



MEETING MINUTES

Date: Feb 1, 2019

Time: 1-3 p.m.

Loc: Hearthside Lounge, Rm 2313

MEMBERS PRESENT

Voting

Tri-Chairs: Ram Subramaniam (administrator), Andre Meggerson (classified staff), Carolyn Holcroft (faculty)

Administrator: Sean Bogle, ~~Laureen Balducci~~

Classified Staff: ~~Lakshmi Auroprem~~

Faculty: Karen Erickson (FT), Donna Frankel (PT), Cleve Freeman (FT), Patrick Morriss (FT)

Students: Arkady Leviev, Farah Hodan

Non-Voting

Ex-Officio: Lisa Ly, Melissa Cervantes, Lan Truong, Lene Whitley-Putz

Recorder: Debbie Lee

Facilitator: Ram Subramaniam, in place of Anthony Cervantes

Guests: Donna Miranda

NOTES BY TOPIC

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
1	Norm review, Courageous Conversations protocol review - Attachments 1 & 2	Carolyn reminded that not everyone was engaged at the last meeting and asked the group to be mindful of being engaged during the meeting today. Debbie reminded people of the norm to seek out other people's voices. As	The norms and CC protocol were fresh in committee members' minds	N/A	N/A

Prepared by:

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>recorder, she noticed this was not the case at the last meeting.</p> <p>Carolyn reminded us of the 4 norms of Courageous Conversations.</p> <p>Farah appreciated that we wanted to hear from students.</p>			
2	Approval of minutes from 1/11/19 – Attachment 3		Minutes approved via e-mail.	Post minutes on website.	Debbie Lee
3	Honors Program Values Statement (revised) – Attachment 4	<p>Members of E & E provided feedback on the 2nd version of the honors values statement.</p> <p>Cleve – will provide Debbie and Voltaire a copy of how he word-smithed the values statement; breaking down the large sentence into smaller parts.</p> <p>Carolyn suggested removing “including people of color,” if we specify one marginalized group, we need to include all groups.</p> <p>Andre – honors is inclusive of all.</p> <p>Sean – lengthy sentence, shorten it.</p> <p>Lan – race is common denominator in disproportionately impacted groups, we need a shared definition of “equity;” agreed with Carolyn to strike “people of color” from the statement since “marginalized groups” and “disproportionately impacted groups” already say a lot.</p> <p>Debbie – intentional use to include “people of color”; everybody has a different definition of marginalized groups and disproportionately impacted groups.</p>	Committee reviewed Honors Program Values Statement version 2 and gave suggestions & feedback.	Bring a revised version of values statement to next E & E meeting.	Debbie Lee & Voltaire Villanueva

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>Lan – FH needs to define what disproportionately impacted means.</p> <p>Carolyn – state has provided a definition of disproportionately impacted group is, a racially predictable disparity in achievement of outcomes. Ram corrected that it is not always race.</p> <p>Lisa –For the student equity plan, the state has identified student groups who are disproportionately impacted. At Foothill, there is not a college-wide definition for disproportionate impacted student groups. For program review, “targeted student groups” are defined as African American, Latinx and Filipinx. But when our campus mentions disproportionately impacted groups in a general context, I’m not sure there is a college-wide definition.</p> <p>Sean – “marginalized “is subjective in nature. Students of color are always in the disproportionately impacted groups.</p> <p>Farah – likes using both explicitly stating race and disproportionately impacted group</p> <p>Arkady – use all of them, make it apparent to the students especially for future students. Everybody has a different perspective on what marginalized means.</p> <p>Ram – Who are we writing this value statement for? Who’s the audience -- the students, the faculty and staff, or some office in the state that determines how much money we get?</p>			

