

FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Student Equity Workgroup (SEW)
Tuesday, June 7th, 2016
MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Room 6501
TIME: 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

ITEM	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	OUTCOME
1	2:00-2:05	Approval of Minutes – May 24th, 2016	Trichairs	Approval
2	2:05-2:10	Funding Request- Learning Communities	LaManque	Discussion
3	2:10-2:20	Funds Approved- Transfer Event	Starer	Discussion
4	2:20-2:30	Review of Proposals	Starer	Discussion
5	2:30-3:00	Umoja Counseling	Fernandez	Discussion
6	3:00-3:15	Multiple Measures	Wheat	Discussion
7	3:15-3:30	Orientation for Fall	Swett/Hanstein	Discussion
8	3:30-3:45	Proposal Rubric	Fernandez	Discussion

PRESENT: Adrienne Hypolite, Micaela Agyare, Hilda Fernandez, Carolyn Holcroft, Angel Tzeng, Kelaiah Harris, Kimberlee Messina, Andrea Hanstein, Andrew LaManque, Kurt Hueg, JR Jiminez, Bill Ziegenhorn, Lauren Balducci, Eric Reed, Thomas Shepard, Paul Starer, Casie Wheat, Denise Swett, Jinn Liang

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 24, 2016

1. Correction on Micaela Agyare’s last name will be updated on meeting minutes from May 24th.
2. Meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The deadline for the Faculty Teaching and Learning Academy has been extended to Friday, June 17th, 2016.
2. The Faculty release time for Professional Development and the position for the Mentoring program has been approved and posted.
3. Angel Tzeng is researching student outcomes for the Equity book voucher program.
4. Andrew LaManque presented that the Chancellor’s office will give feedback on the 2015-16 Student Equity Plan sometime this week.

5. The last SEW meeting will be during finals week. If anyone is interested in becoming a Faculty or Staff tri-chair please notify Paul Starer.

(2) FUNDING REQUEST- LEARNING COMMUNITIES

Andrew LaManque presented the funding request for “Research on student needs and identifying student curricular bottlenecks.” As listed in the 2015-16 Student Equity Plan under Activity B5, this research project will serve African American, Latino, and Low Income students by providing recommendations on how learning communities/retention programs might work together to enhance student experience. Two faculty members will provide approximately 100 hours of research (50 hours each) during summer and fall quarter to develop a report submitted to the learning community program advocates and the college in late August or early September. The research will include discussions from faculty, staff, and administrators to collect information on programs. The report will include:

- An outline of the components of planned or existing Foothill Learning Communities aimed at increasing success, term-to-term persistence rates, and program learning outcomes of basic skills students, including Umoja, FYE, and Puente. This may include a graphic that compares the goals, philosophy, and program learning outcomes and services of each community.
- A brief comparison of the components included in similar programs at other colleges.
- A discussion of the components of the programs, including those that are important to be unique as well as components that would best be shared to enhance the student experience and efficiently use resources to maximize the number of students that can be served.

The recommendations of this report will be included in the 2016-17 Student Equity Plan outlining specific suggestions and activities that may result in improved experiences for students and increase success rates, program learning outcomes and term-to-term persistence for students in the learning communities program.

The committee had no objections.

(3) FUNDS APPROVED- TRANSER EVENT

A funding proposal for a transfer event was submitted to the Tri-chairs. The tri-chairs approved this request.

(4) REVIEW OF PROPOSALS

Some committee members are concerned that the amount of time spent during the SEW meetings reviewing funding requests forgoes the committee's conversation on equity. Multiple options for solutions were discussed.

- **Move to review proposals once or twice a quarter only.** This will eliminate the amount of time the committee spends reviewing proposals during meetings by limiting funding requests to a specific day. Some proposals are received a day or two before the SEW meetings and usually are time sensitive. This option ensures proposals are submitted before the deadline, but this can lead to tension due to the lack of accommodation and flexibility. By choosing this option, deadlines will need to be set in advance and guidelines must be followed strictly.
- **Up the limit for tri-chair review or have all requests go to tri-chairs for approval.** The current limit for tri-chair review is \$2,000. The committee can vote to increase this amount or vote to have all funding requests approved by tri-chairs only. Some funding proposals SEW receives are already written into the Student Equity Plan for approval and therefore do not require much discussion, however this is not the case for all proposals. Sending all requests to tri-chairs leads to a concern of transparency and the elimination of the option to have an open discussion.
- **Proposal requests can be reviewed via email.** Funding requests can be discussed by SEW via emails to eliminate time constraint during meetings. Further discussion on the timeframe for the committee to respond and how much time should be allowed for discussion (a week to 10 days) will be needed.
- **Create a consent calendar.** Creating a consent calendar allows for all proposal requests to be shared. Committee members can request items to be removed from the calendar for further discussion or if there are no objections proposals will be approved by consensus.

Paul Starer will follow up with the tri-chairs to further discuss these options.

(5) UMOJA COUNSELING

Lan Truong has approved 30% assign time for counseling Umoja. Umoja will continue to create a structure for the criteria of the program and communicate with SEW. Sam White reached out to Andrea Hanstein to discuss marketing Umoja to the target student population.

