



## MEETING MINUTES

Date: January 10, 2020  
Time: 1:30-3:30 p.m.  
Loc: President’s Conference Room

### MEMBERS PRESENT

#### Voting

Students: Ashley Dafferner, Andrea Ramirez  
Tri-Chairs: Ram Subramaniam, Carolyn Holcroft, Andre Meggerson  
Administrator: Debbie Lee  
Classified Staff: Christopher Chavez  
Faculty: Donna Frankel, Cleve Freeman, Patrick Morriss

#### Non-Voting

Ex-Officio: Lisa Ly, Lan Truong, Melissa Cervantes, Thuy Nguyen, Kristy Lisle, Laurie Scolari, Lené Whitley-Putz  
Facilitator: Leticia Maldonado  
Recorder: Jessica Alarcon  
Classified Staff: Kennedy Bui  
Guests: Adrienne Hypolite, Josh Pelletier, Alejandro Favela

### NOTES BY TOPIC

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME AND NEXT STEPS	*RESP
1	Approval of Agenda	None	Agenda was approved by consent	N/A
2	Land Acknowledgement	Land acknowledgement made, purpose is to honor the sacrifice and stewardship of those before us, without whom we would not be here today		
3	Public Comment	None		

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME AND NEXT STEPS	*RESP
4	Approval of Minutes	Minutes from December 6, 2019: Approved by voting members.	Minutes to be posted to E&E's web page	Carolyn Holcroft
5	Meeting norms, agreements, and schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Courageous Conversations Protocol review –Attachments 1 &amp; 2</li> <li>b. Back to back meeting schedule in 1901 and challenges</li> </ul>	Dean of Students Leticia Maldonado began discussion regarding meeting norms. There are concerns over the starting/ending time of meetings as well as all voices being heard. She proposed that if there are comments not directly relating to the agenda item at hand, the committee will be intentional about adding the topic to a discussion “Parking Lot.” E&E members agreed with this proposal. Re: hearing all voices, Leticia shared as facilitator she wants to be transparent about monitoring comments in order for more voices to be heard. E&E members agreed that they were okay with this. Committee members moved on to discussion regarding the Courageous Conversations Protocol. Faculty Patrick Morriss stated that everything we do has to do with race. Committee member asked for interpretation of the norm, “speak your truth” and how it relates to representing constituency feedback to E&E. Leticia stated that when she sees the statement taken literally, she sees people getting hung up on it. Faculty Carolyn Holcroft stated she is hearing that the norms are not working for people as they are written. Dean Debbie Lee added that she feels like conversations are being affected because they are being diverted. Felt that this diversion happened when she gave her presentation regarding an Ethnic Studies Department. Adrienne Hypolite asked for clarification regarding what the ask of this discussion was. Leticia clarified that she wanted to hear how the committee wanted to use the Protocol. Tri-Chair Ram Subramaniam suggested going through the protocol and deciding what worked and what didn't. Faculty Cleve Freeman referenced the first E&E norm regarding the start and end of the meetings and voiced concern over the time of the meeting changing from 1:00-3:00 pm to 1:30-3:30 pm. Dean Debbie Lee explained that E&E's meeting time had to shift when the Advisory Committee had to reschedule their meeting. Leticia will check-in with AVP Simon Pennington regarding meeting time. Debbie stated that norm 3 about coming prepared to represent your constituents seems to contradict with the norm “speak your truth.” This topic was added to the “Parking Lot”	Check-In with AVP Simon Pennington regarding meeting time.	Leticia Maldonado

