FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Student Success Collaborative
Tuesday, April 25th, 2017
MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Room 1901
TIME: 11:00 AM – 12:30 PM

ITEMS	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	11:00-11:05	Approval of Minutes- March 14, 2017	Kuo	Approval
2	11:05-11:15	Equity Programs Update	Kuo	Discussion
3	11:15-11:25	Review Timeline for Integrated Plan	Kuo	Discussion
4	11:25-11:45	~~Integrated Planning Model Outcomes~~ *POSTPONED*	Kuo	Discussion
5	11:45-12:00	Integrated Plan Funding Parameters	Kuo	Discussion
6	12:00-12:20	Mentoring Program Models	Kuo	Discussion
7	12:20-12:30	~~Student Mentoring Needs Assessment Survey~~ *POSTPONED*	Kuo	Discussion

PRESENT: Kelaiah Harris, Carolyn Holcroft, Elaine Kuo, Micaela Agyare, Lan Truong, Adrienne Hypolite, Andrew LaManque, Laureen Balducci

1) MINUTES- March 14, 2017

The meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

2) EQUITY PROGRAMS UPDATE

The Equity Programming and Positions meeting will be on Wednesday, April 26th at 3pm to discuss the recommended positions and the priorities of the student equity budget. If Thuy Nguyen is unable to attend the meeting, the college will continue the discussion and make a recommendation. Elaine Kuo will present the feedback and recommendations to the President's Cabinet.

As discussed at the previous Equity Programming and Positions meeting, the college recommended reclassifying the Director, Equity Programs to a Dean-level position, moving forward with the hiring for the Non-Instructional Faculty Professional Development Coordinator and the Learning Community Coordinator, develop an Instructional Services Technician to support the expansion of the TLC, and reclassify the Administrative Assistant to Program Coordinator I.

The Learning Community Coordinator will be funded 50% from 3SP and 50% from Student Equity. There will be faculty representation on the hiring committee, but as faculty may not be available during the summer, the hiring committee should convene during spring quarter. Thus, the most realistic timeline would have the Learning Community Coordinator hired no later than June 30th and start in the summer.

Previously, the college hired an Instructional Service Technician position for the STEM Success Center. It was recommended that the SEW hire a second Instructional Service Technician for the TLC. Both positions will provide an opportunity for the STEM Success Center and TLC to bridge efforts. The hiring

committee for the Non-Instructional Faculty Professional Development Coordinator will convene this week with the goal to complete the hiring process in spring quarter.

Elaine Kuo has convened the hiring committee for the Instructional Service Coordinator positions for the 3SP researcher and the student equity researcher. The hiring committee will go out for both positions simultaneously. The positions will report to the Institutional Researcher with a subsequent reporting line to the respective Dean of the division; thus, the 3SP researcher would report to Lan Truong, Dean of Counseling and the student equity researcher would report to the Dean, Equity Programs. Note: Each researcher is being funded out of their respective funding sources. Both positions have been posted and advertised, and will close in 3 weeks. There will be a 2nd round of interviews in early June to include both AVPs (instruction and student services) in the process. Depending on the applicant pool, the committee intends to have both positions staffed by July.

The Administrative Assistant position is currently working out of class as a Program Coordinator I, with the goal to reclassify the position after the ACE study. By the end of the quarter the position will obtain all professional development administrative duties. There has been some discussion to continue with Courageous Conversations for those who participated in Beyond Diversity 1 or 2. There has also been additional conversation to develop a strategic plan regarding the focus of professional development priorities and capacity for next year to be used as a guiding document for this position. The Non-Instructional Faculty Professional Development Coordinator would be responsible for coordinating these events with the support of the Program Coordinator I.

The Director, Equity Programs reclassification will go to Classification Committee on May 8th. Once approved, the job description will be posted and the hiring committee would likely begin the search process in the summer. The hiring manager will need to coordinate with the Academic Senate to provide faculty representation for the hiring committee. The goal will be to have the new position as a permanent hire by fall. The Interim Director, Equity Programs position has been extended to September; this would provide enough time for the hiring committee to permanently hire for the Dean, Equity Programs and for Lan and Elaine to onboard the two researcher positions.

If the college decides to pursue and fund these positions along with the Umoja and FYE learning communities, there will be limited equity funds remaining. Umoja and FYE is estimated to cost $100,000 per program, largely due to the counseling/instructional faculty release time. Due to the existing allocations, there are still funds available for this year and as of February 15, 2017 the state has allowed colleges two years to use funds. However, once the positions are hired, and even with the carryover of funds and new allocations each year, the college will need to establish an ongoing sustainable cycle to continue to fund these positions (assuming that the college will be allotted roughly the same amount each year). This year, there was a decrease in funds, some of which was related to the decrease in FTES. With enrollment being down for the college, this could have some effect on funding, thereby impacting the positions and equity efforts.

If the student equity funds absorb all of the recommended positions, Umoja and FYE, this would result in a deficit. There may be an opportunity to free up some of the funding if Student Services is willing to fund 50% of the counseling release time for the learning communities. The Umoja state organization has also requested for 1.0 faculty reassign time for next year, this is being negotiated. FYE will be requesting faculty reassign time for next year as well. FYE and Umoja will attend the next SEW meeting and present their budget proposal to the workgroup. Going forward, the SEW can discuss providing a fixed budget for both learning communities to operate. But this will still leave very little money for professional development efforts and for the Non-Instructional Faculty Professional Development Coordinator to scaffold events.