Student Orientation Assessment & Registration (SOAR) held a workshop on Saturday, June 4th and matriculated an approximate total of 275 students. SOAR expects that this workshop was beneficial for Umoja's recruitment and 33 students signed up for FYE. Laureen Balducci mentioned SOAR can be a great opportunity to support the growth of Learning

Communities and the recruitment process. She will further discuss this with Andrea Hanstein.

The committee discussed the roles of Learning Communities on campus. Learning Communities can impact student success rate for targeted populations, but if it does not serve a large enough population, how does this impact the overall campus rate? Attention was brought to equity funds being used for programs to accomplish Student Equity Plan activities. More money channeled towards funding programs does not mean more students are being served. Programs will need to be sustained to continue to serve students. It is important for Learning Communities to collaborate with other programs (Honor's Institute, Transfer Center, student governance, etc) to build a strong supporting foundation for all students in order to see a statistical improvement in rates for the overall campus. SEW will also examine how it evaluates programs and whether programs are being evaluated in an objective way. If so, this can cause challenges and added pressure for Learning Communities. There will be further discussion on how questions are being asked and how to bring more successful elements forward. Another concern is the Faculty's impression of Learning Communities as a single solution to improving student success. SEW encourages Faculty to work with Learning Communities to provide resources for students and practice service learning and cultural competency across curriculum.

(6) MULTIPLE MEASURES

Casie Wheat presented how the Multiple Measures Pilot mitigates the impact of cultural bias in terms of placement tests. A student's placement in English, ESLL, and Math are determined by a single Accuplacer test. Research shows that single tests do not adequately assess students: 1 in 3 students are misplaced in English and 1 in 4 for Math. Students placed in basic skills courses are often from underserved populations. Multiple Measures move students to higher levels in order for students to transfer. The Multiple Measures Pilot uses RP group model as another tool of assessment in order to accurately place students using transcripts, GPA, coursework, and grades earned. The Multiple Measures Assessment are needed for student persistence and completion rates, student equity agenda, and compliance. 40% of test takers never enroll or register and about 70% of test takers are below collegiate level. Some students are eligible for retest and can enroll in Summer Bridge and STEM to help improve scores.

The Engl 1A Pilot:

- Goal: Build foundation for mmap, use high school transcript data for placement
- Population: winter quarter testing for spring enrollment
- Outcomes: 78 students eligible to participate, 7 submitted transcripts, 3 enrolled in Engl 1A
- What we learned: official high school transcript required was a barrier for students

Outcomes

- 4,510 tests records were created and edited
- 1,177 individual student records were updated.
- 559 records of data cleaned up

- 3,951 initial/retests entered
- Data entered for 56 transcripts

The Pilot 2 will consist of Engl 1A and Math 10

- Use RP group model
- Capture spring and summer testing for fall quarter placement
- Faculty to use self-reporting method for high school data with 10% validation

Data will be collected during Pilot 2 for students who do not attend, to determine why students are not enrolling. In fall 2017, Foothill will be moving to Common Assessment, which will include Multiple Measures and features portable scores for students.

(7) ORIENTATION FOR FALL

Thomas Shepard shared the idea for Orientation Day and suggestions for having breakout sessions. The new name for Orientation Day is Welcome Wednesday. Welcome Wednesday will be held on September 21st, 2016 to welcome incoming students to Foothill College and help them identify available resources. The morning will remain traditional and in the evening, programs will present their specific orientation between 1:30pm and 5:00pm. This timeframe may be a challenge for students interested in multiple programs.

Approximately 800 students attended orientation last year, if this year has a large crowd then students will need to be broken into smaller group for icebreakers. Departments and programs are encouraged to become involved with orientation and create interactive workshops to involve students. Since STEM Day will be held during the same time, the committee suggests that STEM also be included as a break out session. The departments, Faculty, or peers can showcase their capstone projects for incoming students to explore academics, this allows students the opportunity to meet with Faculty, and gain knowledge of departments, majors, and Learning Communities. The campus will need to further communicate on events such as these to ensure programs and student services are aware and involved.

(8) PROPOSAL RUBRIC

Hilda Fernandez presented the revised Equity Proposal Rubric to the committee. The rubric is aligned for individual/one time proposal with finalized objectives and to address criteria.

The rubric criteria are as follows:

1. Directly connects to one (or more) of the five SEP focus areas
2. Includes activities that are linked to minimizing disproportionate impact identified in student equity plan
3. Explicitly connected to Educational Master Plan Goals
4. Outlines plans for sustaining the activity
5. Resource request is allowable under the Funding Guidelines from the State
6. Proposal includes clear benchmarks for success
7. Proposal identifies best practice research
8. Proposal will impact both face-to-face and online students

9. Directly impacts > 100 students
10. Includes learning objectives for participants

Question 2 offers clarity on how the proposals will fulfill activities for the target population, it can also be seen as a reminder and a checklist. Questions 5 and 6 will be reduced to lend a larger conversation for a holistic overview. Question 5 will serve as a yes or no question to determine if the proposal meets criteria. Hilda will make changes to the rubric as noted.

Moving forward, comprehensive programs will need a rubric proposal to ensure criteria is being met and benchmarked long-term. Suggestions are to look at the learning outcomes and what was achieved, how the students received the program, how can the program increase the number of students for involvement, and student success rates. Research and evaluations will be cataloged this year to start a discussion on what we have now in order to develop a plan and a comprehensive rubric for SEW's strategic vision.