



FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Student Equity Workgroup (SEW)
Tuesday, December 13th, 2016
MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Room 6501
TIME: 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

ITEMS	TIME	TOPICS	LEADERS	EXPECTED OUTCOME
1	1:30-1:35	Minutes—Nov 29, 2016	Trichairs	Approval
2	1:35-1:45	National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity	Parikh	Discussion
3	1:45-2:00	Learning Communities	Kuo	Discussion
4	2:00-2:10	NameCoach Funding Request	Tri-Chairs	Discussion
5	2:10-2:15	Out-of State Funding Approval for David Marasco	Tri-Chairs	Discussion
6	2:15-3:00	SEW Activities Follow Up from Last Meeting	Tri-Chairs	Discussion

PRESENT: Adrienne Hypolite, Micaela Agyare, Angel Tzeng, Kelaiah Harris, Elaine Kuo, JR Jiminez, Lan Truong, Samera Hadi, April Henderson, Sarah Parikh, Judy Baker, Andrew LaManque

1) MINUTES- NOV 29, 2016

The meeting minutes were approved by consensus.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Adrienne Hypolite reported from the Equity Summit at Skyline College. The summit consisted of a wide range of keynote speakers and panelists from across the country. The summit provided a prime example of progressive professional development opportunities. Although it was primarily focused on faculty, Skyline College was well versed in the movement, perspective, and strategies of equity on campus. For more information on the Skyline College Equity Summit and to watch the live stream click [here](#).

1) NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR PARTNERSHIPS IN EQUITY

Sarah Parikh presented on the National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity (NAPE). NAPE strives to achieve the mission of building educators’ capacity to implement effective solutions. Three different areas of focus are offered to provide professionals with the support needed to increase student success, equity, and workforce diversity.

Sarah presented the micromessaging professional development program to the SEW. The micromessaging program provides participants with an awareness of the power of verbal and nonverbal communication.

It seems appropriate to have this activity as a follow up to Courageous Conversations. The college can continue to have more conversations and develop strategies in the classroom to become more inclusive. This professional development opportunity offers conversations to address culturally based implicit biases. This activity is a yearlong process consisting of a total of 6 meetings; 2 days of workshops, preferably college-wide, followed by smaller intimate workshops throughout the year. The meetings will be coordinated over long distance with the facilitator and at the final meeting, the participants will come together to share individual experiences of implementing the learned concepts.

Although the first two workshops are open, participants will need to be committed to attending workshops throughout the year, similar to FTLA. Participants are also required to gather research to use for their project, be mindful of how words are perceived, promote an equitable environment in the classroom, and explore effective ways to communicate. This program has primarily been geared toward employees who work directly with students; however, it is not limited to faculty only. In fact, the 2 days of open workshops are available for staff and administrators. All employees can implement learned concepts in daily interactions with each other.

So far, members of FTLA have expressed interest in attending this program, and the SEW can also consider extending an invitation to De Anza colleagues. If the SEW grants the proposal, Sarah will work with the Marketing Department to outreach to those who may be interested in participating.

Before a formal proposal is written, Sarah requested to receive feedback from the SEW to address specific information that should be included in the proposal. Typically, the facilitator works with smaller groups, the SEW would recommend negotiating the attendance limit to offer this program to a larger audience. The facilitator has presented this program with a focus on STEM students and faculty but there is a possibility this program can be presented very broadly.

The tentative timeline for the program would begin in the summer of 2017 and follow up through the 2017-2018 academic year. There is some concern that the summer is not an ideal time to solicit to faculty, as most faculty will be away. It may be beneficial to offer the open workshops at the college or district opening day, where it is more likely that faculty will attend.

Additional discussions to include in the proposal are: 1) what the total cost of the program is after additional fees are factored in, 2) how this program can be applied to classified staff, and 3) what research efforts will be used to evaluate how this particular activity contributes to student success. More documentation is needed on how the college identifies the issue of micromessaging, what commitments are required from faculty (and staff) besides attending workshops, and what will occur during the two open workshops. Information is also needed about how this program will be measured for impact and how the expected outcomes will be identified. For example, what outcomes are anticipated other than an increase in faculty and staff awareness about the examination of the language in terms of (implicit) messaging

and strategies to mitigate possible negative effects?

Sarah will edit the proposal and submit a formal funding request document to the SEW.

2) LEARNING COMMUNITITIES

In the previous learning community meetings, the topic regarding administrative support has been at the forefront of the conversations. Umoja, Puente, and FYE have expressed the need for administrative support and a position responsible for the learning communities. Elaine Kuo has been asked to discuss possible solutions with the SEW.

Currently, there is no administrative position overseeing or coordinating the activities of the learning communities. The Equity Programs Office has taken partial responsibility in assisting with the coordination of activities, although it is not required for the learning communities to report to the Director of Equity Programs, who consequently has a limited capacity to coordinate and supervise the learning communities.

The committee should discuss the expectations and the role of the Director. If the Director does not serve as the coordinator or oversee the learning communities, then the SEW should consider creating and funding a coordinator position. Currently, the learning communities consist of Umoja, Puente, and FYE. Although STEM Core is considered a learning community and it has a distinct coordinator position responsible for supporting the program, there is no specific counseling component and the Math pathway courses are not at the basic skills level. Additionally, STEM Core is being funded through a CTE pathways grant so the reporting and responsibility line is through the PSME Dean and not to the Director of Equity Programs or the SEW

The Director of Equity Programs position is under revision and the current status of competing priorities makes this an optimal opportunity for the SEW to review the job responsibilities of this position and offer feedback for the revision. As there have been new duties added to the job tasks, the SEW should consider discussing the details of the current job tasks, whether these tasks are related to equity efforts, and what the expectations are for the position. After identifying the needs of the campus, the SEW should bring feedback to the College President as part of the job description revision process.

