FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Student Equity Workgroup (SEW)
Tuesday, January 31, 2017
MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Room 6506
TIME: 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

ITEMS	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	1:30-1:35	Minutes—12/13/2016	Trichairs	Approval
2	1:35-1:45	Consent Calendar— Umoja Funding Request—Recommend yes A & R request for TEA—Recommend yes Namecoach Software—Recommend no AlEKS Software for Math—Approved by tri-chairs, under $2000		Approval
3	1:45-1:55	Beyond Diversity II Report Back	SEW Members	Discussion
4	1:55-2:10	Trichairs Proposal for LC's	Trichairs	Discussion
5	2:10-2:30	Learning Communities	Kuo	Discussion
6	2:30-3:30	Infusing Equity into Program Review	SEW Members	Discussion

PRESENT: Adrienne Hypolite, Micaela Agyare, Angel Tzeng, Kelaiah Harris, Lan Truong, April Henderson, Hilda Fernandez, Carolyn Holcroft, Jiin Liang, Samera Hadi, Kevin Herral, Sarah Corrao, JR Jiminez, Paul Starer, Donna Frankel, Sara Cooper, Elaine Kuo

1) MINUTES- December 13, 2016
The meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
a) April Henderson introduced Sarah Corrao to the SEW. Sarah is the Program Coordinator for EOPS and she will be attending future SEW meetings.

b) The SEW's efforts are essential to student success, but members must also remember self-care is of equal importance. If members are interested in discussing self-health and wellness, please contact Adrienne Hypolite.

c) Earlier today, Thuy Nguyen and Ramiel Petros sent an email to the college addressing President Trump's executive order to implement an immigration ban. The immigration ban imposes a 120-day suspension of refugee programs and a 90-day ban on travel to the U.S. from citizens of Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Sudan.

Foothill administrators held a meeting to discuss the impact of the immigration ban on students and revealed that 7 international students are impacted. The students who are directly impacted are F1 students; thus far, green card holders are not affected. Counseling services are available for all students. The ASFC will be hosting a panel discussion with some of the students from these countries. Thom Shepard will be moderating this event.

It is important for Foothill employees to be mindful that the students served on this campus are directly and indirectly affected by this ban and we must all do our part to support our students. The college will continue to reflect on how to respond.

Nazy Galoyan reported that some students are unable to receive money from their country, thus preventing students from accessing funds to pay for tuition and could possibly be a barrier for transferring. Nazy is currently working with students to determine other options at this time. There was a suggestion to have a fundraiser to support students and keep the students enrolled. The college can also consider approaches at an institutional level, such as offer counseling services for faculty and staff as well. Lan Truong will follow up with the International Programs Office for further detail on the impact of the ban.

2) CONSENT CALENDAR
As discussed at previous SEW meetings, the workgroup will be using a consent calendar to approve funding requests to decrease discussions regarding funds. Paul Starer will send out the proposals via email along with the SEW minutes and agenda. If there are any objections to the proposals, please notify the tri-chairs. If not, proposals will be approved by consensus. Below are the proposals submitted to the SEW:

a) Umoja has requested money to fund the remaining student activities for the year. The committee approved by consensus.

b) Admissions and Records request funds for a TEA to provide support to the learning communities in regards to registration and related processes under the supervision of Enrollment Services. The committee approved by consensus.

c) At the previous SEW meeting, there was a presentation on the NameCoach software to assist faculty and staff with name pronunciation. This request was not approved.

d) The SEW tri-chairs approved a request for $2,000 for the ALEKS software for math courses.

3) BEYOND DIVERSITY II REPORT BACK
Members who attended the two-day training for the Beyond Diversity II training last week reported back to the SEW. The training focused on mindful communication and listening

skills, and provided techniques for initiating courageous conversations. Attendees shared that the opportunity to reflect in silence was gratifying and also served a purpose for critical thinking. The attendees learned four strategies for effective communication in challenging situations: 1) be impeccable with your work; 2) don't take anything personally; 3) don't make assumptions; and 4) do your best. A member expressed their interest in discussing these elements as they align with meta-cognition reflection, which is relatable to SLOs and program review.

