FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Student Success Collaborative
Thursday, July 23, 2015
MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

LOCATION: Room 1901 – President's Conference Room
TIME: 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM

ITEM	TOPICS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	Early Alert Program – Continued	
2	Mentoring Program	ACTION
3	Agenda for Next Meeting	ACTION

ATTACHMENTS:
None

PRESENT:
Kimberlee Messina, Craig Gawlick, Paul Starer, Karen Smith, Elaine Kuo, Andrew LaManque, Justin Schultz, Victor Tam, Carolyn Holcroft

ABSENT:
Laureen Balducci, Lan Truong, Hilda Fernandez, Roberto Sias, Teresa Zwack, Sarah Munoz, Erin Ortiz

1. EARLY ALERT PROGRAM – CONTINUED
Andrew LaManque began the meeting by proposing the key questions the group members were asked to consider in preparation for the meeting.
   (a) Who would be critical members of an Early Alert Program?
   (b) What other components / additional resources are needed?
   (c) What other programs have an existing Early Alert Program?

The Program Coordinator II (Early Alert) job description was reviewed and discussed. Members of the group noted that the description states the Program Coordinator II reports to a Senior Program Coordinator. The assumption was that the Program Coordinator II would report to the Associate Vice President of Student Services.

Kimberlee Messina proposed postponing the continued Early Alert discussion until the following meeting due to the absence of the Student Services representatives, who were unable to attend due to a scheduling conflict with a division meeting. The group agreed with the suggestion.

2. MENTORING
Kimberlee began the discussion by proposing the following question, *"What mentoring programs currently exist on campus?"* Victor Tam asked if Pass the Torch counted as mentoring – it was clarified that the program would not be counted as such. Victor noted the S-STEM Grant in PSME, which was used for a mentoring program for students at a financial disadvantage who applied/qualified – they were then

paired with a faculty mentor and required to meet 3x per term for academic coaching and career suggestions (<u>not</u> advising) outside of their scheduled STEM coursework. Approximately 20 students were involved in the grant-funded program. The key aspects of the program were noted as the following:

    (a) faculty-to-student mentoring
    (b) faculty-to-student ratio of 1:1 or 1:2
    (c) faculty compensation: $200/year [3 meetings per term each term]
    (d) faculty mentors complete a brief orientation session prior to involvement

Andrew asked if any feedback had been received – Victor noted that he was unsure if any student testimony data had been collected. Elaine Kuo added that Institutional Research has not been involved thus far.

Paul Starer noted that he is currently working on a proposal for a mentoring training program to allow mentors to train other mentors.

It was agreed upon that the following list of programs/services should be consulted to determine what individual mentoring programs might exist (or serve as a model for campus-wide implementation):

    (a) Campus Ambassador
    (b) Associated Students of Foothill College (ASFC)
    (c) EOPS *(outside of counseling/tutoring)*
    (d) Veterans Center *(paired with internship process?)*
    (e) CTE [Clinical Internships] – *cohort model + greater individual attention?*
    (f) Dental Hygiene *(senior students serving as peer mentors)*
    (g) Paramedic/EMS *(does approach similar to DH exist?)*
    (h) Athletics

Andrew requested clarification as to the group's definition of mentoring (e.g. faculty-to-faculty, student-to-student, etc.). Andrew also noted that the goal is to establish another avenue for student engagement. Paul added that it is not only about reaching out to more students, but also about targeting and reaching out to the students most in need.

A consensus was reached regarding the resources needed to address the question(s) proposed above as well as established of any mentoring program. The following resources are critical:

    (a) Mentor Selection [Criteria / Advertising]
    (b) Mentor Training [Professional Development] + Mentee Training [Expectations]
    (c) Mentor / Mentee Responsibilities *(two-way street)*
    (d) Process for Student Mentee Selection [AT RISK Definition?]
    (e) Incentive for Mentor/Mentee Participation
    (f) Mentor Program Coordination [Staffing / Funding]
    (g) Proposed Metrics for Measuring Success
    (h) Designated Meeting Space [for student-to-student mentoring]

Andrew proposed establishing/finding a link between mentoring and Early Alert (along with other campus initiatives), including orientation (possibly including a mentoring presentation). Andrew also noted that it is difficult for some students to see the benefit(s) of a mentoring program before it starts.

Kimberlee suggested adding the discussion of inclusion in orientation and outreach to the agenda for the next meeting, as the representatives from Student Services would be able to provide more information and clarification.

Andrew asked the group to consider how a systematic approach to mentoring and mentor-mentee selection could be structured.

Paul added that the challenge is that the students we want to reach have the most tenuous connection to the College – they do not take advantage of what is already available to them as a service. Paul added that the addition of some type of social component might be useful (to replicate the dormitory experience that exists at the 4-year level). Andrew also noted that at the 4-year level, orientation sessions serve to facilitate informal peer mentorship connections (through social meetings and activities).

Kimberlee noted that adjunct faculty members teach the majoring of classes (including Basic Skills courses) – she noted that it is critical that adjunct faculty be included in mentorship training and opportunities. Kimberlee added that this highlights the importance of having a program coordinator role assigned to mentorship. Paul noted that numerous adjunct faculty members also work in the TLC and this involvement has had a significant impact on the students' experience related to the services provided, as students see their faculty in other roles outside out of the classroom.

Andrew reiterated the importance of determining the focus of the mentoring (e.g. academic vs. personal), as this may overlap with Student Services, and that guidelines must be established for the mentors – to give them a frame of reference of what is OK and not OK to discuss with students. Paul summarized that the fundamental thing is that the mentor gets the student invested in their success – the mentor is not the sole person for all services, but he/she is a connection (someone checking in and showing a genuine interest).

3. AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING
In preparation for next meeting, the programs/services discussed above will be contacted regarding existing mentorship programs (if any). This will serve to facilitate continued mentorship program planning.

The Early Alert Program discussion will also continue once representatives from Student Services are able to attend and provide their insight and suggestions.