The college allocates money to the PDC, but it is not a sizable amount. There is also the Travel and Conference funds available, but majority of the professional development funding comes from student equity. One concern was raised that limiting professional development funds may not send the right message; if faculty are being asked to become equity minded in the classroom, then the SEW should provide some resources. A rough estimate of the actual cost spent on professional development from student equity funds can assist with determining the allocation needed for next year.

Furthermore, the limited funding would impact the SEW's mission and how it operates, this will need to be discussed with the workgroup. With the impact to the budget, the college will need to determine the commitment and priority of the funds. As the Collaborative begins to approach the integrated template, this discussion is critical to the planning and writing of the document.

There was a suggestion to prioritize the positions to free up additional funds. This can be considered at the Equity Programming and Positions meeting tomorrow; which positions can be delayed, if the Director should be reclassified, and if the college can hold off on the Learning Communities Coordinator or classify the position at a Program Coordinator I level instead of Program Coordinator II.

A proposal should be developed indicating plausible prioritization models for the positions and the budget. This should be proposed to the college and then discussed. The model could propose the following: holding off on the Instructional Service Technician for the TLC; keeping the Director, Equity Programs at its current level; keeping the Learning Community Coordinator and look for alternative funding (20% from student equity and 80% 3SP). The Collaborative should also follow up with Denise Swett regarding the counseling release time.

The reclassification of the Administrative Assistant and the hiring of the Non-Instructional Faculty Professional Development Coordinator position would continue as planned. Also, the SEW can consider whether to continue providing direct student support (book vouchers). Note: proposals approved this year will not be impacted.

3) REVIEW TIMELINE FOR INTEGRATED PLAN

Elaine presented the timeline to complete the 2017-19 Integration Plan template by the December 15th deadline. Based on the timeline, the draft plan would need to be submitted to PaRC in the beginning of November for the first and second read, after Thanksgiving the plan would go to the Board of Trustees for review; therefore, the Collaborative will have some responsibility for meeting during the summer to write the plan. During the fall, the data can be reviewed and adjusted for the purpose of writing the plan. The Collaborative can discuss if this timeline is reasonable; if needed, future meetings could be adjusted and the schedule made more flexible considering that perhaps not all of the plan's initiatives would be accomplished.

The Student Success and Retention Team would come to the Collaborative meeting in June to have a joint discussion. Going forward, the Student Success and Retention Team and the Collaborative would meet on a quarterly basis, and the Student Success and Retention Team would meet every two weeks to discuss the implementation and planning components. The template indicates that the college must determine 5 goals. The Collaborative should consider identifying the integration efforts in order to determine the goals and outcomes of the plan.

To briefly review, the Integration Plan outcome is for first-time new students who place in below college-level Math and English and complete transfer-level/degree-applicable Math or English (need to identify time frame). The following should be considered as the Collaborative moves forward with the integrated plan:

- Resources/Inputs
    - Resources needed to achieve the program's objective
    - These resources include SEP, 3SP, and BSI funds
- Activities
    - What the program does with the resources
- Outputs (can be measured)
    - Direct products of activities
- Outcomes
    - Changes that results from activities and outputs (includes short-term and intermediate)
    - Long-term goal of moving first-time new students who place in Math and English along the basic skills pathway to complete transfer/degree applicable Math and English courses at a higher rate.

Should the Collaborative identify 5 goals for integration and alignment, the plan can be further flushed out.

5) INTEGRATED PLAN FUNDING PARAMETERS

The Integration Plan states that expenditure guidelines can now be determined at a local level based on reasonable and justifiable expenses.

The Collaborative will need to have a discussion and determine the criteria for funding, as this will have budget implications. Ideally, the funding criteria would be one guiding documentation and sent to PaRC for review. The criteria can be written similar to the narrative discussion of BSI and 3SP eligibility guidelines.

Based on conversations that had occurred from the SEW, BSI, and 3SP the parameter are as follows:

- Required service/product (how is this critical)
- Alignment
- Students served (count)
- Student value
- Student risk (detriment to students)
- Cost
- Impact
- Evident of student success

The Collaborative will have a further discussion regarding the parameters for funding. This topic should also be discussed at the SEW, BSI, and 3SP.

6) MENTORING PROGRAM MODELS

The Equity Programs office have reviewed various mentoring models, including existing models on campus and the Latino Empowerment at De Anza (LEAD), as well as discussed mentoring with the learning communities. The Collaborative should consider piloting a mentoring program with the learning communities next year. ASFC could be an opportunity for funding. Students will need to be hired as a TEA, but it was noted that the TEA packet can become a barrier for students.

The challenge with mentoring is providing a broad labor force to service more students. The Non-Instructional Faculty Professional Development Coordinator perhaps could provide more information on

this context when he/she comes onboard. The mentoring program would service the basic skills pathway at the course level. Ideally, a needs assessment should be conducted to determine what students want in a mentoring program and to identify the area of focus for training mentors.

The Collaborative will need to determine if ASFC would be interested in committing to a mentoring program. There was discussion regarding the sustainability of the program. Should the college decide to pilot a program, student success outcomes should be discussed before the pilot is implemented. Ideally, the mentoring program would grow and expand to Early Alert and other areas on campus such as the Transfer Center. There was a suggestion to consider creating a space for the program so it is not tied to tutoring, but can be more of a hangout area for students to drop in and receive mentoring services. The space would be staffed by students and supervised by faculty or staff. This would also reduce concern for students who cannot commit fully to the mentoring program, but would like to participate and eliminate case management training. There was a recommendation to name the mentors Peer Advocates or Peer Allies, as the term mentor could be misleading. Faculty can also consider having a similar model in their curriculum, this could be an initiative for the Non-Instructional Faculty Professional Development Coordinator.