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>Carolyn – we’re writing it for equity plan. Faculty, staff and admin and hopefully students will read it.</p> <p>Ram – Since students will read it, it merits writing it (race) out.</p> <p>Debbie – We don’t want to write a statement just for the equity plan. We want to hold true to our values. This statement will go in the website where it is for public consumption. Is the public going to go search for how FH defines disproportionately impacted?</p> <p>Lené – “develop” suggests talent is already there. Outsiders might have some implicit bias because this statement assumes talent is there already.</p> <p>Karen – Honors is for everybody.</p> <p>Donna – have a lawyer look at it if this is going out to the general public to make sure we don’t say something that will get us in trouble.</p> <p>Farah – When we make statements, race tends to get watered down. Are we trying to make a point? Supporting people of color should not be controversial.</p> <p>Carolyn – strongly advocate for leaving the “develop” [talents] to make it clear we acknowledge that talent is already there, keep growth mindset. Do not want to give credence to deficit mindset by suggesting talent is not inherent.</p> <p>Ram – Suggests “honors program recognizes racial inequity that exists in higher education.”</p>			

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>Patrick – Likes to call out race. Likes Ram’s suggestions.</p> <p>Cleve – change to ongoing holistic counseling. Remove the parentheses.</p> <p>Debbie – We put in parentheses so that students would know what holistic meant.</p> <p>Carolyn – suggests “ongoing holistic support”</p> <p>Lan – suggests “ongoing holistic support and counseling”</p>			
4	Honors program entry & exit criteria	<p>Debbie – Current entry criteria is 3.3 HS GPA or 3.0 GPA based off 10+ college credits. The “Try an Honors” program has a criteria of 2.0 GPA from 10+ college credits.</p> <p>Skyline CC has removed all entry criteria for honors courses.</p> <p>Debbie and Voltaire introduced a proposal that we not have entry criteria for taking honors courses (except for courses that have placement or prerequisite requirements).</p> <p>Should we base students on a HS transcript from 10 years ago? What if a student doesn’t have a transcript? People change since HS.</p> <p>CC is open access – honors should be also. Hard to sign up for an honors class because student has to come to campus to get the honors coding to take honors class. (potential barrier)</p> <p>Ram – why was it the GPA requirement there in the first place?</p> <p>Debbie does not know why.</p>	Committee approved removing entry criteria, asked for rewording this portion of the policy to use positive language.	<p>Bring back new exit criteria to E & E at next meeting.</p> <p>Clarifications need to be made for exit criteria (c) and (d)</p> <p>In future, determine how we might develop guided self-placement for honors courses</p>	Debbie Lee & Voltaire Villanueva

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>Donna – I’m OK with following the Skyline model of having zero criteria for entrance into the honors program – total access for all students, but clear standards formulated to remain in the Honors program.</p> <p>Cleve suggests we consider that historically that international students and high-achieving students are part of the program. Has concern about flooding the program with students who are not ready for the academic rigor.</p> <p>Might get a lot more students.</p> <p>Having entry criteria gives the honors program a “wow” factor.</p> <p>Lan – Need to tell students the difference between honors and non-honors courses are. Students need sample syllabi to know what the classes are about so students can make an informed choice. Rush to be equitable may set students up to fail.</p> <p>Ram – This issue is analogous to AB 705. Data shows that when students go straight into transfer-level classes they did ok without going into remedial classes. Do we want to provide students more access? FH has not been flooded by students taking transfer-level classes, increased demand has not been a problem. Agrees with no entry criteria, but need to provide a guided self-placement.</p> <p>Patrick – This is freaking awesome! Change statement to remove “no entry criteria” and say it in a positive way.</p>			

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>We should anticipate pushback from 4-years.</p> <p>Debbie – not concerned about floodgates opening. ENGL 1AH this quarter did not fill up even though the GPA requirement was lowered.</p> <p>The word “honors” scares students so they don’t sign up.</p> <p>Faculty could not tell us the difference between “try an honors” student vs students who are in the honors program.</p> <p>Entry criteria just gives students access to these classes.</p> <p>Exit criteria holds students to rigor and academic standards. The change to the exit criteria was to be in alignment with other Bay Area community colleges.</p> <p>Only several other CC’s that UCLA TAP certified require B or better. All the other CC’s do not have this.</p> <p>Broadened “service leadership” so that it wasn’t just being a part of two clubs which meet on campus. Now, it allows for volunteer or paid work.</p> <p>Farah – Likes the change. Should be more inviting to students. High school freshman year should not haunt you. People are already scared to take honors courses.</p> <p>Arkady – Likes the change. Should be more inviting.</p> <p>Donna – Likes the access. Student still needs to work; it’s not a free ride.</p> <p>Melissa – Voltaire and Debbie are very intentional with marketing pieces and making it clear to students.</p>			

