



FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Student Success Collaborative
Tuesday, March 14th, 2017
MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Room 1901
TIME: 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM

ITEMS	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	10:30-10:35	Approval of Minutes- February 14, 2017	Kuo	Approval
2	10:35-10:45	Update on Equity Programs Office Organization and Responsibilities	Kuo	Discussion
3	10:45-11:15	Review Data for Basic Skills Population-English Pathways	Tzeng	Discussion
4	11:15-11:40	3SP, SEP, and BSI Alignment Mapping (Draft Model)	Kuo	Discussion
5	11:40-12:00	Review Student Success and Retention Team Membership	Kuo	Discussion

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

1) MINUTES- February 14, 2017

The meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The state has released the Action and Expenditure Plan template integrating the three plans (BSI, SEP, and 3SP including noncredit and credit). The template can be found [here](#). As previously discussed, the college is expected to submit one plan on December 1, 2017. The 2017-19 Integrated Plan will cover two years and the budget plan will reflect the 2017-18 allocations. Allocations will now have a two-year timeline to distribute all funds, so the 2017-18 budget can be carried to the end of the 2018-19 academic year (June 30, 2019). The funding for BSI, SEP, and 3SP will remain separate but will be reported in one template. The college will continue to receive allocated funds from the state annually and the mid-year report of expenditures is required annually as well.

The districts and colleges are now afforded the opportunity to make spending decisions locally, but should ensure that all expenses are reasonable and justifiable. As defined by the state, “Reasonable” means expenditures are prudent and every effort is made to utilize funds efficiently. “Justifiable” means expenditures are consistent with goals and activities related to the BSI, SE and SSSP. The ineligible expenses remain as follows: gifts, stipends for students, political contributions, courses, and supplanting. The college will need to have a conversation to set parameters and guidelines for eligible expenditures. For example, t-shirts and professional development out-of-state travel could potentially be an eligible expense should the college approve. If the funding request can be tied back to student success and the goals of the program, it may be worth some consideration, but this is also a larger discussion regarding the prioritization of these funds. Moving forward, the process of budgeting the learning communities will also need to be considered, especially if new programs emerge.

The template requests multi-college districts to demonstrate some level of coordination among the colleges. Foothill is in the process of coordinating with De Anza regarding common assessment, academic senate, board policy procedures, and more. Elaine will reach out to De Anza to further discuss coordination efforts. At the next meeting scheduled in April the group can begin filling out Part II of the template and return in May and June to flush out the integrated plan. As the plan is not due until the end of the year, there will be flexibility in the work timeline. The state also requests that there be one individual (with one alternate) serving as the point of contact, so the college will need to determine who will be responsible for this task.

2) UPDATE ON EQUITY PROGRAMS OFFICE ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Elaine Kuo has been meeting with campus constituencies to discuss the equity funded positions and the organization of the Equity Programs office. On Tuesday, March 21st there will be a meeting with participatory governance and Thuy Nguyen to have a discussion based on feedback Elaine has gathered and a recommendation will be made to the President. There has been much discussion on the equity funded positions and the office organization. The feedback Elaine has gathered encourages the college to remain focused on the implementation of the equity initiatives and the goals of the SEP. There was a request for Elaine to present this information to members of the SEW at the next SEW meeting. This discussion will be added to the SEW's agenda.

3) REVIEW DATA FOR BASIC SKILLS POPULATION

Angel Tzeng presented data on the English pathway on students identified as basic skills, who are enrolling and attempting ENGL 209 and ENGL 1S for the first time. The data does not represent students who are repeating ENGL 209 or ENGL 1S. Angel's data noted an increase among Latino/as students enrolled in ENGL 209. The pathways were identified as follows:

- a. ENGL 209 to ENGL 110 to ENGL 1A
- b. ENGL 209 to ENGL 1A
- c. ENGL 1S to ENGL 1T to ENGL 1B

Students can place in ENGL 209 or ENGL 1S based on the results of the placement test. After completion of ENGL 209, some students may be eligible to retest and based upon their score enroll directly into ENGL 1A as identified in option b. Note: Students who choose to transfer to a UC must complete a course applicable to composition, critical reading and thinking (ENGL 1B).

For the ENGL 209 pathway (refer to option a and option b as indicated above) fall '14 enrollment consisted of 225 students enrolled and 137 students with successful completion of the course. In winter '15, the ENGL 209 to ENGL 1A pathway included 29 students who were eligible to enroll into ENGL 1A, of which 25 completed the course. In comparison, 91 students enrolled in ENGL 110 in winter '15 after completing ENGL 209, of which 80 students successfully completed the course. Continuing into spring '15, 65 out of the 80 students who completed ENGL 110 enrolled in ENGL 1A and ultimately 53 students completed the course.

