

MEETING AGENDA

Date: November 9, 2018

Time: 1-3 p.m.

Loc: Toyon Room

# AGENDA ITEMS

| **ITEM** | **TIME** | **TOPIC** | **PURPOSE** | **PRESENTER** | **OUTCOME** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 1:00 – 1:03 | Norm review, Courageous Conversations protocol review – Attachments 1 & 2 | D, A | Carolyn | The group will recall the norms we adopted, and the protocol for Courageous Conversations |
| 2 | 1:03 – 1:05 | Approval of minutes from 10/5/18 – Attachment 3 | A | Facilitator | Approved set of minutes |
| 2 | 1:05 – 1:15 | Updated charge sheet – Attachment 4 | D | All | Members will leave with more clarity around the charge for E&E this year |
| 3 | 1:15 – 1:45 | Faculty hiring through an equity lens – Attachment 5 | D | All | Draft vision statement articulating how we view faculty hiring in the context of equity |
| 4 | 1:45 – 2:00 | Evaluation of a current hiring prioritization decision | D, A | Lisle | Statement of our assessment of the decision for the president |
| 5 | 2:00 – 2:45 | Evaluation of SEP 1.0: Learning Communities (framing 2-2:05) – Attachment 6   1. STEM Core (2:05-2:15) 2. Honors Institute (2:15-2:25) 3. Discussion/draft statements (2:25-2:50) | D, A | All | Draft evaluation statement and draft/initial recommendations for inclusion in SEP 2.0 |
| 6 | 2:45-2:50 | Transfer Advisory Group and Honors Advisory Group |  | Ram | Members will be able to report back to their constituencies regarding the plans for these advisory groups |
| 7 | 2:50-2:55PM | Evaluation of meeting outcomes and norms | D | All | A compilation of feedback regarding the meeting |
| 8 | 2:55 – 2:58 | December E&E meeting date | I | Carolyn/Ram |  |
| 9 | 2:58 – 3:00 | Good of the Order | I | All |  |

# Purpose Key

A = Action; D= Discussion; I = Information

## Members

### **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

Recorder: Debbie Lee

Facilitator: Anthony Cervantes

## Facilitation Team: Anthony Cervantes (facilitator) and Debbie Lee (recorder)

# Attachments

1. Norms adopted October 2018
2. Courageous Conversation protocol
3. Draft minutes from 10/5/18
4. Clarified charge for the E&E committee
5. Faculty hiring “homework” worksheet
6. SEP 1.0 Reports

# Foothill College Mission Statement

Believing a well-educated population is essential to sustaining and enhancing a democratic society, Foothill College offers programs and services that empower students to achieve their goals as members of the workforce, as future students, and as global citizens. We work to obtain equity in achievement of student outcomes for all California student populations, and are guided by our core values of honesty, integrity, trust, openness, transparency, forgiveness, and sustainability. Foothill College offers associate degrees and certificates in multiple disciplines, and a baccalaureate degree in dental hygiene.

# 2018-2019 Strategic Objectives (E2SG)

Equity; Enrollment; Service Leadership; Governance

1. Reviewed norms: Carolyn asked everyone to:

* Help us be mindful of time since there is lots on the agenda
* Be present and mindful of using computers or phones, and consider the messages these send to whomever is speaking
* Practice non-closure – these are ongoing conversations
* Stay engaged emotionally, physically and mentally
* Practice Courageous Conversation protocol – use this as framework for conversations in the meeting
* Kristy mentioned Keleiah Harris will make posters of the Courageous Conversation protocol for future meetings.

The norms and Courageous Conversation protocol are available here:

<https://foothill.edu/gov/equity-and-education/meetings.html>

1. Approval of minutes from 10/5/18 meeting

Minutes were approved as amended.

1. Updated charge sheet

Ram, Carolyn and Thuy developed updated charge sheet to help clarify role of E & E. See the sheet here: <https://foothill.edu/gov/equity-and-education/meetings.html>

A committee member posed the question: “Is this committee just about race or is the committee looking at other factors such as sexual orientation?”

The response from a couple of committee members is that the common denominator of inequities is race.

Professional Development is addressed by C & C committee, not E & E committee.

Question: Are learning communities aware of the metrics being used? Answer: Not sure.

Question: Whose charge is the Integrated Plan? Answer: Not for E & E.

