

**FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Student Equity Workgroup
Tuesday, October 27, 2015
MEETING MINUTES**

LOCATION: ROOM 6507
TIME: 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

ITEM	TOPIC
1	Approval of Minutes – October 13, 2015
2	Women’s Tech Educators Training
3	Continued Discussion: Goals/Benchmarks/Equity Plan
4	EOPS Conference + Book Loan Program
5	Equity Funds Requests (Proposals)

PRESENT:

Hilda Fernandez, Micaela Agyare, Justin Schultz, Andrew LaManque, Bill Ziegenhorn, Adrienne Hypolite, April Henderson, Sara Cooper, Katie Ha, Carolyn Holcroft, Kimberlee Messina, John Fox, Nazy Galoyan, Paul Starer, Sarah Parikh, Roberto Sias, Teresa Ong, Laureen Balducci, Elaine Kuo

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No changes noted; meeting minutes from Tues, October 13, 2015 approved by consensus.

2. WOMEN’S TECH EDUCATORS TRAINING

Sarah Parikh presented on the equity-funded 2-day Women’s Tech Educators Training conference held at Foothill College on September 10-11, 2015. She noted that most of the funding went towards paying the speaker, with the rest to create posters and banners, as well as provide training binders for each of the participants.

Day One [Recruitment Day]: 21 attendees; lots of departments; teamwork to share ideas across disciplines – suggestions to advertise next classes in the math classes and work more closely with the biology department/classes.

Day Two [Retention Day]: 19 attendees; teamwork to share ideas; Elaine Kuo answered questions during the lunch hour; good discussion opportunities but less learning from the actual speaker.

A survey was conducted across three areas (knowledge, confidence, awareness of resources) to assess learning across Day One and Day Two. Gains in ‘knowledge’ were observed across all the question categories. Sarah noted that her biggest take-away was that she needed to be a ‘marketer’ as well as an instructor. Personal encouragement and one-on-one talks from the instructors help all students (not just women). Sarah would like to revise her department website and suggested adding vignettes featuring content for each of the courses offered. It was

suggested that continued development of the content and resources gained from this workshop be explored.

3. CONTINUED DISCUSSION: GOALS/BENCHMARKS/EQUITY PLAN

Foothill College's 2015-2016 Student Equity funding is approximately \$880,000. Andrew LaManque asked members of the workgroup to share their questions/concerns regarding the current draft of the Student Equity Plan.

A) From your perspective, what is the most "important" activity included in the Equity Plan?

- Early Alert initiatives – targeting probation students
- Curriculum development and refinement; tutoring; mentoring; early alert
- Support of the Student Success & Retention Team – to facilitate the planning and implementation of the plan in a more comprehensive manner.
- I am a huge proponent of professional development for faculty and staff; multiple measures
- Hiring the Director of Equity Programs
- Course Completion -> Mentoring; Student Success & Retention Team
- Improved student services – tutoring, mentoring, individual counseling, one-to-one student interaction

B) Name one activity that you think it might be OK if we lowered the proposed amount of funding for 2015-2016 (at least a little!)

- All of them equally
- Tough. Block grants.
- B.6 -> Online Access
- Online access to data (important task but why so much money); book vouchers; faculty coordinator (for SLOs/ADTs)
- Block Grants
- Access Goal -> our numbers are largely on target in this area. Bigger gaps in other goal areas.
- Professional development / conferences – we have been exposed to so much, let's focus on implementation

C) Is there an area of the plan where the writing was not clear to you?

- No
- Need to re-read
- B.7 -> Textbook Vouchers
- No

D) Please write down one question you have about the Equity Plan.

- How will UMOJA be implemented?
- How is accountability determined?
- How precise do the goals have to be? What will we get in trouble for?
- How can we help the campus community to buy in? Will it be supported? How can we justify release time for an ADT SLO coordinator? [A.L. Note: release time was for a faculty to do equity related professional development, including assessment that involves looking at subpopulations of students – this must not be clear from the description, will revise]

- How will outcomes be reported?
- The most important activities of the plan are ongoing – how can we guarantee ongoing financial support?