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>Lisa – Clarify “C or better” – is this for just the 23 units or for <u>all</u> courses? Ex: 6 are “C or better” and 3 are “below C”, will they still be considered as satisfying the criteria?</p> <p>Do the students have to meet all four exit criteria to be a completer?</p> <p>Debbie – Yes, students have to meet all four criteria. Will re-word part (c) better.</p> <p>Lan – How does a student show service leadership?</p> <p>Debbie – We’ve created a form and students have to write an essay to justify what they did to satisfy service leadership.</p> <p>Ex: if a student has to work to support family, then the student has to justify that it’s service leadership. It’s very open.</p> <p>Karen – suggests writing “students <u>must</u> engage in service leadership.”</p> <p>Carolyn – is the current service leadership wording clear to students?</p> <p>Farah – not clear, need to clarify that work can be service leadership.</p> <p>Ram – propose that Debbie and Voltaire clarify parts (c) & (d) on exit criteria.</p> <p>Arkady – Does service leadership include past service such as veterans?</p> <p>Lan – no campus definition of service leadership.</p> <p>E & E voted on removing entry criteria – all were in favor.</p>			
5	Evaluation of SEP 1.0 – Attachment 5	<p>Carolyn presented the first 10 PowerPoint slides on evaluation of SEP 1.0.</p> <p>Debbie – Question about course completion data: did it include the high</p>	E&E agreed that the Equity Team should continue work, including beginning to draft a student equity plan (1.1) to	E&E will discuss the Equity Team’s evaluation of remaining indicators	Equity Team

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>school dual enrollment students? What is the sample size? The African American dual enrolled high school students were highly successfully – could this have affected the data?</p> <p>Lené – look at trends. What are the overarching trends over four years? This is what is done for online data.</p> <p>Lisa – The data on course success rate is based on fall credit courses. When SEP 1.0 (2015-2016) was drafted, the data was from Fall 2014. The current data, for tracking purposes, is from Fall 2017.</p> <p>Carolyn – what direction should the equity team take?</p> <p>Patrick – trusts the equity team is taking our values and looking at the plan through an equity lens. Should continue working.</p> <p>Ram – If there are specific items that we need to provide input, please feel free to ask us.</p>	ultimately submit to the state and the end of June '19.	(basic skills completion, transfer, and degree completion) at the next meeting.	
6	*Dual Enrollment – introductory discussion	<p>Donna Miranda was invited to provide an intro to Dual Enrollment. She will need to draft a values statement around dual enrollment to be informed by today's discussion. She provided a slide show.</p> <p>Questions & Feedback from E & E Members:</p> <p>Donna F– How many of the dual enrollment courses are taught by HS faculty vs FH faculty?</p> <p>Ram – answered that it depends on who meets min quals to teach these classes. If a HS faculty member meets min quals, then FH hires them to teach these</p>	<p>E&E agreed that dual enrollment is promising but that we do not yet have data to conclude our dual enrollment programs close achievement disparities.</p> <p>Recommended disaggregating future data by DE model.</p>	Craft a draft values statement for dual enrollment as it relates to student equity goals.	Donna Miranda

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>courses. Re-employment preference rules still hold.</p> <p>Carolyn – How did we arrive at these numbers, particularly those on slide 10</p> <p>Donna M- These were Thuy’s slides.</p> <p>Lisa – The course success rate reflects all students flagged as a high school student who enrolled in a “D” designated course. The designation is found in the course sequence number.</p> <p>Donna M – Data reflects singleton (higher achieving students) and ES Prep students, does not reflect all the other models.</p> <p>Ram – Middle college students are not counted since they are taking our courses, not the “D” courses.</p> <p>Patrick – Eastside Prep is a private, residential school. They are not typical of our target population. We are not here to give advantages to students who already have advantages. These students already have resources. Foothill should not be taking credit for the success of these students.</p> <p>Carolyn – Data shown represents the higher achieving students, but we have no data about the other models.</p> <p>Ram – Classes are open to all. Except those under AB288.</p> <p>Andre – duration of HS courses is different from FH. It’s 60 hours over a semester (16 weeks) rather than a quarter (12 weeks).</p> <p>Carolyn – Has an issue with data presented. It says, “look how great we’re doing”, but we haven’t had dual</p>			



ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>enrollment courses in the other models yet.</p> <p>Ram replies that we have had some dual enrollment courses.</p> <p>Carolyn wants data to be disaggregated by models.</p> <p>Ram – ES Prep students are predominantly students of color, 1st gen and low income. They do get extra support from the school. Shouldn't we emulate this model?</p> <p>Melissa – The question is should we take credit for East Side Prep students' successes, not why shouldn't we serve these students.</p> <p>Lan – If you're at a residential school, attendance rate is high. Drop rate is different from FH. We can emulate some things but not others. We can't provide all their services to all students.</p> <p>Ram – the only resource we provide is the instructor, not all the other resources. Impossible to emulate the resources available to students at ES Prep.</p> <p>Patrick – We are doing this to manipulate equity data to get dual enrollment money. If we report our collegewide numbers to include ES Prep numbers, FH will look better but it's not the reality.</p> <p>Lisa – The beginning slides of the presentation suggests the intent of dual enrollment is to give high school students exposure to college classes and to have them continue as college students at Foothill. So perhaps we need to examine</p>			

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>whether these students continue with us and how they fare at Foothill.</p> <p>Ram – Data trend shows that high school students continue with college classes.</p> <p>Debbie – asks for clarification of data. Under “decline to state” there is 1 enrolled, but 50% course success? What does “rate” mean? One person cannot have a 50% course success rate – either this person passed or not. We need data to be clear so that it’s not misleading.</p> <p>Lené – has taught dual enrollment and the experience is transformational for them. They continue to go on to take classes at the college. The idea is to bridge high school and college.</p> <p>Lisa (in response to Debbie) – The dual enrollment data reflects course success rate, but the raw number shows is the number of students who passed the course and not the total enrollment. So the “Enrollment” header that is used in presentation is not correct</p> <p>Patrick – Provided example to illustrate concern that we are not allocating resources for equity purposes. Math dept offered two sections of on-campus Math 2B (linear algebra), which is a high-level math class. A part-time faculty member is teaching two sections of Math 2B at the high schools even though the two sections on campus filled immediately and had 20 on the wait list. Even though our students could take the high school sections, operationally our students couldn’t take</p>			

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>those sections because the HS courses are on the HS schedule which is different from the rest of Foothill. We are misusing institutional resources.</p> <p>Ram – This is the first time we’ve tried this. My recommendation moving forward is that we no longer do this, that we make sure have enough sections on this campus before offering them in high school.</p> <p>Some of the other dual enrollment models are of high interest to us because they serve students of color such as TIDE Academy and Fremont HS (Puente cohort) at Sunnyvale.</p> <p>Our service area includes highly affluent schools.</p> <p>We have to wait for other high school districts to invite us since they are not in our service area.</p> <p>East Side Prep gave us a starting point. We may or may not be able to replicate this model at other high schools.</p> <p>We cannot offer courses that are already offered at the high school.</p> <p>E & E members offered some key words for equity statement:</p> <p>Andre: Lead statement with equity.</p> <p>Patrick: Lead with values, not funding. Be true to our values.</p>			
7	Draft values statement around 705 – Attachments 6	Did not discuss due to time	N/A	Will discuss at the next meeting.	Ram Subramaniam
8	Evaluation of meeting	Need to work on time management.		The group offered feedback about how	All

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
	outcomes and norms	Debbie – appreciates the honest conversation. Lan – appreciates student feedback. Arkady – appreciates the detail that committee is taking Carolyn – appreciated that everybody looked engaged		well we upheld our norms.	
9	Good of the Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Beyond Diversity II: March 7-8 · Culturally Relevant Teaching: Feb. 8 & May 10 			

*Include the person(s) and or group responsible for next steps.