1. Faculty Hiring through an Equity Lens

The E & E committee is tasked to write a draft value statement on the role of faculty hiring in achieving the college’s equity goals. Statement is to be brought forward to Thuy. Last year, the FH and DA Academic Senates drafted suggested revisions to the district Full Time Faculty Hiring Board procedures. This document is procedural and operational and does not provide a vision statement. EEO does not provide a vision, as it is broad, not specific to educational setting or to faculty, and sets minimum standards. The procedures we have now are the bare minimum to avoid lawsuits, but we want a value statement that is aspirational and specific to education.

Prior to the meeting, E&E members were tasked with drafting their responses to four prompts. They were, “When I reflect on the role of faculty hiring in the context of equity and eliminating achievement disparities:

1. I know (or am pretty sure) that …
2. I believe …
3. I feel …
4. I want to …

Here is a sampling of statements from committee members:

* More representative of student demographics.
* Want to hire people that look like our students.
* The college is attempting to address the issue and it’s an ongoing conversation.
* Has areas of growth in hiring faculty more representative.
* It’s doing a really good job of keeping worker bees.
* Angry that we’re not more intentional in our hiring practices.
* Understand what has been done with equity hiring process. Learn from negative & positive.
* Faculty hiring is important and students positively/negatively impacted by faculty.
* Frustrated, embarrassed that we haven’t done what we want to do.
* More work can and should be done in meaning of equity.
* Frustrated in finding qualified candidates in STEM field and not being attractive enough to find qualified applicants.
* When students have a teacher that looks like them, they are more successful but this alone is not going to guarantee success. The person needs to be culturally competent.
* Struggle to find people to hire, meet criteria. Equally a struggle to change people’s teaching.
* Moral obligation to hire teachers who are engaged in equity.
* Implicit bias training and equity training for all faculty.
* Strong biases in hiring committees.
* Discouraging to be the only black student in a class.
* Want to know how to navigate the system.
* It’s important.
* Curriculum change to reflect student population
* Better training or opportunities. Opening up opportunities.
* Clear standards for hiring practices.
* It matters more than we think it does.
* Not enough faculty who are people of color on this campus. Faculty who are people of color are stretched thin – serving on a lot of committees. Hard to find people of color to serve on committees.
* POC candidates are out there but we have to find them.
* College needs to seek out candidates and college needs to have a hiring budget/commitment to find these candidates.
* Public discourse is not reflected in private practice.
* Hire your PT faculty.

Carolyn reminded members that this is just the beginning discussion and will require more time to craft a formal vision statement but there are already some common themes emerging.

E-mail additional responses you want to include in value statement to Carolyn.

In the meantime, members were asked to keep this discussion in mind as we move to the next agenda item. We will continue to find where there’s consensus and common themes.

1. Evaluation of Current Hiring Prioritization

This past year, the college was granted two FT faculty positions. One of the searches failed. That position was returned to “pool” (rather than automatically allowing that department to go back out) and the deans and VPs reprioritized the position to the Accounting department. Paul shared the criteria used to determine which department got this position included: student demand, full-time/part-time ratio, productivity and WSCH for the year, along with impact on 1320 budget (part time faculty budget).

E&E members acknowledged that administrators are responsible to consider all these factors and the current decision was in alignment with the traditional lens the college typically uses. The committee concluded, however, **that in this case the decision was not made with consideration of any of the values around student equity (as per the discussion of the previous agenda item).** At this point, it is too late to include consideration of values around equity in prioritization but that this should be a goal in the future.

There was discussion on clarifying what equity in hiring means. Are we looking at equity in prioritization of faculty positions or are we looking at including equity as a criterion in the hiring process? Carolyn noted that E&E should consider how we can use an equity lens in prioritization, e.g. which departments have the largest disparities in access or course completion?

Example: There is no equity gap in allied health – the course success rates are 85% and over, but do they have an equity gap in access? Who gets admitted to these programs? Is the admission process determined by faculty? What kind of data do we have to support this?

Conversation needs to continue in future meetings.

Should we include faculty diversity in SEP 2.0? Not as a political statement, but as a substantive statement.

1. Evaluation of SEP 1.0
   1. Stem Core – Ram stated that the program is in its 3rd year, course success rates were ok, the number of students served was small, there was quite a bit of attrition in the program, no dedicated counselor for the first year and last year, there were changes to math curriculum due to AB 705.

Year 1 – small cohort, Years 2 & 3 – increasing numbers but still overall small cohorts.

The program had equity in its mission statement – actively looking for first gen students and underrepresented minorities. But, equity gaps still existed.