Andrew asked for feedback on the following areas:

- 1) Funding for Tutoring / Embedded Tutoring - do we need some type of administrative support - what are the tradeoffs?
- 2) FYE for 2015-16 and beyond - have we identified an appropriate level of support?
- 3) For Activity B7 - direct support for low income students - should we focus on book vouchers only or include funding for other items like calculators and lap tops?
- 4) For Basic Skills English target group - should we consider Filipino's / Pacific Islanders?

Details regarding several planned expenditures were discussed. These possible/planned expenditures are documented in the Student Equity Plan.

- *Instructional Services Technician*: Would facilitate scheduling for tutoring (starting with PSME Center) and serve as a liaison between the discipline faculty and the supplemental instruction center (with a greater focus on Basic Skills courses/faculty)
- *Administrative Assistant*: Part of the proposed Student Success & Retention Team – would support the Director of Equity Programs and assist with other administrative projects.

Consensus was reached to move forward with the recommendation for these positions.

- *First Year Experience (FYE)*: The goal is to expand this – as it expands, there will likely be a need for a focused director/coordinator. The SSSP plan notes the possibility of a counselor being responsible for that, with the goal to expand to focus on learning community programs (in general). Needs analyses and cost/benefit analyses would need to be conducted in order to properly expand FYE.
- *Book Vouchers vs. Book Loan Programs*: This needs to be explored in greater detail. The Library has the tools/technology to help facilitate a book loan program. One of the big initiatives for ASFC this year is to address the cost of textbooks. It was suggested that we look at the Santa Rosa model. We also need to involve the Financial Aid Office.

Consensus was that we should recommend funding that includes various items of need, in addition to books, but we still needed to work on an arrangement ensuring student need and tracking the items.

Andrew LaManque also requested feedback for the ‘disproportionately impacted groups’ identified for the Basic Skills – English section of the Student Equity Plan. Consensus was reached to include Filipinos and Pacific Islanders (-13% achievement gap combined) in place of Latinos (-4% achievement gap). He noted that while this is what we report to the State to track with metrics, it does not prevent the College from working with other disproportionately impacted groups.

Consensus was reached to make this change for Basic Skills – English.

Paul Starer asked all workgroup members to read over the Student Equity Plan one more time and provide feedback no later than Friday, October 30, 2015. The Student Equity Plan will be presented to PaRC (for 1st Read) on Wednesday, November 04, 2015.

4. EOPS CONFERENCE + BOOK LOAN PROGRAM

April Henderson presented on a proposed book loan program, developed using the information gathered at the most recent EOPS Conference held in San Diego, CA. Please see attached documents regarding the book loan program.

5. EQUITY FUNDING REQUESTS (PROPOSALS FOR CONSIDERATION)

Four proposals (requests) for equity funding were presented and discussed.

Proposal A: Library Request – Calculators for Loan Program (50% Basic Skills, 50% Equity)

Discussion: No mechanism exists for tracking disproportionately impacted students asking for the calculators. No established success metrics; is it moving the needle? It was noted that student demographics could be looked at after the fact, but not up front. It was also suggested that the calculators could be reserved on a class-by-class basis (i.e. Basic Skills course).

Decision: Can we look at the data from the pilot calculator loan program before making a decision to fund additional purchases?

Proposal B: DRC + VRC Request – Technology and Supplies (100% Equity)

Discussion: The DRC/VRC should be able to use their own funding for most of the technology/supplies requested, except for the Veteran Book Vouchers.

Decision: **Funding request recommended** for book vouchers for Veterans (\$5,250)

Proposal C: Puente Request – Bus Charter Reimbursement (50% Basic Skills, 50% Equity)

Decision: **Funding request not recommended.** Puente should use their existing financial resources to cover this expense. Should their funding be depleted, they can re-propose and request assistance.

Proposal D: Mathematics Department – AMATYC Conference (50% Basic Skills, 50% Equity)

Discussion: As the AMATYC conference (November 19-22, 2015) will be held in New Orleans, LA, approval from the State Chancellor's Office is needed before any funding can be approved.

Decision: **Approval request recommended if approved by the state Chancellor's Office;** Paul Starer / Justin Schultz will follow up with the Chancellor's Office and request approval for out-of-state conference expenditure.