



## MEETING MINUTES

Date: Jan. 11, 2019

Time: 1-3 p.m.

Loc: Toyon Room

### 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

Recorder: Debbie Lee

Facilitator: Ram Subramaniam, in place of Anthony Cervantes

#### Guests:

### NOTES BY TOPIC

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
1	Norm review, Courageous Conversations	Carolyn asked us to pay attention to tech usage and how it comes across to others especially when discussing sensitive topics.	The norms and CC protocol were fresh in	N/A	N/A

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
	protocol review – Attachments 1 & 2		committee members' minds		
2	Approval of minutes from 11/30/18 – <a href="#">Attachment 3</a>	none	Minutes were approved as written.	Post to E&E webpage	Debbie
3	Faculty Prioritization Rubric – <a href="#">Attachment 4</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patrick – Criteria of equity is a huge positive to the rubric which has never been on a template.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ suggests that we move question #9 to #1</li> <li>○ add a head count to the table in question #7.</li> <li>○ If we intend to diversify Foothill faculty, there's a potential for unintended consequences in prioritizing hiring in programs with little faculty diversity. A program could preserve its priority for the next hiring cycle by actually failing to diversify their faculty in this cycle.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cleve – service learning considerations – for now, have it play a minimal role in the prioritization. A clarification was made that service learning refers to those already existing and what is in progress               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ram responded that service learning was added for people to start thinking about</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Lisa:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ #4 EOPS and #5 – interdisciplinary curriculum are yes/no question, do we want to know more?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	E&E made the following recommendations re: the rubric: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Move question 9 to #1</li> <li>○ Add head count to tables in question 7</li> <li>○ Clarify the roles each of these criteria play in prioritization.</li> <li>○ Disaggregate enrollment trend data and degree/certificate data by race/ethnicity</li> <li>○</li> </ul>	Debbie will forward final recommendations to the deans once minutes are approved.	Debbie

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ #1 and #5 Enrollment trends and degrees/certificates -- should disaggregate by ethnicity for access statistics</li> <li>○ Also, should distinguish between who's enrolling vs who's actually getting the degrees/certificates?</li> <li>● Karen -- #2 and #3 – honors enrollment and dual enrollment – do these belong under “equity”? They are broader than just equity.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ram – honors is now under equity office – goal is for honors become an equity-oriented program. Maybe instead of just asking for # of honors courses, also ask how the honors courses help serve the equity mission. He added that consideration of dual enrollment offerings is included because on opening day, Thuy showed that DE closes equity gaps</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Karen relayed concern about: #2 – fully online WSCH -- It's harder for some departments to achieve this.</li> <li>● Karen also asked about #4 – total cost of program – need to spell this out. How are we determining total cost? Is it FT/PT salary? Do we include funds coming into the program?</li> <li>● Carolyn expressed appreciation to admin for moving so quickly to incorporate equity suggestions in faculty prioritization               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Request that we not forget the extended discussions we've had in the past in E &amp; E. Although maybe not feasible to fully implement this cycle, asked that they be</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>reconsidered again going forward in future years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Urge that we stop using the term “targeted” and use “disproportionately impacted students” instead.</li> <li>○ Support for including honors under “equity” because E&amp;E has had extensive discussion about the role of honors programming in helping the college achieve our student equity goals</li> <li>○ Objects to including dual enrollment under “equity” for this cycle because E&amp;E has not had any discussion regarding the role of dual enrollment in achieving student equity</li> <li>○ Debbie proposed that Honors &amp; Dual Enrollment can stay under “equity” if we look at who these programs are serving</li> <li>○ Debbie also asked how we can ensure that new hires based on this prioritization are really helping achieve student equity?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Lisa – #6 completion rates – be specific; what is this? How are we defining completion?</li> <li>● Patrick – ordering of the questions matter</li> <li>● Emphasize and lead with values (#9, #6, #4, #5, then follow with data) – makes a statement</li> <li>● Sean – service learning – come up with an angle (question: if your program is going to get an award for service learning, what would it be?)</li> <li>● Debbie advocated that regarding online WSCH, we look not just at increases, but look at who is taking these courses and if the equity gap is closing</li> </ul>			

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ram – ongoing conversation, he will try to incorporate these comments later, not necessarily this year</li> </ul>			
4	Timeline and process for student equity plan (1.1) – <a href="#">Attachments 5 &amp; 6</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Melissa – New deadline for submission of our college’s updated student equity plan to state is now due June 30, 2019. Formerly it was due Dec 2019.</li> <li>The Equity Team is proposing that they be tasked to complete the evaluation of SEP 1.0 and bring a draft of “1.1” to E&amp;E in April. This will allow time for it to go through shared governance and then the June board of trustees meeting.</li> <li>Clarification that the plan due to the state is very short and although the final template is not yet available, but we have a <a href="#">PowerPoint of what the template should look like</a> and it looks like it will not include much detail. It is more administrative in nature than what we envision as our actual SEP 2.0. (Note: The finalized template came in during the E &amp; E meeting on this day!). Envision that Foothill’s Student Equity Plan 2.0 will be much more robust and include the vision statements being developed by E&amp;E. Our SEP 2.0 is still on track for completion December 2019.</li> <li>Old metrics used in 1.0 Student Equity Plan were access, course completion, basic skills completion, degree/certificate completion, and transfer</li> <li>New state metrics used for next iteration are access, retention (persistence from one quarter</li> </ul>	E&E agreed to task the equity team as a task force to complete SEW 1.1 as proposed.	Equity team to complete the evaluation of SEP 1.0 and bring evaluations back to E&E in February.	Melissa Cervantes, Lisa Ly, Adrienne Hypolite and Carolyn Holcroft

