# MEETING MINUTES

Date: May 3, 2019

Time: 1-3 p.m.

Loc: FH Student Council Chambers

## NOTES BY TOPIC

| **ITEM** | **TOPIC** | **DISCUSSION** | **OUTCOME** | **NEXT STEPS** | **\*RESP** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Norm Review | Carolyn asked if there were any modifications that needed to be made on the list of norms E & E identified as especially important at the last meeting.  Donna likes it when everybody shares and that the committee isn’t just rubber stamping.  Carolyn: What if some people don’t want to be called out?  Cleve: If facilitator asks, then people can respectfully decline.  The group seemed to agree with Cleve’s suggestion.  Carolyn reminded that we are all responsible for keeping to the norms.  Melissa apologized for arriving and leaving early today. | All members will take responsibility for keeping to the norms. | n/a | Carolyn Holcroft |
| 2 | Honors Program Service Leadership Exit Criteria | Reminder that this item is back because E&E previously asked for clarification around the service leadership component of the proposed exit criteria. The committee reviewed the new service leadership rubric developed by the honors program directors.  Donna feels like this is something everybody can accomplish.  Melissa agrees.  Patrick would like the instructions in the Service Leadership Form to be written using either the declarative or interrogative mood rather than an imperative mood since that mood sets one of institutional power.  Patrick suggested asking students if service leadership was valuable, and that the institution should take responsibility if it is not. Adrienne asks why service leadership is the institution’s responsibility.  Patrick says we create this requirement in the hopes to have people get out of their place to grow.  Adrienne says this is an opportunity to reflect on what students are doing and validating their experience. A student’s experience is not necessarily reflective of the honors program.  Carolyn opined that while the institution is not solely responsible for the quality of the student’s experience, we can learn much from asking for feedback about their experience and how we can improve it.  Debbie replies that the Honors program does not have complete agency over students’ service leadership.  Carolyn shared that service learning and leadership programs are typically built around white norms and serve students who are already privileged to the detriment of students of color.  Debbie: Students know about service leadership requirement ahead of time. We do not tell students what they should do for service leadership. The idea is for students to connect what they do, whether it be a paid or a volunteer opportunity, with how this may serve the community.  Donna applauds that this is part of the program. | The exit criteria for the honors program was approved. | Patrick will send his feedback on the service leadership form.  Honors coordinators will work to create a form that lessens the imperative mood.  The committee requested that Honors co-directors share some examples of student leadership that have already been submitted. | Debbie Lee & Voltaire Villanueva |
| 3 | E & E role in evaluating new program proposals | Postponed |  |  |  |
| 4 | New AD-T in Human Nutrition | Postponed |  |  |  |
| 5 | 2nd Read of SEP 1.1 | Melissa has presented SEP 1.1 to many groups including Academic Senate, Advisory Council and some divisions. She is soliciting feedback.  Cleve voices concern that the percentages are too high – Equity Plan Goal Setting Methodology (see Slide 6).  Melissa replies that these are set by the state – the Equity goals were set to mirror the Vision for Success (VfS) goals in terms of increase. The state provided VfS with systemic goals, to inform the college’s local goals, which was an increase of 5% per year in most metrics. Aligning with that, the Equity Team set the Equity Plan goals to show an increase of 5% each year as well. Given the SEP is a 3-year plan, the total increase over the time of the plan would be 15% for each metric.  Patrick asks what it means to systematically seek out and remove barriers to registration (see Slide 10).  Melissa – this activity is based off the data from the state.  Debbie – information only goes to people who want to hear it. Can we get information out to everybody? For example: E & E discusses AB 705 value statement, but the math & English depts haven’t heard it, nor have been a part in creating it.  How can we get these deep discussions into the departments and not just in E & E? How can we get faculty/staff more engaged in equity talks?  Carolyn: Go where faculty are required to be – division/department meetings.  Melissa: At the BSS Division meeting, she asked people to talk about equity for 5 minutes with one other person. This request was met favorably.  Chris: Reminds him of Black Lives Matter where Dr. Luke Wood refers to the choir, allies, resistors, and deniers. E & E is the choir.  Debbie suggests going to dept meetings.  Donna reminds us that PT faculty aren’t at the dept meetings. Maybe bring this to Opening Day.  