Foothill-De Anza / NSCCC Leadership Board Monthly Meeting
13 February 2019

Location: De Anza College, ADM 109

Present: Thomas Ray Co-Chair, Brenda Harris Co-Chair
Julie Vo, Liz Ambra, Dave Hoshiwara, Alex Scott , Liz, Ambra Lori Riehl, Peggy Raun-Linde, Valerie Fong, Adrienne Moberly, Sharon Turner, Karen Filice
 Guests: Felisa Vilaubi, Melissa Jaquish

Agenda

1. General Discussion about changes to reporting of hours.

Peggy: Agencies received an e-mail from Neil Kelly yesterday afternoon. CASAS creating updated TOPS report. Unduplicated hours are the key. Julie: has to do with how TE reads instructional hours. Has to be part of an instructional program. ASAP needs to export in WIOA tagged reports. Pick one program so as not to duplicate hours.

Thomas: De Anza participates even though for 17-18 they did not have non-credit classes. Will report office space, use standard system of accounting to report, meetings that were hosted, part of Thomas' time will all be reported as in kind.

Peggy: recognizes the need for clarity because De Anza had costs but zero hours to report.

Thomas: the rules have changed even though our schools/consortium are engaged in the work.

Dave: Will follow up with his agency about this change. Student support hours should be reported as well.

Julie: Mtn. View can share the instructions they received from CASAS on a recent zoom call so that we report the data in a similar way.

Last Meeting Follow-up/Logistical Items

1. Approval: Minutes from January 18, 2019

Liz: motion to approve minutes. Dave seconds. Motion approved.

2. Information from Director:

    a. Work Group Chairs and changes. Workgroups are fully staffed for chairs. 3 chairs for curriculum alignment. Curriculum Development and Articulation and Alignment Groups have rejoined into Curriculum, Articulation and Alignment [CAA]. There may be a sub leader for each sub group. Need to figure this out as we go. In Data Sharon is stepping down and Karen will be data chair until other leaders can be identified.

    b. New member additions to workgroups. Foothill: Antoinette Chavez, adult learners coordinator, runs ambassador program (SS). Foothill: Anthony Cervantez (SS), admissions, also joined student support. DeAnza: Craig Norman,

ESL instructor in curriculum (CAA). Foothill: Donna MIranda, Dual Enrollment (CAA). DeAnza: Magaly Molina: Dual enrollment (CAA). Jon-Michael Kowertz, Foothill Outreach (SS) ... <mark>ACTION ITEM—in progress:</mark> Valerie assisting to get a counselor from Foothill to be part of Student Support.

   c. Director Update: What's been happening since 1/18/19?

      i. Both workgroups have gone through mission and vision. Good data for 3 year plan. Smart goals: two meetings around goals. People have been clear and thoughtful. Prioritized key items. Website is live, uploaded some documents and program information. Peggy has been participating in webinars, asset mapping, 3-year planning. Peggy is trying to get bios and info on students to be ready to launch social media to help with branding and messaging. Need logos! CAEP summit dates: Oct 29-30 Anaheim. Reminders about timelines: agencies will be getting preliminary allocation, should include COLA. Will need to decide how to distribute the money. There are some requests from the workgroups for additional funds. Leadership will have to decide how to allocate the additional funds. March 1: Q2 for17/18 and 18/19 member expense reports due in NOVA along with close out of 16/17 Member Funds in NOVA. There is a webinar February 15 on what to do with any remaining funds from 16-17. Need to certify by March 31. Deadlines are confusing but Peggy is hopeful that there will be more clarity going forward.

   d. CAEP Summit Dates: October 29/30, 2019

      i.

      ii. NEW BUSINESS

3. Workgroup SMART Goals Presentation. Goal: Obtain guidance and approval from the Leadership Board. Special guests: Felisa Vilaubi (DeAnza College, Co-Chair Student Support) and Melissa Jaquish (Foothill College, Pinch-Hitting as Co-Chair for Curriculum Alignment and Articulation)

   a. Working on curriculum alignment between adult schools/both colleges. Smaller group had been working on curriculum alignment for CTE. Student support had also realized they were working on some of the same things.

      i. Smart goal 1: want to have a person to hand off the student in order to support transition. Challenge to keep it updated—people and programs change. There is a priority for student transition.

