Present:

DeAnza: Thomas Ray

Foothill: Kristy Lisle; Valerie Fong

FUHSD: Lori Riehl; Karen Filice; Adrienne Moberly; Liz Ambra

MVLA: Brenda Harrison; Julie Vo

Palo Alto: Dave Hoshiwara; Alex Scott

Guests:

DeAnza--New Counselor Christian Rodriguez;

Foothill-DeAnza District--Executive Director of Research David Ulate

DeAnza--Researcher Ola Sabawi

1. Overview of changes to website. Peggy needs members to take and share pictures for the website and Instragram. Please send to Peggy.
2. Review of meeting minutes from July retreat. Clarification of the role/composition/purpose of the task force for the curriculum workgroup. Minutes moved to approve with changes, seconded and approved.
3. Program Review tool
   1. Enrollment trends, faculty workload, course success, course success for targeted group
   2. Disaggregates data by course or student level
   3. Can create custom cohorts
   4. FHDA employees access through portal. All employees have access, have different levels of permissions. Drill downs need high level access. Need to figure out the permissions for the counselors so that they can manage cohorts.
   5. Non-FHDA employees can access the tool by a link if they have permission
   6. Lots of filters to splice the data.
   7. Can upload and customize your own cohorts through cohort management. Need student IDs in the upload. Only the person who created the cohort can actually see the IDs in order to add/delete students to the cohort.
   8. To be useful need to connect the adult school student with their Foothill/DeAnza ID.
   9. Want personalized attention with the student. At the same time need good data match between AS and CC as there is not one counselor who works with all AE students.
   10. Is the program review tool robust enough to give us access?
   11. Need central location to gather the data because students exit AE/enter CC at different points.
   12. How can we track the students who transition back/forth between the two providers.
   13. Why are we using the data? To support students or as an after effect to mark our own success?
   14. It’s both: student support group wants to see how students do well over the course of the year. For the Adult school finding out who actually goes to college at some point in their future.
   15. Worry: we’ll lose a lot of data. Might not identify who needs a warm hand off. Might not get the student identified and entered into the data tracker.
   16. For accountability AE is going to need to answer the number of students who transition to CC. We’re going to have to also report the completions if they start a certificate program. Some of this is captured in launchboard.
   17. We need a tool for accountability. Maybe we need the state to provide the tool for us to use. It’s up to them to give us the tool to match who transitions.
   18. The cohort tracker works for the student tracking for the counselor.
   19. Program review is uploaded once/year for Foothill. DeAnza uploads data quarterly.
   20. The limitation of the tracker is that it dictates what we want rather than us telling a system what we want to see in the data. Foothill demonstrated this by sharing a tool that was created and is more customized; this was for a different purpose but demonstrated point..
   21. Kristy is creating a new program review tool funded through strong workforce.
   22. Concern about the scale of the budget to fund our own tool. AEP funds are more limited than strong workforce.
4. Discussion about tool
   1. What about the delay and tool?
      1. Program review data at Foothill is a summer upload for the prior academic year. DeAnza uploads once a quarter after the end of the term. Not real time data. The dashboard is real time depending on when it is uploaded.
      2. When we were looking at the dashboard we can look at the characteristics of the students at the adult ed program not just their CC characteristics. A tool at Foothill De Anza will be for CC characteristics unless we build a specific cohort with those identifiers. AE ESL students who also took PE would have to be a specific cohort separate from the ESL-only students.
      3. Once we refine the tool to have the capabilities we want, it can be automated into a tool that is functional. All would have access. Have to manage the access for student security. It’s possible for it to be real time data.
      4. Real time data would allow for appropriate interventions. Kristy would like to improve how they work with their AE students. Need accurate data in order to have impactful interventions since resources are limited.
      5. Value in thinking about the data in lots of ways: alignment, not just one particular class after transition. Need to see every point in the path: look at student support, if they jump back to AE and why, in addition to the individual support.
      6. See the value but how do we do this without additional resources from the state.
      7. State is not going to get to a point where they use data for program improvement. They answer to the legislature, we answer to our students.
      8. How do we do better at serving our students? What data do we need to do that? Beyond accountability.
      9. What data do CCs currently have on AE students? Need to tag them in their systems.
      10. 2 areas of discussion: 1: Real time vs. static data: 2: the philosophy of how we use the data.
      11. Access to data and cost of having the data is another area of discussion.
          1. 60 K is on the high side; it would not cost more than that, possibly less;
          2. Is money the real concern? Or is it the philosophy around data?
             1. Is there a middle ground? Can we start using the data we do have and when we can provide more data there is the capacity to discuss and use data to make decisions at their own school sites.