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME AND NEXT STEPS	*RESP
6	Draft Equity Plan 2.0	<p>Dean of Equity Melissa Cervantes began discussion regarding Equity Plan 2.0. She recognizes this is a process and people are awaiting a final product. Also acknowledges it is important to give the campus time to review the plan and give feedback. Reminded us that there is no deadline and that it is possible to take as much time as necessary for the team to get it right. First draft will be made available on January 17th. Emphasis made that this will only be a draft and that we will be able to see that on the document. When the retreat comes, the draft will have been available for at least two weeks and the retreat will be the opening conversation for feedback. Melissa also mentioned that the team has decided to shift away from townhalls and instead will be reaching out to all areas of the campus. Tri-Chair Ram Subramaniam suggested a “cheat sheet” be created for people to use and find where they fit in the plan. This could help them process it in a better way. Melissa emphasized once more that this is only a draft and would appreciate E&amp;E’s help in spreading the word about that.</p>	E&E members are asked to help spread the word about the draft being only a draft	all
7	Industry Partnerships	<p>Administrator Tri-Chair Ram Subramaniam began conversation by reminding us there were two questions about ethical issues and equity we would like to propose IP&amp;B include the new program application. Program Supervisor Adrienne Hypolite and faculty Patrick Morriss shared their draft wording for the questions. Chris Chavez suggested an additional question regarding ethical concerns. Dean Lené Whitley-Putz stated that sometimes it’s a decision between bad and really bad, so a question could include whether or not alternate partnerships (less bad) have been looked at. The questions drafted were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What barriers to access do you anticipate this program would pose for students in disproportionately impacted groups? (Adrienne)</li> <li>2. What steps can you imagine the college might take to lower/eliminate those barriers to access? (Patrick)</li> <li>3. What steps you imagine you or the college might take to reduce the chance that the new program will reproduce our collegewide racially predictable success patterns? (Adrienne)</li> <li>4. What ethical concerns are presented due to the partnership with this industry and how does this curriculum address these challenges? (Chris)</li> <li>5. Did you look for partnerships with alternates that did not have those ethical issues? (Lene)</li> </ol>	Potential questions were proposed but no action taken. Review and take action at next meeting.	all

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME AND NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>Lené asked the students whether they would like instructors to have an equity lens. Student Ashley Dafferner shared that they would like instructors to have an equity lens, however there are pros and cons like having a token student or having it just be part of a check off list. Student Andrea Ramirez stated that students can tell when it's not genuine. President Thuy Nguyen added that as a council E&amp;E has the opportunity with guided pathways to define what it means to have pathways and enter a pathway.</p>		
8	Dual Enrollment Part II	<p>Institutional Researcher Lisa Ly and Supervisor of Student Outreach Josh Pelletier led a continuation of their <a href="#">presentation</a> regarding dual enrollment. Lisa emphasized they are presenting to support E&amp;E's efforts to clarify its charge around dual enrollment. Focus is on high school students enrolled with us, which is 5% our total credit enrollments. Big Picture: Of this 5%, classes taught at high schools ("D-designated courses") make up 1% of our total credit enrollment. High school student head counts and enrollment have been increasing. Faculty Cleve Freeman shared that as a counselor there are challenges with dual enrollment, especially with the differences between quarter and semester. Shared that maybe our charge should be to consider where to use our resources efficiently to make better use of them and not spread people too thin. How can we more efficiently allocate resources to help support the goals of dual enrollment? Faculty Patrick Morriss asked whether or not we follow-up with our partners about students who have not succeeded in course completion. Josh clarified we do follow-up and ask questions such as what we can do to help. Program Supervisor Adrienne Hypolite asked what is making the difference between students who succeed at the high schools instead of on our campus. Vice President Kristy Lisle answered that the high school community makes a difference. Students Ashley Dafferner and Andrea Ramirez shared that there is less of a sense of community on our campus. Also, on our campus, high school students may feel intimidated and not know what resources are available. President Thuy shared that Foothill's data mirrors the state data. Consistently, dual enrollment students are outperforming our general population. Dual enrollment students are more racially diverse. Posed questions to think about – Is dual enrollment a strategy for equity?</p>		
9	Review/Agenda Items for next meeting	<p>Parking Lot Items: 1. Outcome: Revision of the norms, resolve contradictions (E&amp;E agreed to add this to next agenda)</p>		



		2. Meeting time: Updates on schedule 3. Industry Partnerships – Identify which questions we are sending to IP&B 4. Dual Enrollment: -Is dual enrollment an equity strategy? -Allocating resources to support dual enrollment		
10	Evaluation of meeting outcomes and norms	Skipped because we ran out of time.	N/A	
11	Good of the Order	Faculty Donna Frankel shared information regarding a hate crime that happened in Palo Alto. Invited E&E members to ask her more about it and how the community is coming together to help.	N/A	