

**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**

**Student Success Collaborative**

**Thursday, September 1st, 2016**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**PURPOSE:** Student Success Collaborative (BSW + SEW + SSSP)

**LOCATION:** Administration Building / Room 1901 / President’s Conference Room

**TIME:**  3:30 PM – 4:30 PM

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ITEM** | **TOPICS** | **LEADERS** |  |
| 1 | Retention Team Location | Kuo & Truong | Discussion |
| 2 | Equity Innovation Fund  | Nguyen | Discussion |
| 3 | Implementing Cohort Process | Kuo | Discussion |

**PRESENT:** Laureen Balducci, Adrienne Hypolite, Kelaiah Harris, Andrew LaManque, Angel Tzeng,

 Carolyn Holcroft, Lan Truong, Elaine Kuo, Paul Starer, Maureen McCarthy, Thuy Nguyen

**(1) RETENTION TEAM LOCATION**

The idea of the Student Success and Retention Team developed around the commitment on integrating student services and instruction. The Retention Team’s initiatives are to improve the achievement of student outcomes among those population groups experiencing disproportionate impact. There has been much discussion on the initiatives and best suited location for the Retention Team to help facilitate these goals for students.

Lan and Elaine met to brainstorm some ideas. They stressed the need for the involvement of the learning communities and their coordinators in this discussion, and the need for a thoroughly thought out process before any decisions are made.

To lead their discussion, they emphasized the goal of the Retention Team location should coincide with meeting the goals of equity. The Student Success Collaborative would need to determine the vision of the location. For example, whether the space should be a centralized location for learning communities and the Retention Team or would it be used for program retention purposes only. Lan and Elaine interpreted the ideal vision for the Retention Team location as a space for the broader learning communities, in which Puente, Umoja, FYE and possibly Stem Core students can be housed together. For example, events, activities, orientation, end of year celebrations, and workshops can be created to include all learning community students. Some benefits of having a combined space are (a) prevents duplication of services, (b) all students have the opportunity to engage in activities, (c) potential to house the mentoring program, and (d) it can still remain a work center for students. If the learning communities (Umoja, Puente, FYE, and Stem Core) can agree to match goals, then more students can be served.

In support of this idea, they referred to research on the ecological systems theory of human development. According to the ecological systems theory, there are five environmental systems with which an individual interacts (ex: individual, family & peers, school & neighborhood, mass media & local government, social conditions & cultural values). Lan and Elaine explained how crossing these environments and boundaries can help students engage with one another and provides a well-rounded experience. Within the Foothill College community, student success can be promoted by institutionalizing larger communities and encouraging interconnectedness.

According to Lan and Elaine, the ideal vision might be to create a broader learning and retention community and combine services with Early Alert. Early Alert provides students with workshops for time management and organizational skills, as well as counseling services. Since Early Alert will continue to remain in the counseling center for student privacy and managing of confidential needs, a central location will allow Early Alert to bring its services to the students. A rotating space, comparable to a conference room, will allow Early Alert to hold workshops and can also be used for counselors and faculty to hold office hours. These services can be wrapped around the center.

The committee expressed the need for the Retention Team to be housed in the same location as the student hub as it is valuable to have faculty and/or staff in the space to address questions or concerns students may have. For example, PSEC students are surrounded by faculty to help facilitate services and in case of student concerns.

Lan and Elaine also discussed the possibility of a staff-faculty hub. The staff-faculty hub will be centered around an equity lens on professional development. It could also be used for the potential development of new hire orientation training for classified staff.

The location could be incorporated in the student hub with the retention team or a separate location isolated from students. Separating the staff-faculty hub may be ideal, as staff and faculty share information and discuss case management, these discussions should remain confidential. If repurposed, the staff lounge could be a potential location for the staff-faculty hub. Also, the previous workforce center on the other side of the marketing and international office could be an option. The hiring of the Non-Instructional Professional Development Position will help determine this vision and more discussion from faculty and staff will be needed to clarify their visions of the staff-faculty hub.

Before any plans or implementation, these ideas need to be further discussed with the initiators and coordinators of the learning communities. Learning communities will need to evaluate their expectations and goals of the wrap around services. Organization and collaboration of shared vision is required in this process.