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>to next), completion of transfer-level math &amp; English (passing grades), earned degree/certificate, and transfer to 4-year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will continue to disaggregate by the populations from initial plan, and the state has added homeless students and LGBTQ students. The district board of trustees may also include additional categories.</li> <li>• The Equity Team (Adrienne, Melissa, Lisa and Carolyn) proposes E&amp;E task them to <a href="#">take over evaluating Equity Plan 1.0 and drafting SEP 1.1</a>. Will bring evaluations to committee in Feb and draft in April.</li> <li>• Donna – seniors from the community are left out. They like to take classes. Nothing is there that addresses ageism. Cleve proposed maybe we could include them as re-entry students?</li> <li>• Patrick – state moving due date up six months is not transformative. 2.0 Equity Plan is.</li> <li>• Motion to task Equity Team to take over evaluating SEP 1.0 and draft SEP 1.1 approved by consensus</li> </ul>			
5	Honors program values statement – <a href="#">Attachment 7</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cleve – 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph – “take action against this system” sounds strong. Recommend to soften the language.</li> <li>• Donna – make it positive. We are trying to support “marginalized students”.</li> <li>• Patrick – Wow! Delighted to see this statement. We are here to take action on behalf of marginalized students.</li> </ul>	E&E provided much feedback regarding the draft vision statement	Debbie and Voltaire will take feedback and propose revisions to the vision statement for our next E&E meeting	Debbie Lee & Voltaire Villanueva

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sean – loves the spirit. Powerful. Inspiring. Be mindful of students of color. Need holistic support. How are we supporting students when accepted into the honors program?</li> <li>• Karen – Take out the “we believe” in first sentence.</li> <li>• Arkady – need to specifically include DRC students in the statement</li> <li>• Janet – would love to include students with disabilities but hesitated to suggest because of our commitment to focus on race               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Carolyn responded that adding more groups makes the conversations more comfortable and moves us away from conversations about race. Not ignoring the role of other characteristics such as gender, sexual orientation, etc. but keeping the focus on race. When we disaggregate other groups (e.g. women, LBGTQ) by race we see persons of color in those groups experience greater disparities than non-POC in those groups. Strongly advocate “disproportionately impacted students including persons of color.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ram – when you highlight students with disabilities, there’s still a racial separation.</li> <li>• Arkady – put it somewhere in sidelines, not prioritized over race</li> <li>• Adrienne – most of language refers to classroom; how do we develop leadership? Activities? Increase efficacy of students? How do we make the program more than just five classes? More</li> </ul>			

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>community? Include a sentence that we are concerned about all of these things not just curriculum and faculty.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patrick – “marginalized” includes all students, preserve that</li> <li>• Cleve – likes Carolyn’s recommendation</li> <li>• Lan – propose we add “professional development” for culturally competent curriculum resources</li> <li>• Increasing the diversity and cultural competence of the faculty ...</li> <li>• Farah – likes initial wording. Where will it be posted? We need to stay true to the statement. Currently, the honors program does not reflect the statement; we want us to achieve this goal.</li> <li>• Carolyn – The statement will be on the website and placed in Equity Plan 2.0. We need to think about how to support the program.</li> <li>• Ram – When the statement is in Equity Plan 2.0, that means we are committed to it.</li> </ul>			
6	Draft values statement around 705 – Attachments <a href="#">8</a> & <a href="#">9</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carolyn – propose to switch the first and second sentences.</li> <li>• Adrienne – are students going somewhere else because we’re not offering basic skills classes? Concern about “eliminating basic skills courses” in the statement.</li> <li>• Look at the data – how did the students who needed basic skills courses do?</li> <li>• Lan – huge assumption that we know students want – the language is patronizing.</li> </ul>	-		