Carolyn: This group has power to change culture of college. At mid-morning break of Opening Day, half of the college leaves and this is widely accepted. We have to change this culture. There needs to be leadership to make the cultural change that the expectation is for people to stay and engage.  Patrick: Previous Opening Days have been a waste of time. Only the last few Opening Days have been worthwhile. He would welcome equity discussion on Opening Day.  Melissa requests departments invite her to their meetings.  Adrienne: Is there an expectation that EOPS is linked to equity? EOPS is our largest retention program.  EOPS would like to see themselves incorporated into the SEP. Rhonda Moore from the Chancellor's office asked EOPS directors/supervisors at a recent statewide meeting if they were being incorporated into their college's equity plans. She made the statement that if they weren't, they should be. April Henderson relayed this information to me. | The committee approved SEP 1.1 and to move forward. | SEP 1.1 goes to June 1st Board meeting for approval.  Equity Office will move to work on Equity Plan 2.0. | Melissa Cervantes & Equity Team |
| 6 | Equity Plan 2.0 Update/Process | Melissa has been soliciting feedback for Equity Plan 2.0. What are inequitable experiences for students?  How can staff/admin/faculty engage students in equitable ways? Systemic issues?  How can the Equity office support these efforts?  Two Town Halls will be scheduled.  Zoom will be an option.  She has reached out to ASFC and learning communities for feedback.  The Equity Office is just in gathering information process.  Over the summer, Equity team will write a draft.  Debut first draft of 2.0 in September.  Carolyn says Thuy has asked us to reach high and to encourage people to be aspirational.  Two additional E & E meetings are dedicated to Equity Plan 2.0.  The question will be: ”what should the college finish up by the end of June and what should be left for the Equity Office to write up during the summer knowing that there will be opportunities for change?”  Patrick: Ibram Kendi stated that “As an antiracist, when I see racial disparities, I see racism.” We need to get out of denial of systemic racism. African American women are screened out at the front door. He would love to see language that defines our role clearly.  Cleve: our campus has a lot of online courses. How can we support those students?  Debbie: Can we ensure that language used in SEP 2.0 is understood by the FH community? That we are not just using jargon. That we are not limited to folks in E & E understanding what goes into the Plan.  Donna: We need to use delicate language about racism because people don’t see themselves as this way.  Adrienne: Social justice is not comfortable, not without resistance. The discussions need to be honest. The charge is to get things done. Are we asking for voluntary engagement or is it forced?  The lack of understanding is not from jargon, but could it be that people choose not to listen?  Donna: How do we reach people who need this the most?  Carolyn: Every department must complete program review, and questions around student equity are embedded throughout. This makes consideration of student equity unavoidable.  Debbie: There are some big departments where not everybody engages and participates in program review.  Carolyn: May 17 and June 14 are extra dates for E & E meetings that will be devoted solely to 2.0. | The committee is apprised of the timeline and process of writing Equity Plan 2.0. | The Equity Team will solicit feedback for Equity Plan 2.0 through town halls, dept/div meetings and extra E & E meetings. | Melissa Cervantes and Equity Team |
| 7 | Equity and Online Learning | Lené presented a brief overview on a Report from Public Policy Institute of CA completed in 14/15 using data collected by the Chancellor’s Office. The report analyzed 10 years of data on online courses. Student, staff, and faculty interviews were conducted across 113 community colleges.  The report looked at who’s taking online courses and disaggregated the data by race and gender.  The report also looked at who’s succeeding in online courses and disaggregated the data by race and gender.  The report shows a correlation between students who took an online course and transferring to a 4-year institution, though reasons for the correlation were not discussed  Subsequent studies show online students write more, so possible factors could be Increased writing skills. Another factor could be that allowing students to take online courses allowed them to take enough units to keep financial aid.  Recently we have heard the equity gap is decreasing, however, this report demonstrated that online courses are actually not catching up to face to face This study lays out an argument for carefully disaggregating the data and ensuring we’re comparing apples to apples.  We need to compare the same instructor or shared course, rather than just comparing the subject. (For example, in math, we need to compare how students do in Math 1A, not just in math overall.)  Folks need to look at their own data.  We have the ability to do this but we don’t necessarily do it.  