered before March 29<sup>th</sup> due to the BOG Fee Waiver, please send student's information to Kelaiah Harris so A&R can register these students.

FYE reported that in spring, FYE courses ART 1 and SOC 1 will be open to the general student population due to the limited number of FYE students who will be enrolling in these courses. Although, these courses are open, A&R will register these students into the appropriate section. This is also true for MATH 220, which currently has reserved seating for learning community students. Jue Thao and Tracee Cunningham will confirm how many students will enroll in the Math course in order to open up the remaining reserved seats.

**2) SPRING BOOK VOUCHER UPDATE**

Angel Tzeng presented the spring book voucher proposal to the SEW. Per Angel's recommendation, the proposal will include providing book vouchers for learning community students in the English pathway for spring quarter. The SEW has requested that Angel return to the meeting with a written formal proposal of the anticipated budget.

Going forward, it was recommended that learning communities consider including the book voucher program or a book loan program in their budget proposal for next year. Elaine Kuo will follow up with Angel on the status of the book voucher proposal and will report back to the learning communities.

### **3) EQUITY PROGRAMS OFFICE ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The learning communities received an invitation to meet with Thuy Nguyen and other campus constituencies to discuss the Equity Programs office organization and responsibilities of the equity funded positions. As this conversation will impact the learning communities, faculty and coordinators are encouraged to attend the meeting on March 21<sup>st</sup>. Elaine has been meeting with other shared governance groups on campus to gather feedback for this discussion. This meeting will provide an opportunity for campus constituencies to present their feedback and make recommendations to Thuy.

Per the SEP, the equity funded positions were created to carry out the implementation of the SEP. The Equity Programs office was created as a product of the hired positions. Currently, the Equity Programs office consists of the Director, Equity Programs and the Administrative Assistant. Additional equity funded positions that do not report to the Director, Equity Programs include the Instructional Services Coordinator-Equity, who is the researcher that reports to the Office of Instruction, and the Instructional Services Technician in the STEM Center.

According to the feedback Elaine has gathered, the college has the following recommendations for the equity funded positions: the reclassification of the Administrative Assistant to a Program Coordinator 1; the hiring of the new position for Learning Community Coordinator; the hiring of the new position of the Non-Instructional Faculty Professional Development Coordinator. Other recommendations include hiring an Instructional Services Technician for the TLC and the discussion on whether to reclassify the Director, Equity Programs position.

Elaine is in the process of developing the job description for the Learning Community Coordinator. Once the job description is complete, it will be sent to Andrew LaManque and Laureen Balducci for review. Elaine will also share the job description with the learning communities. The learning communities will have representation on the Learning Community Coordinator search committee. The Learning Community Coordinator will report to the Director and be responsible for coordinating logistics and operations.

The Learning Community Coordinator will also support recruitment efforts. Recruitment by faculty and counselors are more likely to increase student retention because students prefer to identify a face with the program. The college should be mindful that the Learning Community Coordinator may not be the best recruitment method because the position will not be the face of the program, although there is some potential for the position to work closely with students to support the registration component.

If faculty are allowed to recruit and are provided with release time for their efforts, there will be more opportunities to build relationships with organizations in the community. The release time would have budget implications, which would require additional conversation with the SEW and for each learning community. The learning communities can consider alternative forms of compensation such as stipends. The faculty expressed that coordinating a learning community program can be considered an overload. The Learning Community Coordinator may reduce some of the work overload but there was concern that faculty do not receive full compensation for the existing workload.

Given the limited resources (annual fixed budget allocation for student equity funding), priorities in spending will have to be determined. Should release time be assigned, it will affect the allocated funds because funding from other areas will be effected. Moving forward it may be helpful to develop line item budgets to assist with program planning and prioritization.

The development of the Equity Programs office is an effort to increase support of learning community faculty, counselors, and coordinators while working to streamline and document the process. Thereby, it is recommended that the Director provide support and oversight to the learning communities. This organization will also provide support to facilitate coordination and promote an institutional vision. The budget for equity funds is currently housed under Andrew in the Office of Instruction. There has been some discussion about transferring the responsibility of the student equity funds to the Director. Should the Director oversee the learning communities, it would also be helpful to have this position also be responsible for the budget, which funds the FYE and Umoja programs.

There was an inquiry on whether the learning communities counselors will have reassign time provided by equity funds for the next academic year. Should equity funds be responsible for providing 50% reassign time, the expense would largely impact the budget as both Umoja and FYE counselors will have 50% release time. There will be further discussion on the budget implications and the percentage equity will be responsible for funding.

Puente and STEM Core will retain its current reporting lines; Puente to Student Services and STEM Core to the PSME Division. However, this organizational structure will be reassessed in a year as future efforts will consider whether to centralize all learning communities under a single position. The Equity Programs office will continue to provide administrative support for Puente and STEM Core. Both programs are encouraged to participate in the learning communities meetings and activities.

Discussion occurred about the sustainability of FYE and Umoja and the importance of moving beyond being funded solely by categorical funds. Other more stable sources of funding should be identified and considered. As these two learning community programs begin writing program reviews, it will allow for documentation and support the Director's efforts to advocate for stable and consistent program funding.

There was a suggestion to look into TRIO, a federally funded program that support outreach and student services programs designed to identify and provide services for individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds. Neither Foothill nor De Anza offers this program. Elaine will look into TRIO for more information.

The learning communities would like to follow up on the discussion of identifying a space for learning community students. Elaine will work with Justin Schultz to add this topic on the President's cabinet agenda to continue this discussion.

#### **4) MENTORING PROGRAMS INITIATIVE UPDATE**

Elaine has been researching some of the existing mentoring models on campus. Some of the learning communities have MOUs that require a mentoring program. For example, Puente's MOU states that the mentors must be professionals, other programs may not have this requirement. Elaine is currently working with Puente to institutionalize a mentorship program with professionals.

FYE and STEM Core has expressed interest in creating a mentoring program within their cohort.

In the existing programs (e.g. De Anza's LEAD), funds for student mentors are not stable. Some students receive stipends and others are volunteers. The state has confirmed that compensating students for being mentors could be an eligible expense of equity funds; however compensating students to participate in a mentoring program is ineligible.

There have been some logistical challenges to developing a mentoring program where student mentors are compensated. According to Human Resources, students can only be compensated if he/she is a student employee. There are only two categories of student related employment, tutor and note taker. In order to compensate students, a new category will need to be created and approved for student mentors. As TEAs (temporary employment assignments), students are required to be full time (12 units or more) and this can be challenging for the students. Should students drop a course mid-quarter, their employment would also be terminated, which would be especially challenging for the mentor-mentee relationship.

The learning communities previously considered the possibility of offering student mentors course credit, but this approach should be discussed with Andrew. The college can also pursue De Anza's LEAD mentor model and approach ASFC to request funding for a pilot mentoring program. Efforts could continue with Human Resources to determine the possibility of hiring students as peer mentors. As the learning communities are interested in establishing a mentoring program, discussion and planning should occur regarding developing such a program. If a defined program can be clarified next quarter, such a proposal would be robust enough to be submitted to ASFC for funding consideration, and for piloting next academic year.