          3. Example: there is a belief among the AS ESL teachers that when ESL students go to CC they are not successful. We could have a researcher see what the data says about that. We could then have the workgroup look at what is or is not happening to make the students stay.
             1. Program review tool is limited/dictated. What causes that is not addressed. Can’t see if a student accessed tools, supports or even their majors.
             2. Need to go back to the workgroups and find out what questions they have. Could see if the tools we have answer those questions or is we need to build the tool.
             3. There is no tool that will answer all the questions—particularly the why’s of what impacts student performance.
          4. Need an analyst whether or not we have our own tool. Need someone who can tag, pull data, analyze what data we do have.
          5. We are being asked to fund an on-going position.
          6. The issue is that we’re discussing the process that prevents success but maybe it’s that the student has different goals than what’s being addressed in the classes they take.
          7. Data can help us make the necessary changes at both the AS and CC.
          8. Data is helping the CC take a deep look at who the students actually are.
          9. How have we used the data we have now?
             1. Regardless of the tool, need an analyst who can guide us in the usage.
             2. How do the dollars go to direct support of students, particularly at Foothill? If we spend on a data analyst how does it go to support the student?
             3. Workgroups are more engaged in the work. Commitment to identifying the students who need the extra support. Foothill has created an on-going AE coordinator position.
5. BREAK
6. Proposal: Fund 60% researcher position [16/hrs] under Foothill DeAnza with partnership of director and over site of the board. 60K max/year for two years.
   1. Process: We’re under the Brown Act. We’ll aim for consensus with 3 times. If no consensus, go to vote per agency.
   2. Work has to run through the director. Questions must be relevant
   3. We’ve been talking about a five way split, 12K per agency for each year. Can use WIOA funds from the Adult Schools.
   4. This would be in addition to each agency paying the share of the director’s contract.
7. Motion: Dave: move to hire a data research anaylyst. Seconded by Valerie.
   1. Brown Act discussion. No comments
   2. Move towards consensus. No consensus at this point.
      1. What is keeping us from consensus?
      2. FUHSD/ MVLA have spent or allocated funding. No more in the budget for next year.
      3. Thomas: return on investment. Not sure of what we’d get back.
      4. Concern about having fewer students and need marketing.
      5. Adult Schools are spending down their reserves so can’t appropriate those funds.
      6. Second attempt at consensus. No consensus after third attempt.
      7. Question: can one agency be the funding lead and others catch up down the line? You can use carry over funds.
         1. For 19-20 FH can cover an additional portion lowering the amount to other agencies.
      8. Dave moves to amend the original motion to ask other members to contribute 9.5 for one year moving up to a full portion of 12 K in 20-21 unless other monies can be identified.
      9. Consensus not obtained. Principals vote:
      10. Dave: yes Valerie: Yes: Brenda: No. Lori:No Thomas: No
      11. Measure is not accepted. final comments
          1. MVLA: This is a purely financial discussion. It has nothing to do with beliefs or big questions about data.
          2. FUHSD: The timing is not good for us. Thanks to Foothill for the generous offer.
8. Annual Plan
   1. All are good with the proposed submission
9. Future Meeting dates:
   1. 9/18
   2. 10/18
   3. 11/13
   4. 12/11
10. Director Updates:
    1. Peggy will send e-mail
    2. Foothill Svale Site: wants to explore co/dual enrollment
    3. Apprenticeships: state is giving lots of funds. New dean of apprenticeships at FH. Law pathway is in motion. A job attached while dual enrolled at no charge. Lots of options!
    4. Bridge classes: ESL, Math, English. If at Svale site, could they be taking classes in both programs. Opportunity for adult school students to take some CC classes and earn some credits.
    5. New funding for transition classes held at the HS campuses. 288 funding covers for both FH and DA. Dual enrollment. Courses can be taught by either faculty. Dual enrollment in both high school and community college.
    6. How does the model work for adult school students?
    7. AS: need to identify some classes that we should target. Need to explore options and implications. Questions about teacher qualifications, pay, fees for students, apportionment and AEP/WIOA funding.
    8. Peggy will convene meeting with principals to discuss this opportunity. Peggy is also going to follow up on articulation work with DeAnza.
    9. Update on Valerie:
11. Opening Day Presentation: 9/19 Foothill Campus 9:45 ish
    1. Who are the adult school students? How do we serve them? How do we serve them WELL?
       1. Adrienne, Julie, and counselors from CC, Anthony from PA
12. CAEP summit 29-30 October in Garden Grove
    1. Cost to attend
    2. Peggy, Thomas, Valerie and Lori plan to attend
13. Site updates
    1. FH: ESL/dental program??
    2. PA: teachers training for CASAS writing assessments to help ESL students better transition to CC
    3. Discussion regarding placement assessments for ESL. Lack of clarity on what constitutes multiple measures. Palo Alto sent their Adv Writing Academy students’ CASAS reading scores and the De Anza writing assessment to Kathy. Still pending
    4. Facilitator training: LB with the co-chairs on Oct 2