The attendees also shared that the training was a good experience and very effective. It was a valuable experience to learn how to practice techniques and seek opportunities to use these techniques on a daily basis. Some expressed their appreciation for having an opportunity to reflect upon their purpose, how these techniques can be practiced daily, how to bridge gaps, and how to make positive changes. The training gave attendees the opportunity to reflect on how they contributed to making a difference.

One takeaway, a member reported, was from a posed question; what contributions have led to the failure of Foothill students and particularly African American males. The conversation was very blunt; however, having this discussion was very powerful and encouraged an honest reflection on personal commitment to the college. This initiated a conversation on strategies for improvement, acknowledging challenges, and perseverance. There was a sense of solidarity and overall the attendees felt supported by the college.

The SEW should consider strategies to communicate this message to the whole college. Elaine Kuo, Carolyn Holcroft, and Thuy Nguyen will meet with Glenn Singleton to discuss the Beyond Diversity II training and strategies moving forward.

For those who attended the training, please complete the survey link at the bottom of the certificate of completion email.

4) TRI-CHAIRS PROPOSALS FOR LC
The learning communities have limited administrative oversight and the Director of Equity Programs is not officially responsible for overseeing the learning communities. The SEW is mindful that due to limited oversight, the program development and planning may not be conducive to the program. For example, the counseling component for reassign time was increased in Fall 16. In preparation for the 2017-2018 academic year, some learning communities are considering program expansion.

The SEW has spent a significant amount of time discussing the challenge of the learning communities without taking action and members are mindful that this topic precludes discussions on initiatives. The SEW tri-chairs recommend for administration to hire a program coordinator to coordinate efforts of the learning communities. The coordinator position will be responsible for working with the learning communities and facilitating their efforts. This position will be funded through equity. A member cautioned the SEW to use equity funding strategically; the learning community coordinator will be a benefit to the

campus, but the SEW should also remember the purpose for the funding, as discussed in previous meetings, is to move equity efforts and initiatives forward.

There was a recommendation for the SEW to consider using other colleges' learning community programs as a model. Other colleges may have had similar challenges coordinating learning community efforts. For example the SEW can consider modeling the structure of De Anza. As of now, Foothill's learning communities are learning as they go.

The learning communities originally requested 30% reassign time for counseling. The expansion of the programs were sudden and counseling, now unprepared, must build the capacity to serve the increasing amount of students. Lan has requested allocations for a program coordinator position for Counseling in the program review to assist the department; however, this does not solve the absence of the administrative component. An administrator is needed to address concerns with expansion, resources, and funding.

If the hiring of the program coordinator is contingent on identifying an administrator, it may become more challenging to hire for this position as this process could be further prolonged. The purpose of hiring a program coordinator is to potentially find a solution sooner rather than later; however, there remains a structural challenge to be solved.

FTLA briefly discussed the practice of learning communities and the correlating research on the future of these programs at community colleges. This may be interesting for the SEW to review if learning communities will continue at Foothill. Hilda Fernandez can follow-up on the available research and gather additional information.

Learning communities will need to identify resources to create a sustainable program. The SEW is willing to fund a coordinator position, but the programs need to think strategically on funding and resources. There is a concern that requesting learning communities to identify resources to develop a sustainable program may be adding to their responsibilities. The learning communities may not be familiar with the process of determining resources and the administrator should address this issue. The SEW supports the granting of funds to initiate the program; moreover, the SEW is weary of providing ongoing funds. The funding request proposal form specifically ask all requestors to consider strategies for sustainability, perhaps people who are completing the form do not understand the operations of sustainability, this is a topic to consider discussing in the future. Conversations on sustainability and available resources should be at the forefront of the learning communities' discussions.

At some point, the SEW should also discuss the purpose of the cohorts and the reasoning behind expansion. If the purpose of the cohort is for students to be successful in their first year, the college will need to review data for at least a couple of years to identify trends to support the program. As of now, the programs are too far along to question goals and objectives, but this discussion could perhaps be revisited in the future. The learning communities and Angel Tzeng are currently working to collect data on why students are discontinuing or withdrawing from the program. This data will aid the college in understanding the students' perspective and identifying room for improvement.