      ii. Goals 2 and 3 are very similar. Student support wanted a process outlining what needs to happen for adult school students to make

successful transition. Prep students for next learning institution/goal. Transition advisors working on aligning their processes. Felisa will help identify gaps to alleviate the pressure that results in students going back to adult school when it gets overwhelming at CC. The plan is to better prepare students at adult school and identify learning styles, career interest surveys to place students into the right path. May consider Naviance or something similar to support the work.

iii.   Goal 3: effectively help students transition. Some fear is expressed by students going into the CC system. Some of the adult schools do offer more advanced level classes. Want to make sure classes are aligned well in order to place students properly. There has been some resistance along with changes at CC which has slowed down the process of having deeper connection with the CC and adult schools. Outreach can do work at the adult schools to help ease some of the barriers. Can do more focused work with transitioning students like offering specific campus tours for CTE students to familiarize them with the opportunities at CC.

iv.   Articulation: need for multiple measures. De Anza will be instituting 5 levels of non-credit ESL classes. Perhaps can use CASAS or other tests like GED to help remove barriers from participating. De Anza curriculum committee has yet to approve the new classes. Concern from the curriculum committee that it's too late to institute for Fall 19. State has not yet changed any procedures to help speed up the process for approving non-credit classes.

v.   Goal 6: create a cohort and follow the students. May help with tracking of students. Student support had the concept of creating cohorts. Adult school students have different needs than the typical 18 year old. Still trying to identify the attributes of successful adult students so that it's a positive experience. Thomas: this will require space which will be a challenge. The students will need a soft space to land. Felisa: we have discussed student ambassadors who could share some of the important information like how to buy parking permits which also would require space.

vi.   Discussion about goals.

vii.   Peggy: How does the leadership board feel about the goals? Anything missing?

viii. Liz: Goals are great, we've been working on these for a long time. Is there enough time, support and funding to accomplish the goals?

ix. Peggy: workgroups haven't reported any issues with time or funding. More questions about how to bring the work together. Separate groups with shared goals requires some thought and strategic planning on how to do the work.

x. Julie: For smart goal 1: CALWorks has done much of this work through their ed matrix. Using this would speed up the work. Could publish the information on the website. This is specific to course offerings and can be used to identify pathways. Student Support had two separate ideas: career guide as well as "who's who" guide as resources for students.

xi. General feedback on smart goals:

xii. Smart goal 3 could be more specific about the multi-pronged approach to touchpoints of where the handoff takes place.

xiii. Very broad goal: can we identify two goals instead of such an overarching goal? #3 includes short term, mid-term, long-term goals. We can make the articulation, but how do the agreements impact the students? We need to be intentional with students on how they implement the steps for a successful transition. Mtn. View has shared a paper form that could be used. There is a way to use CATMA to share articulated data. 28 colleges are using it. Its one of the best practices in the articulation handbook. Keep it small and start with one tiny piece. Adult school have worked separately to do the work. It's better to combine and use one model across the board.

Goal 4: focus on retention as a means of growth rather than more students transitioning. State may set the goals for us so it makes sense to see what they say with regard to growth.

Valerie: what is the logical order/system to bring to implementing the goals. Some are more straightforward than others. What is the order or priority? More important? What leads into the others? How does the work get organized?

CASAS may be too narrow of a tool to look at for multiple measure. AB 705 has disallowed tests as a multiple measure.

Guided pathways at Foothill work is on-going and should be included.

Goal 6: First year of 3 year hold harmless period on the new funding mechanism. Many questions about future funding at CC. For now this includes retention and completion.

Need to unpack the different populations we serve: some are on a pathway to a degree while others aren't. When we help them set their goals we may need to help them set goals that aren't academic.

Different audiences are going to need different information. Need to tailor responses by knowing the needs of the population.

Sharon/Brenda: Do all groups need smart goals? Do we want them for other groups who are not as active? Do we keep the other groups that are not as active to continue into our next three-year plan? Other groups: marketing, industry and professional development.

Peggy: Career pathways is implied by not explicitly articulated in the smart goals. Strong workforce is consistently mentioned in webinars. Underscores the need for articulation agreements so that students can push forward more quickly.

Sharon: career ladders have produced a toolkit for how to do mapping. The toolkit helps with course mapping that leads to certificates. Tool for helping with alignment/articulation.   Toolkit training 2/27 at Foothill. This could help CTE accomplish something similar to what ESL has done. Perhaps the goal could be for the leadership team to get trained in the mapping hosting some trainings in the process with the goal of mapping one -two pathways.

General acceptance of the goals with some refinement.<mark>ACTION ITEM:</mark> (Peggy will articulate a SMART goal around this for the Board.)

