



**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**  
**Student Equity Workgroup (SEW)**  
**Tuesday, March 28, 2017**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

**LOCATION:** Room 6505  
**TIME:** 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

ITEMS	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	1:30-1:35	Minutes—3/14/2017	Trichairs	Approval
2	1:35-1:45	Consent Calendar—	SEW	Approval
3	1:45-2:10	Service Learning Models	Mauer/Ong	Discussion
4	2:10-2:20	Book Voucher Update	Tzeng	Discussion
5	2:20-2:30	ESLL 26	Starer	Discussion
6	2:30-2:40	Equity Staffing Update	Starer/Harris	Discussion

**PRESENT:** Micaela Agyare, Kelaiah Harris, Hilda Fernandez, Carolyn Holcroft, Adrienne Holcroft, Angel Tzeng, Donna Frankel, Andrew LaManque, Josh Pelletier, Eric Reed, Katie Ha, JR Jiminez, Paul Starer, Teresa Ong, Kathryn Maurer, April Henderson, Thuy Nguyen

**1) MINUTES- March 14, 2017**

The meeting minutes will be revised to reflect changes. The meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

**2) CONSENT CALENDAR—**

The SEW tri-chairs recently received a funding request under \$2,000 and are in the process of reviewing the proposal.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The next SEW meeting will be on May 2<sup>nd</sup>. Proposals submitted over \$2,000 will be placed on the consent calendar and reviewed at the following meeting.

**3) SERVICE LEARNING MODELS**

Teresa Ong and Kathryn Maurer were invited to present service learning models. Teresa presented the USF model.

At USF, service learning is institutionalized and written in the USF 2028 planning

document. Service learning provides an opportunity for students to engage in activities that address human and community needs while promoting professional development. USF cultivates partnerships with local organizations that mutually benefit both parties, thereby creating service learning opportunities that serve as a social and educational agent by applying creative expression, knowledge and research skills to promote human development, advance understanding, and improve quality of life. Partnerships are selected based on their benefit to student education. USF is currently looking to offer rewards for their community partners.

The Leo T McCarthy Center for Public Service and the Common Good sponsors academic programs, public events, service learning opportunities for 40 courses a year, student research that encourage civic engagement, and ethical public leadership. There are 11 full time employees that support the work of this center; some of who have backgrounds in education and community engagement.

Some areas of this model that have represented challenges are finding faculty and staff interested in service learning; adhering to accreditation standards; reticent students; the curriculum determined by faculty, thereby the center has no purview; and sensitivity to the experiences of students of color or socioeconomically disadvantaged students in service learning.

The SEW can continue to explore other models and reach out to Tania Mitchell and Marshall Welch who were both recommended as potential resources due to their experience with service learning. As the SEW considers different models, there was a suggestion to explore San Jose State University. It would also be beneficial to look at models demonstrated at community colleges as it may better reflect potential challenges at Foothill. De Anza College may have a model that Foothill can review.

Kathryn presented her service learning course to the SEW. ANTH 12: Applied Anthropology and the complimentary course ANTH 55: Applied Cultural Anthropology Field Methods is traditionally taught as a study abroad program in the summer to provide students the opportunity to engage with the local community. This year, Kathryn will be offering the courses during the spring. Kathryn is willing to align the course objectives and content with a focus on utilizing student-driven research produced in the class to inform the campus of equity efforts. The process would be student driven and students can select the community to engage. The course currently has low enrollment, and more students need to register for the class in order for it to run in spring.

There was an observation that service learning can be linked to SLOs in the broader concepts of students retaining the content of the course. There are service learning opportunities on campus that the SEW can consider modeling for example, Donna Frankel includes service learning in her courses by taking students to perform dance at a local nursing home. Bill Ziegenhorn also uses a service learning model in his history course for students to engage with the community, as well as the EMT program, Allison Meezan from GIST, Eta Lin from Psychology, and the Environmental Horticulture & Design Program. The SEW can reach out to see if the instructors are open to assigning equity related research

topics.

In the interim, Thuy Nguyen would like to begin the discussion and catalog the service learning efforts that are currently on campus to explore if these models could potentially expand across the broader campus. The library has collected some resources on service learning to support the initiative. Micaela Agyare shared that a LibGuide was created as a resource for tools, curriculum, models from other community colleges, and more. For additional information of the LibGuide visit <http://libguides.foothill.edu/servicelearning>.

The SEW can continue to reflect on strategies to institutionalize Kathryn's models and build partnerships with communities. Service learning can be very broad and interpreted in a variety of ways. The SEW should consider this while reviewing service learning models.

There was a suggestion to collaborate with the PDC to begin discussing strategies to coordinate service learning efforts. The PDC could consider providing a professional development opportunity for service learning workshops or perhaps USF could be invited to present their service learning model. The SEW can continue to gather information on current efforts on campus and discuss creating a survey to determine how the student government defines service learning.