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Misconception that basic skills is illegal to offer. This is not true – we can offer it. It's student choice to take basic skills courses.</li> <li>• Farah – Proposed to take out “eliminating basic skills courses”.</li> <li>• Ram – Suggest putting in “eliminate barriers to taking transfer level math courses”</li> <li>• Janet – Seconds Adrienne’s and Lan’s comments. Some other CC’s are keeping some basic skills classes and DRC students are choosing to go to these schools instead of Foothill.</li> <li>• M180 good effort but still want the basic skills.</li> <li>• 1 on 1 tutoring needed for DRC students.</li> <li>• Carolyn – Take out “eliminate the basic skills courses”, don’t want to be patronizing to students. Most students think they need basic skills courses so they take basic skills courses. But that’s the message they’ve been getting.</li> <li>• Ram – Reminds us that this is a value statement, not data on AB 705.</li> <li>• Patrick – We have not eliminated basic skills courses; we are trying to transform the path, M105 is the class they’ve been told they need, so students sign up for this course and not the alternatives. Strongly opined that M105 is an egregious disservice to students.</li> <li>• Andre – Doesn’t like something about the last sentence</li> <li>• Ram proposed we use “We will” instead of “we believe”?</li> </ul>			

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lan – Wants statement to affirm AB 705, rather suggesting we do it on behalf of students (potentially patronizing).</li> <li>• Ram - preliminary data shows the impact of AB 705 on disproportionately impacted students is positive. In math dept, students did almost just as well in stats as when prereqs existed</li> <li>• Adrienne – What are our current placement policies? Ram answered that we still using placement policies but moving towards guided self-placement.</li> <li>• Cleve – Suggests using “Our goal is” ... vs “We believe”</li> <li>• Adrienne – Where is the accountability to this statement? Does this go into the value statement?</li> <li>• Patrick – Alluded to Courageous Conversations compass. Value statement falls in the “believing” quadrant</li> <li>• Carolyn – E &amp; E charge to generate a value statement and to examine the implementation, and see if it was in alignment with the value statement</li> </ul>			
7	Additional E&E meeting in March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tri-chairs request one more E&amp;E meeting before spring break given the state timeline for our revised Equity Plan (“1.1”).</li> <li>• Request that we look into the governance summit date on March 15<sup>th</sup> and see if we can squeeze in another meeting during lunch, depending on the summit agenda.</li> <li>• The group agreed to hold 3/22 as an additional meeting date in March. Also, hold 4/12, which</li> </ul>	- The group offered feedback about how well we upheld our norms.	In future meetings, continue to allow plenty of time for substantive discussion, arrive on time, and stay engaged throughout meeting.	All

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		will be dedicated to reviewing the Equity Team's recommendations for Equity Plan 1.1.			
8	Evaluation of meeting outcomes and norms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Patrick: one of the norms is to start and end on time. The meeting starts at 1 PM but several E&amp;E members arrived late. Request that we respect our norms by arriving on time in future meetings.</li> <li>Carolyn: Noted that the tri-chairs intentionally did not pack agenda – plan was to have more time for substantive conversation of each item. The committee agreed that this seemed to work well. She also noted it looked like many people weren't engaged during the earlier agenda items. The active listening appeared to get better later.</li> <li>Ram – Enjoyed discussions today. It got deeper than usual. Didn't feel rushed.</li> </ul>			
9	Good of the Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beyond Diversity I: Jan. 24-25</li> <li>Beyond Diversity II: March 7-8               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Culturally Relevant Teaching: Feb. 8 &amp; May 10 Two day seminar – Patrick says it was transformative.</li> <li>Debbie - To include other people in equity discussions, bring it to the dept &amp; division meetings.</li> <li>Sean – sometimes people don't have time, find a different way to package it</li> <li>Andre – word of mouth to get interest</li> <li>Janet – tell people to take advantage of the opportunities we have here in the college</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		<p>Carolyn – will bring chocolates and wine, coffee, dinner, for every person you get to sign up for Beyond Diversity</p> <p>Lene – reach out to new hires</p> <p>Sean – give out information in new hire orientation</p> <p>Janet – include PT hires</p> <p>Donna – include tutors</p> <p>Cleve – 1/31 – last day for UC and CSU applications</p> <p>UC Davis bus trip on Friday 2/22/19 – this trip is specifically for students transferring in 2020. UC Davis is looking specifically for disproportionately impacted students to be a part of this trip.</p> <p>Carolyn - Meet Mondays 10 – 11 AM to practice courageous conversations about race – use practice case studies and role play about equity issues</p> <p>Debbie – APAN Reading Club’s 1<sup>st</sup> meeting is Wed, 1/16, Noon – 1 PM, Altos Room, Book is “The Refugees” by Viet Thanh Nguyen.</p> <p>– Efficiency &amp; effectiveness in governance committees – can we read and vote in one meeting? If we don’t, it takes two months to move on items that are time sensitive.</p> <p>Carolyn – we could look at a system where we could change the two reads and vote system.</p> <p>Karen – can we approve the minutes after they come out? The timeline of approving minutes does not mesh with appropriate dissemination of information. The meeting minutes must be approved before the content of those minutes is shared with others. Proposed sending minutes out immediately, then e-mail vote to approve. Ram</p>			



 Foothill College

# GOVERNANCE | EQUITY & EDUCATION

ITEM	TOPIC	DISCUSSION	OUTCOME	NEXT STEPS	*RESP
		says we can do this. Donna asks that subject line say "Vote now."			

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