



FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Student Success Collaborative
Tuesday, June 13th, 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- April 25, 2017	Kuo	Approval
2	10:35-10:50	Review Mentoring Needs Assessment Survey	Kuo	Discussion
3	10:50-11:15	Review Integration and Alignment Plan Goals	Kuo	Discussion
4	11:15-11:35	Confirm Integrated Plan Model	Kuo	Discussion
5	11:35-12:00	Identify Next Steps	Kuo	Discussion

PRESENT: Kelaiah Harris, Carolyn Holcroft, Elaine Kuo, Micaela Agyare, Lan Truong, Adrienne Hypolite, Lori Silverman, Paul Starer

1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES- APRIL 25, 2017

Meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

2) REVIEW MENTORING NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

The draft version of the proposed mentoring survey was presented to the Student Success Collaborative for review. Upon review, changes and edits will be made to the survey to reflect feedback and the final survey will be administered online before the spring quarter ends. Elaine Kuo will connect with Romeo Paule to discuss possible incentives for students in an effort to increase student participation. The survey will provide an opportunity for the Collaborative to gather additional information from the students and use this information in the Integrated Plan.

The purpose of the survey is to provide a better understanding of students' concept of mentoring and to assess need. In addition, the survey could be used to identify desired outcomes, such as skill development for academic success (time-management, organization, etc.), career development, social engagement, and non-cognitive development (motivation, commitment, etc.). The Collaborative can consider additional desirable outcomes if needed; however, the outcomes should be measurable and evaluated to assess student success. The survey will also collect students' expectations of a mentoring program, perceptions of mentoring, and provide ground development for a mentoring pilot program. The survey will be administered to students enrolled in the basic skills pathway this year and currently enrolled in spring quarter. Some considerations the Collaborative may want to be mindful of when developing a mentoring model are the training components and costs, staffing needs, and capacity.

As mentoring can occur in varying types of programs, the following mentoring programs were discussed:

- **one-to-one-** one mentee to one mentor

- **individual to team**- one mentee paired with specialized mentors or one mentor with more than one mentee (can occur at programmed events)
- **peer to peer**- mentee paired with mentor; typically there is an age difference or difference in years of experience
- **peer to group**- one mentor and multiple mentees; typically there is an age difference or difference in years of experience.

The Collaborative can consider which mentoring pilot program will best meet students' need.

There was some discussion that the survey should also be created using a framework that is not deficit-minded. The survey may inherently refer to components that the college views as successful, but may not reflect the students' perception of success. Some of the desired outcomes of the mentoring program may not reflect the goals of the students. The Collaborative should consider how students identify success, for example, students may see success as reducing the number of attempts to pass a course, and not necessarily passing the course with a successful grade. On the other hand, students may not know how to define success until they have accomplished it. The survey should be developed using language that is mindful to best capture the students' perspective. Perhaps language can be edited to identify areas students want to improve. Additional data collection such as focus groups, qualitative data, and individual observations could also be considered.

If students are not receptive to a structured mentoring program, other programming such as workshops and informational events can be provided. When providing programs and opportunities for students, the college should be mindful not to assume what students want or need; therefore it may be beneficial to scale back to ground level and ask critical questions about students' needs.

The members of the Collaborative provided the following feedback for the draft mentoring survey:

- Question 5- Rephrasing the question and so it is more concrete and measurable.
- Perhaps include an Agree or Disagree statement that defines what it means to be a successful student.
- Question 6- Maybe too difficult for students to answer, should consider rewording phrases such as "humane facilitator" and "reciprocal relationship".
- May need to be careful with the phrases used as students may have different definitions.
- Question 8- Change to "Rank" instead of "Select all that apply". Can also reframe the question to, "The college provides information to students in a variety of forums, consider the following and rank those that you would be most comfortable receiving information from."
- Question 12- Refers to an earlier question in the survey, should consider moving this question.
- Question 6- The mentorship expectations list is too long.
- In the mentorship extra survey, Question 6 should include "Librarian" as a response.

