STUDENT SUCCESS TEAMS

GINA ABBIATE

IAN DUCKLES

BRIDGET HERRIN

ANTHONY REUSS

SPECIAL THANKS TO: TRINA LARSON AND MONICA ROMERO

AGENDA

1. Why Student Success Teams? (5 minutes)

2. Four Potential Frameworks and pros and cons of each (10 minutes):

    1. Student Goals

    2. Academic and Career Pathways

    3. Affinity Groups

    4. The Modular or "Cafeteria" Approach

3. Feedback Activity (15 minutes)

THE GOAL OF STUDENT SUCCESS TEAMS

- Because at Mesa we recognize that the educational journey for some students can be lengthy, confusing, costly and/or inequitable.

- The goal of student success teams is in the name: student success. We want to increase student success.

- The following student success metrics are part of the Mesa2030 Roadmap:
  - Completion: the percentage of students who complete their educational goal (degree, certificate, transfer/transfer prepared) within six years.
  - Term to Term Persistence: Percentage of students who continue at Mesa from term to term.
  - Course Success: Percentage of students enrolled at census who complete a course with a passing grade.

- In accordance with the Mesa Pathways Call to Action, we would also like to shorten the time it takes students to complete their educational goals.

WHO WOULD BE ON A STUDENT SUCCESS TEAM?
THANKS TO ONBOARDING AND CAREER EXPLORATION WORKGROUP

The key question we want to explore today is what kind of framework we can use to organize these student success teams.

We will present you with four different ways to organize these teams and discuss some of the pros and cons of each.

We would like your feedback on what you think of these different frameworks and which you think would work best for Mesa.

We would also like to know what kind of work you are already doing at an individual, department, office, school, division, or institutional level that would fit into one or more of these frameworks.

THE WORK FOR TODAY

FRAMEWORK ONE: STUDENT GOALS

FRAMEWORK ONE: STUDENT GOALS

PROS

- A comprehensive approach as every student would fit into one of those student goals.

CONS

- Very broad, would include students who don't need a success team.

- Resource intensive.

- Could be an imbalance in the size of the various groups.

- Would not easily allow us to leverage existing services on campus which are already primarily configured around academic interests and affinity groups.

Art, Design, & Performance

Business & Entrepreneurship

Earth & Environment

Education & Guidance

Engineering, Math, & Sciences

Health, Medicine, & Well-Being

Language & Literature

People, Culture, & Society

FRAMEWORK TWO: ACADEMIC AND CAREER PATHWAYS

FRAMEWORK TWO: ACADEMIC AND CAREER PATHWAYS

PROS

- Also comprehensive as most students would fit into one of these ACP's.

CONS

- Very broad, would include students who don't need a success team.

- Resource intensive.

- Could miss undecided/undeclared students or lifelong learners.

- Could be an imbalance in the size of the various groups.

- The campus already has a wide range of affinity groups (Umoja, Puente, Veterans, Former Foster Youth, LGTBQ+, Formerly Incarcerated Students, DACA/Dreamers, Kapwa, help us identify others).

- Leverage existing affinity groups to expand and formalize success teams.

FRAMEWORK THREE: AFFINITY GROUPS

FRAMEWORK THREE: AFFINITY GROUPS

PROS

- Many of these affinity groups already have robust offerings in line with what a student success team would do.

- Formalize many of the existing informal campus groups.

CONS

- Some students don't fit into existing affinity groups.

- Some students fit into multiple affinity groups and could be overwhelmed with messaging.

FRAMEWORK FOUR: THE MODULAR APPROACH OR THE "CAFETERIA" APPROACH

- Develop a set of coordinated resources that can then be used by existing or new campus groups as they identify needs.

- Examples:
  - Every department identifies a faculty advisor who is available to assist students with information about the majors of that department and career opportunities. These faculty advisors could then be a resource that can be called upon as needed.
  - Other groups and campus resources could identify individuals, creating a network of administrators, classified professionals, peer mentors, and faculty that could be assembled on an ad hoc basis.

FRAMEWORK FOUR: THE MODULAR APPROACH OR THE "CAFETERIA" APPROACH

PROS

- Very flexible.

- Can target students who most need a student success team without burdening those who don't need it.

- Could be more cost effective.

CONS

- Leaves open gaps that students could slip through.

- Similar to what is already being done at Mesa and may not be proactive enough.

- May be a more reactive than proactive approach.

FEEDBACK

- Please answer the following questions on the Google slide (see link in chat):
    1. Which Framework do you like best? Why?
    2. What existing work are you involved in that would feed into one or more of these frameworks?
    3. How do you see yourself participating in these frameworks?
    4. Other feedback or things that we have missed?