The ENGL 1S pathway consists of a smaller cohort; there has been a decrease in enrollment of the pathway because of the unit implication with the co-requisite requirement (ENGL 242A/B). In fall '14, 107 students enrolled in ENGL 1S and 87 students completed that course. In winter '15, 65 students of those ENGL 1S completers enrolled in ENGL 1T, and 49 students completed the 1T course. In spring '15, 43 students enrolled in ENGL 1B and 27 students successfully completed the course.

The ENGL 1S pathway suggests that as students complete each course in the sequence, they experience success rates that are successively lower; however, with the ENGL 209 pathway, students experience lower success rates at the ENGL 209 course compared to other courses in the pathway, which may represent a barrier for completion.

The Collaborative expressed interest in learning more about the English pathway and collecting long term data. To determine if rates are consistent, the fall '14 cohort data can be compared to that of fall '15 and fall '16. There was a suggestion to consider looking at the pathway over a two year time period to give students enough time to complete ENGL 1B and determine the rate of students who stop at ENGL 1A. It would also be of interest to explore how the UC transfer requirement of successful completion of ENGL 1B impacts the students' decision to persist to ENGL 1B or are students likely to stop at ENGL 1A because ENGL 1B is not a requirement for CSU transfer. The next Collaborative meeting will follow up on data for Math and ESLL.

4) 3SP, SEP, AND BSI ALIGNMENT MAPPING (DRAFT MODEL)

Elaine presented a draft of the alignment model to the Collaborative. The model is a graphic that displays the alignment initiatives identified by the group are, to some extent, all connected in the effort to lower the achievement gap and reduce the amount of time for students with basic skills needs to achieve transfer level.

The Collaborative briefly reviewed the instruction and mentoring initiative. The instruction component will include professional development and the expansion of the Foothill Teaching and Learning Academy (FTLA), in addition to team-teaching for instructors who teach basic skills courses. The Collaborative would also like for the learning community faculty to participate in the professional development component, but further discussion is needed on the expectations of faculty participation.

The mentoring component will include an internal faculty peer mentor program, an internal student peer mentor program, and an external student mentoring program in which the mentors are professionals. There have been some logistical challenges as far as compensation and student related employment. As it stands, there is a fine line in the eligibility guidelines to provide students with stipends using equity funds. 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.

According to Human Resources, students can only be compensated if he/she is a student employee. There are only two categories of student related temporary employment assignment (TEA), tutor and note taker. In order to compensate students, a new category will need to be created and approved for student mentors. As TEAs, 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. There was also some consideration to provide mentors with course credit, but this option would need to be further discussed as there may be some implications.

The purpose of the alignment is to incorporate initiatives that overlap within all three plans. This does not preclude the 3SP, BSI, or the SEW from continuing their distinct initiatives. For example, the SEW can continue its efforts on the research component, program review tool, and educational planning data. The Student Success and Retention Team will be responsible for implementing the aligned initiatives.

The Collaborative can continue to refine and add detail to the alignment mapping as needed. Some members expressed an interest to begin having conversations on the developmental stages of the mentoring component. Future Collaborative meetings will provide further research and discussion on mentoring. It is also critical to continue discussions on the evaluation of the initiatives. Future meetings

will also include reviewing the evaluation component and determining the individual point of contact for the state.

5) REVIEW STUDENT SUCCESS AND RETENTION TEAM MEMBERSHIP

The Student Success and Retention Team membership was briefly reviewed. The membership is as follows:

- Early Alert Counselor
- Student Success Specialist
- Part-Time Counselor
- Director, Equity Programs
- Faculty Coordinator (Non-Instructional Faculty Professional Development Coordinator)
- Instructional Services Coordinator (Equity)
- Administrative Assistant
- Student/Peer Mentors
- Supplemental instructors
- Instructional Services Technician
- Researchers
- Early Alert Coordinator

The Part-Time Counselor position has not been filled, but was originally created to serve the students that were recommended to the Student Success and Retention Team.

There was a brief discussion to pursue a student representative to be included in the framework of the Student Success and Retention Team. This process may need to be facilitated by ASFC. Elaine will follow-up with ASFC.

There was a request to categorize these positions based on the areas each position will serve as demonstrated in the alignment mapping. This will be presented at the following Collaborative meeting.