

FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Student Equity Workgroup
Tuesday, September 22, 2015
MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Room 6506
TIME: 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

ITEM	TOPICS
1.	Introductions + President’s Welcome
3.	Review Student Success & Retention Team Positions (Student Success Collaborative)
4.	Student Equity Plan: Data & Evaluations

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Equity Report Data Summary (PowerPoint)
2. Student Equity Plan Data – September 2015 (PDF)

PRESENT:

Nazy Galoyan, Micaela Agyare, Hilda Fernandez, Carolyn Holcroft, Justin Schultz, Lori Silverman, Andrew LaManque, Kimberlee Messina, April Henderson, Adrienne Hypolite, Michelle Palma, Sara Cooper, Richard Mills, John Fox, Sara Parikh, Bill Ziegenhorn, Paul Starer, Lan Truong

1. INTRODUCTIONS + PRESIDENT’S WELCOME

Following member introductions, Acting President Kimberlee Messina addressed the group to provide a summary of the work done over the summer and the importance of student equity and the planning / initiatives driven by the Student Equity Workgroup. She noted that the Tri-Chairs of (Basic Skills, Equity, and 3SP) met over the summer to examine existing activities and to propose a strategic framework to guide our work. The ad-hoc group has come to be known as the Student Success Collaborative and the hope is that they will continue to meet periodically throughout the year so that our efforts are coordinated. As with Equity and Basic Skills last year, the collaboration between SSSP and Student Equity also includes the allocation of funds between projects.

The Student Success Collaborative is proposing the idea of a Student Success and Retention Team that is both a conceptual framework as well as a group that will eventually meet as a team. There was consensus that our strategic focus would be on three initiative areas: Early Alert, Mentoring, and Equity Related Professional Development. These are broad areas that should serve as an umbrella for our activities. For example, Supplement Instruction / Tutoring can be seen as a form of Mentoring. The specifics will need to be articulated in the activities in our plans and also developed further when staff is in place.

Kimberlee walked through the proposed positions matrix briefly (it was discussed in detail later). She pointed out that one of the positions involved faculty release time. The cost of reassigned time is always a concern for the district. It is not just the dollar amount of the reassigned time. First, the 50% law is very strict in its definition of direct instructional costs. Faculty reassigned time takes a portion of the FT faculty salary out of the budget, and in addition the cost of the time is added directly to the “wrong” side of the 50% law, resulting in a double whammy for the district. The law is so restrictive that Faculty librarians and counselors are not considered instructional costs, and therefore count on the “wrong

side”. So do all classified staff and administrative positions, as well as electricity, water, furniture, computers, telephones...etc.! So the faculty stipend is significantly more beneficial as it compensates faculty with less stress on the 50%. However, the impact is reduced when using categorical funds. In this proposal for a faculty coordinator (the person would coordinate or facilitate equity discussions around the curriculum) the faculty member would be serving the entire college and not just one department.

Kimberlee also mentioned that the plan for the activities this fall was to start with easily identifiable cohorts of students. There was some confusion on this point as Lan was having discussions about a more limited group of students. The consensus was that the groups should include cohorts like FYE. Lan agreed to go back and develop a plan to incorporate the broader set of groups (as noted in the student success collaborative minutes).

2. REVIEW STUDENT SUCCESS & RETENTION TEAM POSITIONS

Hilda Fernandez and Andrew LaManque provided guidance on the various positions that make up the Student Success & Retention Team (as discussed by the Student Success Collaborative over the summer). This team focuses on three key areas: (1) early alert (2) mentoring (3) targeted professional development. Kimberlee Messina noted that she is also working on the possibility of housing the members of this collaborative team in one general area (to facilitate communication and access).

The positions (+ discussions) are as follows:

- (a) *Early Alert Coordinator* – Newly hired position (Adrienne Hypolite)
- (b) *Early Alert Retention Counselor(s)* – On SSSP report (waiting for funding); want to hire FT + PT
- (c) *Professional Development & Mentoring Program Coordinator* – Proposed title *Director of Equity Programs*; administrator position that provides coordination of mentoring (student/student or faculty/student) and professional development (faculty/staff/admin); pending approval from Student Equity Workgroup, this categorically funded position would be moved forward (through HR, etc.). It was noted that the combination of mentoring and professional development in one position was for cohesion (for example, there will be a need for professional development for the mentoring program). This position is meant to be an administrative position that would coordinate activities.
- (d) *Supplemental Instructors* – existing positions; function remains the same (TLC, STEM Center); they will assist with evaluation of student needs + tutoring
- (e) *Faculty Coordinator* – Faculty member with re-assign time. They would be responsible for coordinating professional development activities for faculty around equity and the curriculum. This might include best practices for CORs as well as classroom teaching practices. They would work closely with the *Director of Equity Programs*. It might be possible to combine this position with the New Faculty Orientation Coordinator possible but that had not been determined.
- (f) *Institutional Research* – Elaine Kuo and Liz Leiserson (SSSP)
- (g) *Student Success Specialist* – As the program grows, this position may be needed to assist the *Early Alert Coordinator* with the management of the Starfish program (triage, monitoring flagged students, and administrative support).
- (h) *Instructional Services Coordinator (Equity)* – This position if proposed to replace the now vacant Equity Research Analyst position, but expanded to include tracking of funding and other administrative coordination and support for the Student Equity projects/proposals. They would be responsible for much of the tracking the various equity related activities and expenditures.