In response to Lan and Elaine’s shared vision, Paul Starer recommended building 3600 as an option. The location will serve TLC and Pass the Torch, and has approximately 5 rooms (2 unassigned offices, 3 small group offices), and direct access to the library. The location is close to the foundations lab, easily accessible, offers soft seating, and is scheduled to open fall quarter. This location might potentially be able to house the peer mentoring program as well.

Currently the student success center, which houses the Student Ambassador Program, has been designated as the student hub for learning communities. The committee discussed whether the student success center will remain the student hub, with the potential of building 3600 to become the location for the Retention Team or would the student success center be a hangout space for students, and building 3600 will be a location for academic purposes.

Someone mentioned a concern of housing learning communities in 3600 with TLC and Pass the Torch. Since students in learning communities will be provided services from Early Alert or potentially the mentoring program, will students who are not in learning communities have the opportunity to use these services? It may be inequitable to offer these services only to learning community students, when other students may be in need. The EOPS tutoring services were acknowledged as a similar scenario. The tutors in EOPS only tutor EOPS students. EOPS tutors are not limited to tutoring in the EOPS center, but since the space has been created and previously established it is the rational solution. However, Early Alert and mentor services specifically administered to learning community students is not immutable.

The committee will continue this discussion in collaboration with all those who may be affected by the decision. The committee will reconvene in October after the learning community coordinators, faculty, and staff have returned for fall quarter.

**(2) EQUITY INNOVATION FUND**

President Thuy Nguyen discussed the idea of using private funds for the opportunity to encourage innovation. Foothill College is the first community college to offer online classes and Thuy would like to challenge the Foothill Community to continue this innovative thought process.

Her plan is for people to submit a two page proposal of initiatives, activities, or programs. The proposal does not have to include technology.

The committee discussed how this differs from the equity proposal process and equity funds. Equity proposals are limited to what people can do, for example does the proposal meet the equity guidelines, is it a feasible activity, what are the expected outcomes, and how can it be applied to the Student Equity Plan.

Thuy explained that the private funds will be used as an experimental factor, almost to the idea of risk. The requestors should be thinking out of the box.

Someone recommended using the concept of a big idea contest with the goal of major changes/programs to improve and promote student success. The committee agreed the big idea contest would be best for Thuy’s objective and a possibility for the winner of the contest to receive a monetary reward.

Thuy also volunteered to review the proposals and meet with the requestors to share information and flush out ideas.

For guidelines and directions on the big idea contest, the committee thought it best to include the equity plan. More specifically, the equity indicators can help guide but not limit the proposals. The equity indicators are access, course completion, ESL and basic skills completion, degree and certificate completion, and transfer. After a brief discussion on determining the number of students to be served in the proposal, the committee decided the proposals should serve approximately 500 students.

Thuy will create draft a document and email it to the Student Success Collaborative members for feedback. She will also connect with marketing to work on language and notify the Student Equity Workgroup of the big idea contest before announcing it to the college on Opening day, Friday, September 23rd.

**(3) IMPLEMENTING COHORT PROCESS**

Elaine Kuo presented a flow chart she created for the cohort/learning community implementation process.

Programs will need to be approved by PaRC before implementation. Ideally in this process, after the program receives approval from PaRC the flowchart will guide the coordinators through the logistics and operational aspects of implementing a program. Before this process can begin programs will need to identify a program lead (dean/faculty?).

The flow chart outlines a process circulated with instructional and student services leadership. For example, once the coordinators determine the preferred demographics of students in the program, they will meet with marketing and outreach for recruitment. The flowchart maps out these particular processes including speaking with the dean and enrollment services to identify curricula and register students in courses, meeting with the appropriate people to track students’ progress in the program or code core sections specific to the program, etc. Someone suggested to revise the flow chart and include numerical steps (1,2,3) in the interest of readability and follow through.

There was discussion on whether the flow chart should be used to start conversations around implementation before or after program would ideally receive approval from PaRC.

1. The processes within the flowchart should take place prior to college approval as they could possibly take a quarter or more to put into place. This will help leaders identify the logistics in advance and guide initiators through the process.
2. The flow chart represents literal organizational logistics and steps that happen after approval when strategic implementation is ready.

IP&B has also created a process to improve the early stages of program creation and implementation that includes campus awareness and faculty by-in. The collaboration of IP&B’s document as well as Elaine’s flowchart will systematically smooth the introduction and implementation process of new programs.

The college is currently in the process of vetting the flowchart. Once approved the flowchart will become an official document for program implementation.

The committee will circle back to this discussion in future meetings.