

FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Student Equity Workgroup (SEW)
Tuesday, November 10, 2015
MEETING MINUTES

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

ITEM	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	2:00-2:05	Minutes – October 27, 2015	Trichairs	Approval
2	2:05-2:20	District Equity Work	Fernandez / Sias / Hyland	Discussion
3	2:20-2:40	Embedded Tutors	Ha / Kuo	Discussion
4	2:40-3:00	Chancellor Discussion	SEW / Chancellor	Discussion
5	3:00-3:15	SEP Feedback	SEW	Discussion
6	3:15-3:30	Professional Development Winter and Spring Proposals	Fernandez / Sias / Holcroft	Approval
7	3:30-3:45	Funding Request	Starer	

PRESENT:

Paul Starer, Lan Truong, Adrienne Hypolite, Roberto Sias, Richard Mills, Carolyn Holcroft, Debbie Lee, Hilda Fernandez, April Henderson, Pat Hyland, Andrew LaManque, Justin Schultz, Sarah Cooper, Bill Ziegenhorn, Teresa Ong, Katie Ha, Eric Reed, Victor Tam, Judy Miner, Elaine Kuo, Micaela Agyare, John Fox

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from October 27, 2015 were approved by consensus.

2. DISTRICT EQUITY WORK + UPDATES

Pat Hyland stopped by the meeting to update the committee on work being done at the District-level regarding equity and equal opportunity training for hiring committees. Right now, only the EO representative receives any formal training (there are about 20 trained EO reps). Each campus only certifies their own EO reps – there is no set training for entire hiring committees. Due to the availability of the EO reps, a concern was expressed that you have the same folks serving on all the hiring committees, while others remain interested in serving. Pat requested suggestions for getting formal training better integrated into the hiring process. Andrew LaManque suggested having the members of the hiring committee meet with an HR designee for 30 minutes during their initial planning session. Carolyn Holcroft advocated for slowing down and allowing for more time for training – others suggested that Opening Day feature an EO rep training session. Katie Ha added that incorporating the training into the new faculty orientation would be a helpful tool, as many faculty want to serve and help select their colleagues. It was also noted that brush-up sessions could be offered to those already trained.

3. CHANCELLOR DISCUSSION

Judy Miner stopped by the meeting to express her commitment to internally supporting and externally communicating the importance of equity. She emphasized that equity needs to be infused into the messaging around all our initiatives. She noted that the FHDA Foundation is also committed to student equity, with major fundraising taking place for EOPS and the S.L.I. at Foothill. – she added that expansion of the STEM Success Center is also

being discussed. Hilda Fernandez asked about strategies to make sure there is enough time to root all of the great projects in development. Judy noted that it comes down to resource allocation – look at the money and figure out the best way to use those funds. Judy added that the initiatives with the greatest impact on students should be the longest lasting. She also suggested taking time for professional development in one of the division meetings for faculty, as increasing the number of people involved and committed to equity is critical.

With regards to funding, she noted that it is her personal priority to finding additional funding (endowments, parcel tax, etc.) for the District, as these gifts add up – the presence out in the community and outreach can make tremendous difference. She noted that a potential goal is 60% state funding, 40% other funding – the difficult part is figuring out how to get there ... this requires greater attention towards revenue.

4. EMBEDDED TUTORING

Embedded tutoring is meant to improve course success rates in courses where there appears to be a significant gap between certain student population groups (either enrolled Basic Skills students and/or different ethnic groups). The embedded tutor is a student who took the course and did well – he/she then returns to the course based on faculty recommendation to serve as the tutor. Each embedded tutor meets with Katie Ha or Sumi Sukumar (math) for training. Generally, the embedded tutors are in the class and then conduct small group sessions – they DO NOT introduce any new material. It was noted that all MathMyWay tutors are only embedded in the classroom – any outside sessions are conducted under direct supervision – Katie Ha added that the math tutors are more connected since they are in the classroom all the time. She also noted that managing all the embedded tutors is very time intensive. Bill Ziegenhorn observed that in classes with an embedded tutor, the faculty member might not give up on the student as quickly, as he/she has a partner to collaborate with – he noted that the tutors do sometimes check in individually with the faculty members as well.

Limitations for embedded tutoring were noted, specifically that the student must be full-time and eligible through Financial Aid. Getting the students enrolled in the class to take advantage of the tutoring sessions is also key, as students must volunteer to show up to the sessions – it is up to the faculty member to offer incentives in the classroom. Lan Truong noted that De Anza offers a 0.5 credit course linked to tutoring.

In planning the next steps for embedded tutoring, two approaches were proposed: Do we see where the disproportionately impacted student groups are having difficulties in courses? Or do we track cohorts and put embedded tutoring in an entire area? When embedded tutoring was first started, it was focused on Basic Skills students, but with a shift towards equity funding, the decision will need to be to either focus on certain classes or focus on certain students (cohort groups). Lan Truong noted that many of the cohort groups (Puente, FYE) already have the services they need. Andrew LaManque added that it is more about identifying the need and then finding the resources/funding – we need to make sure the money goes to the disproportionately impacted students (be intentional about where we put the resources and go back after to assess if there was success).

5. STUDENT EQUITY PLAN – FEEDBACK

The Student Equity Plan is up for a 2nd read at PaRC on W 11.18.15. The plan is also scheduled to be reviewed at the December 07, 2015 Board of Trustees meeting. April Henderson requested clarification if UMOJA funding would come from Student Equity (and need to be written into the established Student Equity Plan) or if there was separate money allocated for the program from the State. She was unsure based on the information she received at the UMOJA conference. Andrew LaManque noted that he would follow up with the State Chancellor's Office to request clarification.

It was noted that the Instructional Services Technician for the PSME Center would serve a scheduling role as well as a liaison between faculty and the tutoring services offered – the goal is to provide greater support for our tutoring efforts (largely from a logistical standpoint). It is difficult for a faculty member to deal with the day-to-day logistics of the existing services, let alone try to grow the services – collaboration between classified staff and faculty is needed.

6. PROPOSAL – O.E.I. COURSE REVIEW RUBRIC

The Academic Senate resolved to adopt the Online Education Initiative (OEI) Online Course Review Rubric as the standard for evaluating and improving the quality of Foothill College's online courses. Valerie Fong and the Language Arts department requested student equity funding to compensate part-time faculty for participating in the discussion of best practices for online courses. Upon review of the proposal, it was noted that no

deliverables were included at the end of the involvement in the discussions. While there was agreement that adjunct faculty should be part of the decision-making process (and discussion), it was suggested that a deliverable be inserted into the proposal (e.g. a reflection or plan on how the faculty will address their own classes based on best practices shared). Equity was also discussed – how do we make this information accessible to other adjunct faculty unable to attend or participate in the discussion? Disseminating the information to the College-level was a key concern.

The group agreed to ask Valerie Fong and others in the Language Arts department to revise and resubmit the proposal at the next Student Equity Workgroup meeting. The key areas to address would be (1) adding a deliverable / measure of success, and (2) further elaborate on the equity aspect.