There was a suggestion to consider funding the program coordinator position through general funds in an effort to show the SEW's commitment to this initiative. If the SEW considers funding a position out of general funds, the workgroup should prioritize and begin with the Director of Equity Programs position. In the interim, the program coordinator could be funded through equity, but there is a chance that this position will go away with funding. If the college decides to continue financially supporting these programs after categorical funds end, then the college will need to have a discussion at the administration level. The Counseling and Language Arts division are the most impacted by the learning communities and the program coordinator position will assist with the organization and planning of the programs, but it is far from the final solution. The college may discover that additional support and positions are needed in the future.

The program coordinator position will serve as a stopgap and the SEW is in favor of requesting long-term institutional support and commitment from general funds. At the following SEW meeting, the workgroup will take a formal vote on recommending the coordinator position. The SEW can also write a proposal recommending the position. The position will most likely be fulfilled no later than spring quarter.

5) LEARNING COMMUNITIES
The SEW followed up on the discussion from the previous meeting regarding providing support for the learning communities. There is no administrator overseeing the learning communities. In the interim, the Equity Programs office meets with the learning communities twice a quarter to discuss challenges with recruitment and registration, and provide additional administrative support as needed. Some learning communities have discussed finalizing curriculum for the next year and the impact this will have on recruitment and attrition.

6) INFUSING EQUITY INTO PROGRAM REVIEW
The workgroup divided into 4 groups to discuss integrating equity in the program review template. This is an activity to focus the SEW on moving out of the analysis stage towards action. Every year, programs submit annual or comprehensive program reviews to the PRC. The program review template requires each program to address equity; however, the PRC has noticed that almost every program demonstrates and acknowledges an equity gap, but that is the extent of the discussion. The programs should be considering strategies to address the gap, and the programs that do address this issue tend to have deficit minded responses. Some of the responses consists of needs for support services, under preparedness, and the idea that improving the success rate implies faculty to lessen standards, which is unethical.

As this remains an issue each year, the college should consider reviewing the template. The SEW will develop a series of recommendations on how to infuse equity throughout the template. Each group reviewed the document and discussed suggestions for revising the template to integrate equity. These recommendations will be submitted to IP&B.

Often times, a program's experience with program review consists of cutting and pasting responses from the year before. Majority of the goals for the program are centered on funding and resource requests. There was a suggestion to integrate equity in the funding and resource area to motivate programs to be equity minded and more thoughtful; however, there is also a concern that programs may modify their responses in order to receive funding.

Perhaps programs can share their success with each other, thereby creating an opportunity for programs to consider modeling other department's strategies to increase their success. If the data is presented early on, this can impact student success. Programs can list approaches that have been successful and those that have not been as successful. As this will take time, the information will need to be determined in advance. If this opportunity is provided, hopefully this will encourage accountability of the department to determine interventions.

There was another suggestion to use equity minded language in the template. Questions can be broken down to request programs to specify and provide examples in their responses. Reframing the questions based on the equity plan, and the goals the SEP identifies, may be plausible.

The issue may be that programs are receiving feedback too late and thereby are unable to address challenges in advance. The program review should not only focus on trends, but also gaps. Programs need to specifically address the gaps as identified by the data. There was a suggestion to consider providing disaggregated data and use the percentage point gap method. Programs can be provided with pre-calculated disaggregated data and requested to address the data in course success and completion. There are multiple approaches the institution can consider to revise the program review template; however, the SEW should recognize that it takes years to gain the skills and practice to understand what works and what doesn't work.

Perhaps the template can pose the question as discussed in Beyond Diversity II training; what contributions have led to the failure of Foothill students? Perhaps this will encourage the programs to reflect on their efforts and critically think of strategies for intervention. Although, this is not very diplomatic, it may be needed to encourage further discussion on gaps in student success.

The SEW can also consider revising questions so that they are explicit and direct as broad questions can be overwhelming. There was a suggestion to consider engaging faculty in conversations with students to gather information directly from the students. Students face adversity outside of the classroom and faculty should consider challenges from the student perspective and how this may impact performance in the classroom. Faculty can also share experiences with each other on techniques they have used that were successful.

There is a misconception that requesting the college to be equity minded implies that employees must do more; however, the college is asking employees to do something different, which in some ways can be defined as additional tasks. Some employees may consider this as an inconvenience.

At the next SEW meeting, the discussion will begin with each group presenting concrete and specific suggestions for the program review template.