

**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**  
**3SP + Equity + Basic Skills Collaboration**  
**Thursday, July 16, 2015**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**LOCATION:** Room 1901 – President’s Conference Room  
**TIME:** 12:00 PM – 1:00 PM

ITEM	TIME	TOPICS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	12:00 PM – 12:30 PM	Guest Presentation	
2	12:30 PM – 1:00 PM	Early Alert Program – Discussion	Action

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Item 1: Meeting Agenda  
 Item 2: Rachel Baker – Presentation PowerPoint

**ATTENDANCE:**

Carolyn Holcroft, Karen Smith, Laureen Balducci, Paul Starer, Roberto Sias, Elaine Kuo, Andrew LaManque, Justin Schultz, Kimberlee Messina, Lan Truong

**ABSENT:**

Hilda Fernandez, Craig Gawlick , Victor Tam, Teresa Zwack

**GUESTS:**

Rachel Baker

**MEETING START:** 12:00 PM

**1. GUEST PRESENTATION – UNDERSTANDING HOW STUDENTS SELECT MAJORS**

Rachel Baker from Stanford University presented on *Understanding How Students Select Majors* to provide a foundation for the eventual discussions within the collaboration group. Rachel has been working with Foothill and De Anza for more than two years on research for her dissertation.

For today’s presentation, Rachel focused on two research questions:

- (1) what majors do students know about and which do they say they would consider choosing,
- (2) what factors are important to students when they are deciding on a major.

A summary of her finding can be found below:

- a. There is a need to increase general awareness of what majors are available.
- b. There is not a lot of difference in awareness across groups (e.g. male/female, ethnicities).
- c. Grouping / segregation exists in major selection (e.g. business/accounting/management).
- d. Non-financial reasons appear to be a greater determinant for major selection than financial.
- e. Male students care more about earning potential than female students.
- f. Students update their beliefs about economic returns to program (for good news, not bad news).
- g. 77% of students report they are considering majors in more than one broad field.

- h. The average student is considering at least 2.6 fields (i.e. great deal of uncertainty exists).
- i. Important determinants were (1) will this lead to a job I will enjoy, and (2) do I like the subject.
- j. Female students are less likely to choose business, computer science, or technology.
- k. Less affluent students are less likely to choose creative writing or language arts majors.

The full PowerPoint presentation can be found as an attachment to the meeting minutes. Rachel encouraged the group to contact her with any additional questions or follow-up at [rachelbb@uci.edu](mailto:rachelbb@uci.edu).

## **2. EARLY ALERT PROGRAM – DISCUSSION**

Andrew LaManque began the discussion by reviewing the email Kimberlee sent summarizing the last meeting. She suggested that for each initiative we:

- (1) evaluate what currently exists,
- (2) conduct a gap analysis,
- (3) determine what resources are needed, and
- (4) determine appropriate funding needs.

Andrew suggested the group start with Early Alert and move forward from that point (mentoring, and targeted professional development).

### EVALUATION OF WHAT CURRENTLY EXISTS

Lauren Balducci discussed the introduction of a pilot program in PSME (using 3SP grant funding) with an interim coordinator and two teaching assistants who met with at-risk students (as indicated by reports provided by participating faculty members [approximately 400 reports]). This was a somewhat effective approach but it lacked the speed associated with a built-in software program for flagging and outreach. Manually contacting individual faculty and informing them of the efforts made with the students is very time consuming. Currently, there is no built in method with the Advocate electronic system – it focuses on behavioral conduct issues. There is no research data available yet on the impact of the program.

### DISCUSSION OF GOALS & RESOURCES NEEDED

Lauren Balducci and Lan Truong both discussed the eventual introduction of Starfish Enterprise Success Platform, a comprehensive, web-based program that provides instructors with access to up-to-date course rosters and the ability to flag their students (using a variety of behavioral categories). Using this system, an Early Alert Coordinator would be able to monitor the flags and forward them to a counselor and/or appropriate resource. Follow-up data can then be entered for the instructor to view. Tracking mechanisms for multiple flags and services provided are also built into the program. Lan Truong noted that the State wants to utilize Starfish and Foothill College is on the list to be one of the first five schools to get the software, but likely not until Fall 2016.

Roberto Sias noted that training (professional development) for the faculty is critical. Kimberlee Messina and Lauren Balducci both reinforced that ethical/integrity training will be part of any new rollout of software + outreach procedures. Kimberlee Messina emphasized the need to determine what resources would be required for the implementation of a revised Early Alert Program.

Lauren Balducci stated that the job posting is up for an Early Alert Coordinator, whose role would be to monitor the Early Alert software program (i.e. flags) and forward the alerts to counselors and relevant resource. The hiring committee has been formed and is ready to consider candidates.

Lan Truong summarized the main goal of an Early Alert Program: *To identify students early on so they can experience academic success and pass their classes.* She noted that the difficulty the College faces is that students are on a 12-week quarter system and the students must be identified by the 4<sup>th</sup> week. This requires faculty buy-in to do more assessments early on in each term.

Andrew LaManque stated that this is more of a “section-based approach” and there may be differences between the interventions to help a student persist at the college versus pass a particular class (ranging from personal and financial aid counseling, to tutoring or peer mentoring). The student may not succeed in their current course but may experience success in later courses (due to timing restrictions, etc.). He suggested a more holistic “student-based approach” to help them find success in more than just one flagged course. Laureen Balducci added that having a counselor tied specifically to the Early Alert Program would be a helpful approach. Carolyn Holcroft reinforced that the overarching goal is to identify at-risk students and get them to the right resource – this could mean identifying students for help before the quarter starts. Elaine Kuo added that getting the students to use the right resources available to them is also key (not just point them in the right direction).

Kimberlee Messina noted that it can be agreed upon that aside from the mission of the program, the first two goals for the development of the Early Alert Program would be (1) establishment of an outreach software program [Starfish], and (2) hiring of an Early Alert Coordinator.

Lan Truong emphasized that Early Alert is a shared responsibility. Elaine Kuo noted that it must be a team approach and have collaboration across departments, not a unilateral approach lacking any form of feedback. Lan Truong noted that if an instructor shows they care and approaches a student, it can have a tremendous impact, possibly more so than an unknown counselor or coordinator offering assistance. Kimberlee Messina suggested integrating the flagging / outreach into the 2<sup>nd</sup> week roster certification procedure.

Kimberlee Messina asked the group members to consider the shared responsibility approach and **who would be critical members of an Early Alert Program team.** She asked the members to think about this alongside the goals already discussed. How will student serviced in programs such as EOPS or DSPS fit into the Early Alert framework?

The Early Alert Program discussion will continue in the next meeting. Discussion of mentoring and targeting professional development will also be moved to the next meeting.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 1:00 PM**