Patrick: We need to be brave enough to look at the data. We’re all good people. There’s a visceral reaction to being called a racist. De-personalize the message. Recognize what we are doing. It’s not a judgment.  Lené: Online course quality (all course quality) is an equity issue. Students shop for online courses wanting to find easier courses and teachers and they are reporting that some online courses are just a few minutes of work each week. We need to have a high bar for equity reasons to actually help them attain knowledge and skills.  To teach online, the only thing instructor needs to do is get Canvas certification. It’s good that we’re not putting up barriers to teaching online, but we’re also not recognizing the support faculty need to create strong online courses, including ongoing professional development. We need to give online faculty tools to teach.  People have very good intentions but online courses that are not providing instruction are not ok.  Debbie: We are uncomfortable with discussing online courses and what happens in them. That’s a problem.  Chris: We don’t know how big the problem is. How do you help students who are logging in from 11 PM – 2 AM? Is this an equity issue?  Are we helping students understand how online courses work, that they still need to put in time; we can’t assume that students know the technology.  Carolyn: “Shopping around” does not have to be taken personally. Can’t automatically assume that students avoid or gravitate to instructors because of a reputation of low standards or easiness. Need to be willing to look at our own data without feeling threatened by it.s  Lené: In online environment, we have to be able to look at the level of the content and see if it’s being held.  Patrick: The J1 is the tool.  Lené: Deans have asked how to use this tool better. There is an issue with course quality that dovetails with equity issues and are not addressed in the J1. The Office of Online Learning is working with the Equity Office to see what can be done to address these issues. We want to raise course quality to support students and raise need for professional development for online instructors.  CCC OEI Course Design Rubric – FH is a pilot campus. We signed a contract with them. One agreement is ensuring that by end of grant cycle (4 more years) we have done quality review of courses – must be peer review, not deans.  Peer review is far better than the J1 evaluation tool.  The rubric is an important tool to help us with the review.  Significant resources are being put into equity in online courses.  We need to look at course design, interaction, assessment and accessibility.  We also need to create a rubric for online equity. Peralta has created one. Do we want to adopt Peralta’s or create our own?  Peralta’s rubric focuses on technology access, diversity and inclusion, images and representation, human interaction bias, content meaning, personal connections with and among students, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and student support.  Chris: The college should focus on quality online education, not just chasing WSCH in online classes.  Lené: Teaching students technology skills are necessary for today’s jobs. A lot of professional development is fully online now. Online courses can reach students who are normally shy. Not every course has to be taught online.  Carolyn: This is the tip of our discussion. Half of management plan is to grow online, but it needs to go into Equity Plan. We can’t just put “grow online courses” without looking at equity issues with online courses. | Members in attendance became more aware of connections between (online) course quality and equity gaps.  Became aware that the college has agreed to review 20% of our online courses using the OEI Online Course Rubric and that we are not on track to get this done. | Continue discussion around online course design and equity gaps. Consider making recommendations for EP 2.0 | Lené, E&E members |
| 8 | Evaluation of Meeting Outcomes and Norms | The group evaluated the norms. We  did not start on time, but we are ending on time.  Everybody was in the discussion.  Everybody’s voice was heard.  We are looking ahead.  Everybody was engaged.  We experienced discomfort.  We spoke our truth – awesome job today.  Good seeing multiple perspectives. | The group did a self-evaluation on the norms used in this meeting. |  |  |
| 9 | Good of the Order | Donna reminded the group that there is a Part-time dinner on 5/10. All are invited.  Chris – Thanked Carolyn for bringing up issue of rubber stamping at the last Advisory Council meeting.  Carolyn responded by saying it was not intended as calling out, but a surfacing of the issue. Council is a reinvented form of PaRC.  Donna – agreed with this. |  |  |  |

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

## MEMBERS PRESENT

### Voting

Tri-Chairs: Carolyn Holcroft, ~~Andre Meggerson~~, ~~Ram Subramanium~~

Administrator: ~~Sean Bogle~~

Classified Staff: Chris Chavez

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

Students: ~~Arkady Leviev~~, ~~Farah Hodan~~

### Non-Voting

Ex-Officio: Lené Whitley-Putz, Melissa Cervantes, Adrienne Hypolite, Erika Owens, ~~Lan Truong~~

Recorder: Debbie Lee

Facilitator: Carolyn Holcroft