The mentoring program will serve first time new students who place in the basic skills pathway; however, it may be beneficial to survey other populations in addition to students who place in the basic skills pathway. The mentoring program should serve the population that is most "at risk" and not limited to first time new basic skills students. This survey could be administered to other student populations (non-basic skills students) in the fall and the responses from each student population could be compared.

Additional feedback and comments on the survey should be provided no later than Friday. Edits will be made to the survey and a final version will be sent via email for the Collaborative to review. The student emails and IDs will be built into the survey, therefore questions related to student demographics will not be included.

3) REVIEW INTEGRATION AND ALIGNMENT PLAN GOALS

The Integrated Plan timeline has been revised to reflect the cancellation of the April meeting and the shift of the planning timeframe. The draft plan should be completed during the summer before fall quarter. In October, the draft plan will be sent to the Core Mission Workgroups for review. In October and November, the plan will be submitted to the President's Cabinet and PaRC (as well as other constituency groups such as Academic and Classified Senates, and the Associated Students of Foothill College (ASFC)) for review, and the Collaborative may request funding from ASFC for the mentoring pilot program. PaRC will have the month of November for the 1st and 2nd read of the plan. In early December, the plan will go to the Board of Trustees, and finally on December 15th it will be submitted to the California Community College Chancellor's Office. Elaine will present this timeline to the BSW and the SEW.

The Collaborative will review each plan's (SSSP, SEW, and BSI) goals over the summer. Elaine will email the individual workgroups to gather this information and review areas of overlap. The Integrated Plan refers to the following student success indicators: access, retention, ESL and basic skills completion, course completion, and transfer. The transfer/degree applicable indicators should be further flushed out, as not all students want to transfer. The Collaborative can consider using the following outcome-based goals: identification and use of services among those at-risk; collaboration with high schools, community, and workforce; and improved non-credit success (CDCP certificates/transition to credit). Note there is an optional "other" goal category that can allow for some customization of the plan that would more directly address the college's specific needs.

There is a word count limit (e.g. 250 to 500) for all of the responses, which is different from the previously submitted plans. While the plan does not require data submission, the Collaborative will still need to review the disproportionately impacted student population data to write the plan. It is unclear if feedback will be provided on the document. There will be a data study session workshop over the summer (most likely in July) to review this information.

4) CONFIRM INTEGRATED PLAN MODEL

The Integrated Plan model will need to be finalized. Potential goals should be identified and additional information can be included for the instruction component. The Non-Instructional Faculty Professional Development Coordinator can help support initiatives related to the classroom once the position has been filled. Once the model is finalized, it will be shared with the stakeholders (instruction, student services, and professional development, etc.) involved to review, and provide feedback and improvements on the identified services.

5) IDENTIFY NEXT STEPS

Over the summer, the Collaborative will meet to begin writing the Integrated Plan. There will be a separate meeting to review data either in July or August and a meeting will follow specifically for the writing of the plan. The meeting can be three hours if needed and food can be provided. There was some discussion on requiring attendance for these meetings. All tri-chair members should be present for this conversation, and there is some concern that members may not attend during the summer. Attendance could be required for the chairs of each group (SSSP, SEW, and BSI). There was a suggestion to be strategic when planning meetings and reviewing the data. Elaine will contact each group separately to ensure there is a representative present. The Collaborative will aim for the three-hour meeting and an invitation will be extended to Denise Swett, Andrew LaManque, Laureen Balducci, and the new VPI, Kristy Lisle. The meeting to review data will be scheduled in July to allow

time to review data points and provide feedback. There was a suggestion to check-in with Thuy Nguyen to appoint an Administrator tri-chair for the BSW to ensure the position is filled before the Collaborative reconvenes in the summer.

The Equity Programs office is looking to hire a work-study student during the summer to be a liaison between the Collaborative and ASFC. There was a suggestion to contact Daphne Small, as there could be some interest from the newly elected ASFC student government members or Kathryn Maurer's students. If there are any students who may be interested in this position, please contact Elaine.