



FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Student Equity Workgroup (SEW)
Tuesday, March 14, 2017
MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Room 6506
TIME: 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

ITEMS	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	1:30-1:35	Minutes—2/28/2017	Trichairs	Approval
2	1:35-1:45	Consent Calendar—	SEW	Approval
3	1:45-1:55	NAPE Follow Up Discussion	Fernandez	Discussion
4	1:55-2:55	Book Voucher Program Update and Extension	Tzeng	Discussion
5	2:55-3:10	Equity Office Organization and Responsibilities	Kuo	Discussion
6		Service Learning SEP <i>POSTPONED</i>	SEW	Discussion
7		Deactivate ESLL 26 <i>POSTPONED</i>	SEW	Discussion

PRESENT: Micaela Agyare, Kelaiah Harris, Hilda Fernandez, Carolyn Holcroft, Adrienne Holcroft, Jiin Liang, Sara Cooper, Angel Tzeng, Thuy Nguyen, Donna Frankel, Sarah Corrao, Andrew LaManque

1) MINUTES- February 28, 2017

The meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a) Owl Scholars will be hosting a workshop Wednesday and Thursday, March 15th and March 16th from 12:00pm-1:00pm in Room 3203 to support students in creating a study plan for finals. These workshops are open to all students. It would be appreciated if faculty can encourage their students to attend.
- b) In support of the district spring convocation, Micaela Agyare presented the Tim Wise LibGuide (<http://libguides.foothill.edu/TimWise>). This resource serves as a guide in support of related scaffolding events such as the reading circles on April 18th and April 19th, and post-convocation activities. The LibGuide includes Tim Wise’s biography, you tube videos, and links to additional resources. The SEW can continue to brainstorm post-convocation activities.

Students are welcomed to attend the district spring convocation; however, the district would like to be mindful to ensure capacity for faculty and staff.

2) CONSENT CALENDAR

- a) Ben Stefonik submitted a proposal for honorarium guest speaker, Dr. Laurie Watson, to facilitate a discussion for Psychology 22: Psychology of Prejudice in spring. The SEW tri-chairs approved the funding request for \$300.
- b) Lisa Schultheis submitted a proposal for \$6,000 requesting funds to purchase iclicker2 devices. The goal is to establish a campus-wide pool of clickers for students to check out and use in the classroom, thus eliminating the financial burden for students. This proposal was approved by consensus.

3) NAPE FOLLOW UP DISCUSSION

Hilda Fernandez met with Sarah Parikh to further discuss the NAPE proposal and how it differs from FTLA. Hilda provided details of NAPE to the SEW:

Participants: faculty, staff, administrators (aim for 40)
Length: summer 3 day workshop + 1 support/task meeting per academic month Possible days for summer intensive: 2nd week in September
Summer Intensive: <i>3 days</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Think about and discuss the individual roles participants play on campus/online to promote student success● Look into actions complementary to the courageous conversations that have left many asking “what next?”● Tease out and address systematic racism, sexism, ableism● <i>Sample Discussion Question:</i> Which students are being driven away by your practices?
Action Research Project: <i>monthly meetings</i> during academic year <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Detailed agenda for each monthly meeting● Make observations as steps towards forming conclusions about what is working● Try out activities assigned and report back during monthly meetings● Receive individual support in the implementation process● Reflection component

FTLA has a high focus on faculty while NAPE includes faculty, staff, and administrators in a three-day workshop and once a month meetings. The proposal estimates 40 participants; a larger audience compared to FTLA. The SEW anticipates that this could be very beneficial

in promoting inclusivity on campus.

The workshop will focus on implementing learned strategies, which could assist in addressing equity initiatives, such as student engagement and program review. NAPE encourages participants to thoughtfully consider reflection and respond to thought provoking questions such as “*Which students are being driven away by your practices?*” The agenda for the NAPE program is also more detailed oriented compared to FTLA, but the most significant difference is the cost and commitment. People may be more willing to participate in NAPE because the program does not demand a commitment from participants. Should the SEW decide to continue FTLA next year, there are no barriers preventing FTLA from returning.

The three-day workshop and monthly activities are included in the set price of \$15,000; therefore, no additional costs will be accumulated. The remaining \$4,500 will provide stipends for part-time faculty attending the workshop and breakfast and lunch for all participants for the three-days. It is assumed that part-time faculty will commit to the monthly activities without compensation. Full-time faculty, staff, and administrators will receive PGA credit. The total estimated cost of the program is \$19,500.

There was an observation that the SEW funds similar professional development events year-long, but never receives a report back from participants; however, employees should have the opportunity to engage in these professional development events. Adrienne Hypolite suggested to take the NAPE proposal to Classified Senate to collect staff perspective and see if anyone may be interested in participating.

There was another suggestion to encourage involvement from the faculty who do not regularly engage in these professional development activities. Most faculty who participate in these activities tend to be the same ones who continue to engage in campus equity initiatives, but the SEW should be encouraging those who do not regularly participate. This seems to be a reoccurring conflict for all equity-related activities. There was a suggestion to consider promoting program outcomes and to focus on messaging. Hilda shared with the SEW that programs such as these are beneficial because they provide a pathway/guidance to develop and gain skills to contribute to campus initiatives.

Student Services offers a growth mindset workshop for students and there was a suggestion to consider expanding or modeling this workshop for faculty and staff. The SEW can consider reaching out to the EAP (Employee Assistance Program) or the PDC to discuss if this could be an option for a potential workshop.

The NAPE proposal was approved by consensus.