The data for STEM Core can be found here: <https://foothill.edu/gov/equity-and-education/meetings.html>

Grant concludes at the end of this academic year; the program will not be continuing after this year. It was a conscious choice not to institutionalize the program.

* 1. Honors – Bernie Day, director of Honors Institute prior to fall 2018, provided reflections to the Honors program and the data on honors courses retrieved from the online Program Review Tool via e-mail. The document can be found here: <https://foothill.edu/gov/equity-and-education/meetings.html>

Voltaire Villanueva and Debbie Lee shared UCLA’s recommendations for the honors program based on the 2006/2007 site visit and noted that many of these are equity related.

The recommendations are listed as follows:

* Improve capacity to monitor honors students.
* Increase students’ access to honors counselors.
* Encourage honors participation of underrepresented students from Foothill’s local service area.
* Foster sense of community among honors students.
* Address ways of increasing TAP certificates.
* Increase the number and diversity of faculty.
* Diversify and expand curriculum.
* Allow smaller class sizes.
* Diversify advisory board.
* Increase advisory board’s decision-making power.
* Offer courses and instructors that appeal to diverse students.
* Formalize the relationship between EOPS and Honors, and establish similar formalized relationships with other program, such as Puente and the Freshman Experience program.

Discussion on STEM Core and Honors Program

* One member expressed concern about pushing students to be a part of these programs if they don’t want to be. Other members expressed that goal is not to force students into what they don’t want to do, but look at programs to see if they are attractive to students of color. Are students of color changing majors from STEM to social justice, humanities because STEM is less welcoming?
* What are some lessons learned from STEM Core?
  + Equity lens on STEM Core focused on students – could we broaden the view by diversifying offerings and faculty? There was concern over reallocation of resources from counseling to classroom support.
* Honors program Discussion:
  + Expand this program.
  + Create a culture shift, think about wraparound services such as mental and financial issues, challenge is to help those who think they don’t traditionally belong.
  + 10% of honors was first gen, yet college is 25% first gen. Disproportionate.

12% of honors were Latinx, yet college is 27% Latinx. Disproportionate.

* + Be cognizant of tracking system – unconscious/unintentional racial bias.
  + Data from UCLA has shown that when students of color are in UCLA, they are successful.
  + These students are elite – have students believe this.
  + Honors to leadership pipeline – get students of color into this pipeline.
  + 12 years of conditioning that people of color don’t belong in honors or STEM.
  + Change in culture – could change student’s chosen path and belief in transferring.

Moving forward from STEM Core:

* New program in math – MPS (use lessons from STEM Core to help)
* Faculty can help change culture.
* STEM has branding problem – classes are hard, and most people in STEM are white and male

Honors in SEP 1.0 was viewed as a learning community. STEM Core was not included in SEP 1.0.

How do we measure our goals? How is Honors a learning community?

Include a value statement about honors in SEP 2.0.

There will be no statement for STEM Core in SEP 2.0.

Voltaire Villanueva and Debbie Lee will come back with a draft value statement about the honors program for next

meeting.

1. Transfer Advisory Group and Honors Advisory Group

Honors Advisory Group for Honors Institute – Could the Honors Advisory Group be the E & E committee? If there are specific issues or policies that need to be brought forth, a charge will be given to the co-directors to create a study group, using Academic Senate as the body to recruit and approve members for the study group.

What is UCLA charging the Honors Advisory group to do? Debbie Lee & Voltaire Villanueva will bring back the charge to the next E & E meeting.

Transfer Advisory Group – Transfer Center exists so Advisory Group not necessary, but there is an option to have a study group if necessary. Cleve Freeman agrees.

1. Evaluation of Meeting Outcomes and Norms – Members noted some side conversations occurred and would like to avoid this in future. One member expressed that there was discomfort during today’s meeting but that this is a good sign. Not everything had closure and it’s OK.
2. December E & E Meeting – Beyond Diversity II (12/6 & 12/7) conflicts with original December date for E & E meeting, so the next meeting will be held on 11/30. The recorder will not be able to make this meeting and will request a substitute recorder. Other committee members also have time conflicts.
3. Good of the Order/Public Comments

* 12/6 & 12/7 are the dates for Beyond Diversity II.
* BD I - 1/24 & 1/25
* BD II - 3/7 & 3/8
* BD III - 4/25 & 4/26
* Thuy requests that we think about roles of ex-officios in these meetings.