<mark>ACTION ITEM:</mark> Peggy and guests will share feedback with the workgroups. Peggy will have a meeting with all co-chairs to refine SMART goals and fit into three year plan.

   4. Data Workgroup update. Karen and Sharon.

         i.   Should have funding to support the on-going data mining. Someone needs to oversee the data that the workgroups would like to have. Sub-committee met and reviewed the questions that the leadership

group and workgroups submitted. This will require some hours for a researcher to help analyze the data. Sharon will check with David Ulate to see how many hours this might entail. ==ACTION ITEM:== Thomas stated that he had funds that will go unspent and could put toward this for this year if the cost fits within the parameter but then the Leadership Board will need to address how to fund this beyond June 30, 2019.

5. Roles: Determine what the role is of Board Members in workgroups? How many workgroups should a Board Member participate in--both minimum and maximum? What Board "norms" should be followed (i.e. do's and don'ts)?

   i. General Discussion:

   ii. Adrienne: re-envisioning the workgroups. Combining articulation and alignment workgroups. Three task forces/three leaders. Well intentioned professionals in the group. Adrienne considers her role as administrator is a contributor and gives guidance but is not creating the work of the group.

   iii. Julie: the administrator serves as resource/support to the group.

   iv. Thomas: would like more of what we saw this morning. The members are empowered to do the work and present their work to the leadership board.

   v. Peggy: She will have regular meetings with the chairs/co-chairs. Coach them how to structure meetings, how to divide up work, considers this as role of the Director. They will come back and report out as a priority. It would be ideal for there to be at least one administrator in each workgroup so hear what people in the groups are saying.

   vi. Alex: who will oversee the newcomers into the group? Peggy: it will be organic. Peggy welcomed a new member in student support and introduced him to the co-chairs. Peggy is getting lots of e-mail questions from the various workgroup members. Lots of communication already. Positive.

   vii. Julie: where can we see the workgroups and their members? ==ACTION ITE:M:== Peggy has all of the members "sorted" now and will put in a list and will be on the web.

       viii.   Alex: the joining together of the two workgroups into one has left some teachers, especially ESL teachers, think that their support may no longer be needed.

       ix.   Peggy: it will be important for administrators to help their staff see what they can contribute so members remain engaged in the work as we address the smart goals.

Alex: our group has 3 leadership team members in it...and Peggy. Maybe we divide? We want the chairs to be empowered. It's a delicate transition to help empower them to be the leaders. Key issue is that the right people are at the table. Important to continue to reach out to people who should be members of the subgroups as was the case with the dual enrollment counselors coming to the recent meeting.

SUMMARY POINT: Leadership Board (LB) members are not required to be on a workgroup. Leadership Board agrees that LB members are support providers in the meetings and will be support providers on their sites. Peggy will meet with co-chairs and coach leadership, help with agenda planning, help with follow-up items. LB did not identify any "don't do's."

6. Self-Assessment Tool

    a. Review of the answers to the self assessment for clarification and comment.
    b. Based on the above, what additional consortium goals should we have?

General Discussion:

The most important goal is to have articulation system wide! We want articulation agreement that applies to all schools!

Integrated education: Could we have joint 243 programs? For example, Adult Ed ESL with a training program at the college. We did not apply as a consortium but could when it re-opens.

Student support: have yet to do a survey across all agencies. We're addressing this in our smart goal.

Transition: key is demonstrating: we're at the beginning of doing this. And how do we measure effectiveness? What do students report?

Partnerships: tracking the data may be the challenge. Are we answering for one site or for the consortium? What does the term programs of study mean? It has a specific meaning in CTE.

Improvement planning: do we move to an advisory board model? Bring in stakeholders to help us evaluate and improve our program. Similar to CTE and once a year?

ACTION ITEM: Support for the idea for the consortium to complete our plan first, identify who we should connect with, and in the Fall ask for their feedback rather than seek advice now.

7. Asset Mapping:

Need to identify who is out in the community who meets the needs of our adult learners. Start with assumptions, see if they are true and ask questions that we want to know. To help us identify other assets and partners in the community who we could work with or refer students to.

Share agency resources with Peggy to include in the asset mapping.

8. The Logic Model: tabled for future meeting.

9. Task Force: Evolving and Suggested Model

   i. ACTION ITEM: Peggy will proceed without convening task force and utilize co-chairs and Leadership Board as needed throughout the process. Much of the work is already moving forward in this manner. Next meeting March 6 at FUHSD.