#### **4) BOOK VOUCHER UPDATE**

At the end of fall quarter the SEW approved to allocate \$25,000 of equity funds to the winter quarter book voucher program. About \$20,000 of the allocation was used leaving nearly \$5,000 remaining. There has been some discussion within the learning communities to extend the voucher program to spring quarter. Angel Tzeng presented two proposals to the SEW:

- a) The learning communities request funding to provide book vouchers to students for spring quarter. The book voucher program will include students enrolled in the learning communities' English pathway course. For those not enrolled in an English course they will be considered on a case by case basis. This proposal looks to serve an estimated 100 students for \$12,000. This cost will also provide foster youth students, in need of financial assistance, with book vouchers on a case by case basis.
- b) The second proposal requests to pilot a book loan program for MATH 220 in spring quarter. The book loan program will serve students enrolled in MATH 220 and MATH 105, who are not currently EOPS students. The books will be housed in the Foundations lab and Eric Reed and Jiin Liang will oversee the rental process. The textbooks will be ordered by the Foothill College bookstore, estimating \$17,000. One hundred textbooks will be available for check-out.

The MATH 220 textbook includes an access code, but each access code is individually assigned to one student and is only valid for one year, thereby diminishing the life of the book. The Bookstore would need to purchase access codes for the book loan program every year, but the access code cost is not much less than the book. There was a suggestion to

negotiate with the publishing company or request for math faculty to consider using open sources.

Some discussion occurred around the intent of the book voucher program. As noted in previous meetings, the program serves a good purpose, but the current process may not be the best way to use the money. The book voucher program costs a considerable amount of overhead; therefore, the learning communities should consider the incentives of using the same book each year.

There was a suggestion to create a code in banner to track students who redeem their vouchers and request these students to return the book(s) at the end of each quarter. The used book(s) can be donated to the library to allow opportunities for other students to use them the following quarter. There is also some concern that students are not taking advantage of the book voucher program. One of the funding requests intend to serve students who identify as foster youth, but there are not many of these students receiving services. Efforts should be made to increase participation.

The SEW will need to set a date in spring to discuss the book voucher program and make a decision for next year. Discussion will occur around the long term implications of providing students textbooks in learning communities and if the book voucher program should continue. Once a decision is made, the SEW will no longer need to revisit the program. Should the SEW choose to continue the voucher program, then money will be set aside in the budget and changes to program can be made as long as it is within the budget. Additional discussion will be needed to strategize how to recover books from students.

The two proposals were approved by consensus.

## **5) ESLL 26**

There has been some discussion in the Language Arts division to modify the ESLL 26 course. The ESLL faculty are exploring how to improve the ESLL course sequence for transfer and ensure students who move through the sequence are successful in ENGL 1A. This approach will address the completion and throughput of the pathway. This may have broad implications across divisions and with ESLL students, but there seems to be no immediate impact with equity initiatives. There are various reasons for why the faculty are considering modifying the ESLL 26 course, but the Language Arts division is confident that the process for curriculum development and refinement will address any unforeseen challenges.

## **6) EQUITY STAFFING UPDATE**

Kelaiah Harris gave an update on the recommended equity funded positions as discussed at the Equity Programming and Positions meeting on March 21<sup>st</sup>. The college gave the following recommendation to the President: reclassify the Director, Equity Programs to a Dean-level position; move forward with the hiring for the Non-Instructional Faculty Professional Development Coordinator and the Learning Community Coordinator; move

forward with the proposed (second) Instructional Support Technician to support the expansion of TLC services; and (ultimately) reclassify the Administrative Assistant I to Program Coordinator I.

The President's Cabinet will discuss these recommendations before the President makes her decision. Then the college constituents will reconvene to review and discuss the budget implications on April 26th. If the college pursues the recommendations to hire and reclassify positions, the college will need to determine whether this recommended priority for the student equity funds are sustainable, appropriate and strategic, given other (competing) needs.

Should the President choose to move forward with the recommendations the hiring committee for the Learning Community Coordinator would convene in the spring with the goal to fulfill the position by summer. As the ACE classification study is currently ongoing, the Administrative Assistant I cannot be reclassified at this time; instead a working out-of-class process will be pursued. Elaine Kuo will work with Katie Ha on the proposed Instructional Support Technician (TLC) position.

The Director, Equity Programs position would need to go through the reclassification process. The Dean position and the Non-Instructional Faculty Professional Development Coordinator position should theoretically be filled during the summer and the individuals would begin in the fall quarter before opening day. There was some discussion that convening the hiring committee so late in the quarter would delay interviews into the summer, which may limit the number of those willing to serve on a search committee (especially 10-month, 11-month faculty). Ideally, the hiring would be completed by end of June.