4) BOOK VOUCHER PROGRAM UPDATE AND EXTENSION

Angel Tzeng gave an update on the winter '17 book voucher program and presented the data (updated as of February 15th).

Programs	Offer	Accept	Percentage
Umoja	34	25	74%
FYE	39	29	74%
Puente	23	20	87%
Learning Community Total	96	74	77%
ENGL 209	127	68	54%
MATH 220	121	56	46%
Winter 2017 Total	344	198	58%

In winter quarter, learning community students were eligible to receive book vouchers if they were; 1) enrolled in the learning communities' English pathway courses (ENGL 110, 12, and 1T), 2) not a current EOPS participant, and 3) if students were not enrolled in the English pathway, counselors can recommend students to Angel and she will verify students' financial need through EFC and financial aid status before distributing the voucher.

The learning communities have a higher percentage of redeemed book vouchers compared to the ENGL 209 and MATH 220 courses. About 74 students redeemed their book vouchers out of the 96 eligible. The number of redeemed vouchers is subject to change as students continue to redeem their vouchers this late in the quarter. Although it is difficult to directly link the cause of success to the book voucher program, it may be beneficial to continue providing the learning communities with book vouchers for spring.

Angel proposed to continue the book voucher program for spring quarter. The book vouchers would serve learning community students who are in the English pathway, student not enrolled in the English courses would be recommended on a case by case basis. Angel estimates that the spring vouchers will cost \$14,000.

As of now, the MATH 220 and ENGL 209 success rates for winter cannot be determined until the end of the quarter. Once the success rates have been determined, Angel can present this data to the SEW and discussion can ensue on continuing the book voucher program. Angel recommended to pilot a book loan program for MATH 220 since the instructors use the same textbook. The book loan program is not possible for English because the instructors use different textbooks. This is a barrier to creating a sustainable program.

Originally, there was a significant amount of money allotted for the book voucher program and the SEW had expected for many students to participate. It seems that not as many students are participating as originally anticipated. There was a recommendation to gather faculty perspective in terms of what they are experiencing as to why students are not redeeming their book vouchers. There was some discussion regarding the logistical challenges of coordinating the voucher program and some of the experiences the learning communities had with the Bookstore and Smart Shop. There are many perspectives as to why the challenges arise, but it's important to ensure that students are receiving the appropriate service and the logistical process is streamlined to prevent any further barriers.

Going forward it was suggested that the learning communities consider including book vouchers in their budget proposal or pilot a book loan program. This would be up to the faculty to agree on using the same textbook. The SEW requested Angel return to the following meeting with formal documentation of the anticipated number of students to be served and provide a budget summary of the book voucher program and proposed funds for spring.

5) EQUITY OFFICE ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Elaine Kuo has been meeting with campus constituencies to discuss the equity funded positions and the organization of the Equity Programs office. On Tuesday, March 21st there will be a meeting with participatory governance and Thuy Nguyen to have a discussion based on what Elaine has gathered and a recommendation will be made to the President.

The equity funded positions to be discussed are;

- 1) The hiring of the Non-Instruction Faculty Professional Development Coordinator to focus (primarily) on faculty professional development and potentially be responsible for SLOs. The hiring committee is set to convene in spring.
- 2) The Director, Equity Programs would support classified staff professional development, facilitate the Student Success Collaborative and the Student Success and Retention Team, and oversee the learning communities (FYE, Umoja, Puente, and perhaps STEM Core) and mentoring program.
- 3) The hiring of the Learning Community Coordinator whose responsibilities would be the logistical organization and support of FYE, Umoja, and Puente. The coordinator would report to the Director, Equity Programs. The hiring committee is set to convene in spring.
- 4) The reclassification of the Administrative Assistant I of Equity Programs to a Program Coordinator I whose responsibilities will expand to supporting professional development activities in addition to supporting the Director, Equity Programs.
- 5) The potential hiring of an Instructional Support Technician to support the TLC and its expanding services. The hiring committee may convene in spring or fall.

There has been much discussion of the Director, Equity Programs job description and responsibilities. There has been some discussion on reclassifying the position to allow for a broader umbrella of tasks outside of what was written in the SEP. For example, the state is looking for one primary contact person for the BSI-3SP-SE integrated plan (currently in development). The Director could be the point person of the plan. The staff professional development would also be included as part of the Director's duties, which may address some concerns of Classified Senate to be mindful that a faculty professional development coordinator may have a limited perspective regarding staff issues and needs. Discussion regarding future equity-minded professional development noted that most professional development directed by the faculty professional development coordinator should be open to all employee classifications.

Further discussion included reclassifying the Director position to an AVP or a Dean. De Anza recently approved a Dean of Equity and Engagement position; Foothill can consider

creating a similar position for parity. As the Director's tasks increase, the Administrative Assistant I will also need to be reclassified due to acquiring additional responsibilities such as coordinating professional development events. Elaine is in the process of working with Human Resources to have the Administrative Assistant I temporarily working-out-of-class as a Program Coordinator I until the ACE Classification Study is completed.

If there is no change in classification of the Director position then the job description will be cleaned up and the search committee will most likely go out in spring. If there is a change in classification, the position will have to be presented to the Classification Committee for approval and the hiring committee will most likely convene in fall.

The meeting to discuss the equity funded positions will provide the opportunity for the campus to have an open conversation and provide Thuy with a recommendation. Once Thuy has made a decision on the Director's position, the SEW, along with other college constituents, will be informed. The SEW expressed interest to review the Director's job description once it has been finalized.