Paul Starer added that the group discussion in the Student Equity Workgroup is critical to moving these positions forward (before bringing them up to PaRC). It was noted that a clear understanding of the roles of all the positions (as they interact) and what overlap does/doesn't exist will be extremely helpful,

as would a hiring timeline. As a robust discussion regarding the timeline has not taken place (as this is a proposal), once the ideas/plans are approved, a more detailed timeline will be established. Another key factor is how to address the growth of such a program and make sure current/future goals and initiatives have proper funding. Much of the discussion cannot take place until key positions are in place and the actual distribution of duties can be observed.

A key discussion item was the role of the Student Success & Retention Team in relation to the Student Equity Workgroup. It was noted that the team would be in constant contact and collaboration with the workgroup – the Director of Equity Programs would report out and provide regular updates to the larger group. The workgroup is the planning body and the team is responsible for the implementation and/or operational considerations for the equity-related initiatives.

Summary: It was the consensus of the group that we should move forward with the positions outlined on the matrix. This information should be shared with PaRC at the next meeting.

3. STUDENT EQUITY PLAN: DATA & EVALUTIONS

Andrew LaManque presented on Student Equity data and the Student Equity report. For the actual presentation document, please refer to the Student Equity Workgroup [webpage](#). Andrew reviewed the gap methodology which compares group averages to that of the college average. This is different than last year where we compared group averages to the highest performing groups. Last year students with an unknown ethnicity were coming up as the highest performing groups. Andrew noted that he is still waiting for information from David Ulate (Executive Director of IRP) on this topic which was requested at the last SEW meeting in the spring.

The data on Access is compared to Santa Clara County which does not report Unknowns. Foothill College data on student ethnicity has been recalculated without the Unknowns. Based on this data there are no significant percentage point gaps by ethnicity – the college student makeup is similar to that of Santa Clara County.

The data on Student Course Success was also reviewed. Data for each of the Asian subgroups was included showing an achievement gap for some of the groups such as Cambodians. As with the data in general it provides only averages or aggregates and it is important to ask questions about the makeup of the subgroups, for example, are a high percentage of Foothill College Vietnamese students on an F1 visa?

Data on student success by enrollment priorities, and educational goal was also included. Looking at student educational goals can act as a proxy for student aspirations. For Foothill a very high percentage of Latino and African American students (about 70%) have a goal on entry to transfer. This then can be compared to the rate of transfer for those student groups.

Andrew also presented on the success rates of resident students earning 12 or more hours. Even though the rates were similar across ethnicity groups it was determined that this data really only showed the percentage of students with D's and F's and we might not expect too much variation in the data. But it was a good reminder that we are working with averages and even though there may be gaps between groups as a whole, there are high achieving students from every ethnic group. We might be able to learn from these students – what is it that has helped them to be more successful compared to many of their peers?

The powerpoint outlines the methodology included in the template which suggests that -3 plus percentage point difference is a group that should be considered to be disproportionately impacted. The College can decide, based on the number of students, whether it wants to adjust its which groups will be the focus of interventions. The template also suggests that the college consider calculating the number of students needed to show improvement to get the group average up to the college level. The template requires that the activities and expenditures be explicitly linked to improvement targets for specific groups.

It was noted that it is critical to involve the workgroups in the writing of the various initiative reports (BSI, SE, SSSP) and solicit feedback from faculty/staff/admin members. A major goal associated with the development of a Student Success & Retention team is to determine methods for closing achievement/success gaps for targeted groups (those determined to be disproportionately impacted).

ASSIGNMENT FOR NEXT MEETING:

Using the [Student Equity Plan Data](#), review the key factors (access, course completion, basic skills course completion, degree/certificate completion, and transfer) and identify the three groups with the biggest gaps in each success area [refer to the *comparison to all student average (+/- percentage point difference)*]. Once identified, begin thinking about how we can implement success strategies in each of these areas. This will be the focus of next week's working session.

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, September 29, 2015, 2:00PM-4:00PM (Toyon Room)