The Interim Director position allows for the SEW to get a sense of how much time is needed for the various tasks and what might be the best way to meet all the varying needs. It is important for the SEW members to be aware of how Thuy Nguyen envisions the position and have a larger discussion on the intentions of the revised job description.

The Interim Director is not fully coordinating the learning communities due to the limited job capacity. The campus needs a manager that will oversee the learning communities and assist with planning, logistics and administrative components. If a coordinator position is hired, the coordinator would work under the director and be responsible for the operations of the three programs including registration, recruitment and evaluation. It would be preferable for the SEW to prioritize this responsibility and be proactive in providing a

solution to this challenge. On the other hand, it can be challenging to identify responsibilities of the Director position when the workgroup is uncertain of the responsibilities of the non-instructional faculty position. There was a suggestion for the SEW to help craft both the Director and the non-instructional faculty job descriptions more clearly.

If the college would like to reclassify the director position at a higher level and more externally focused, then the position would need to go to the Classification Committee for approval and the SEW will need to create a new position to assist the learning communities.

Originally, the non-instructional faculty position was designed to work directly with faculty on professional development with the support of the Director. The Interim Director's shifting priorities create a need to map out the job tasks through an open discussion process. To be fair to the Director position, the SEW should consider reviewing the job description and have a larger conversation with the BSI and 3SP Advisory Council. Pat Hyland offered to facilitate a meeting for the three groups to collaborate on the Director and the faculty position job descriptions. As the permanent Director will ideally begin their role on July 1st, 2017, it is important for the SEW to move quickly on this activity, particularly if the goal is to reclassify the position. Pat and Elaine will review the two existing job descriptions, along with the newly added priorities, and try to map them out before the committee reconvenes.

A meeting has been scheduled on January 17th, 2017 for the SEW to review Elaine and Pat's work, work out details, and make revisions as needed. This is not an official SEW meeting, but an invitation will be extended to members of the SEW to join this discussion if interested. Following this meeting, the Student Success Collaborative meeting on January 25th, 2017 will be expanded to allow for the tri-chairs of the BSI, 3SP, and SEW to review the mapping of the positions. An invitation will be extended to the learning communities as well. Once the groups have finished collaborating on the job descriptions, the recommendations will be sent to Thuy.

4) NAMECOACH FUNDING REQUEST

Judy Baker shared a presentation on NameCoach. The idea of using NameCoach initiated from faculty and staff requesting to have a training on name pronunciation. An in-person training may not be as beneficial because some people may be unable to attend, therefore the audience would not represent all employees in need of this training. For those who have difficulty pronouncing names or need to hear the name several times before it can be repeated, NameCoach is a more impactful solution to address the need.

Sometimes people with difficult names can relate to having limited communication with others due to the barrier of name pronunciation. This has the effect to negatively impact a person. Surveys show that the correct name pronunciation is most important for students and also initiates conversations. NameCoach offers the opportunity for people to record their name, that way others can listen to the recording and practice the pronunciation. In the demo presented to the SEW, students recorded their names and faculty were able to replay the recordings.

Each person can create a name badge with the origin, meaning of the name, and verbal and written pronunciation. A link can also be included on the signature of the email to direct users to the name badge. This product can be used for on-campus, hybrid, and on-line courses for faculty, staff, and students. This tool can also be used for commencement and other events. Name badge is a free service, but in order to maintain a database of everyone's name and pronunciation the college must pay for the NameCoach service. The service offers a one year contract for \$3,000.

Some members of the committee expressed their concern for privacy. If the college commits to using NameCoach for one year, the third party server will need to be secure as it will contain students' and employees' personal information. This will need to be closely monitored to prevent a breach of information.

There is also a need to verify how many people will participate in this activity. The workgroup cannot force participation, so this would be a voluntary effort. The product can also be implemented as a pilot program for the first year and if the college receives a lack of interest, then the SEW can consider opting out of the contract the following year. There was a suggestion to contact NameCoach and request if the company can provide data on consumers using their services.

The college can also explore other alternatives to NameCoach; for example, Foothill can create its own service. This is a possible option to consider; however, it is more challenging and time consuming. Pat shared that previously NameCoach contacted Foothill College regarding using its software for the commencement ceremony. At that time, there was a significant time constraint on the implementation of the service. Students would need to pre-record their name and deans would have to be willing to allot time to listen and internalize the pronunciation. The college decided that with such a short time period, the commencement was not the ideal occasion to pilot this service. It would be best to use this service in a classroom setting.

The college should be mindful when considering this service to make sure that it does not preclude human interaction, but instead serves as another resource. The service could be helpful for adding a more human dimension to online courses. The SEW should also carefully consider how this product relates to equity efforts and if there are alternative resources on campus that can assist with funding this product. Unfortunately, due to the expenditure guidelines, this product is an ineligible expense for professional development funds. Although this may not relate directly into equity activities, this proposal can be tied into the broader equity initiatives as an engagement tool to promote student success and community building. Additionally, it can be used for the mentoring program and building mentoring relationships.

If the college is committed to this activity, someone will need to be responsible for coordinating and implementing this tool. Judy volunteered to manage this tool; however, due to the amount of her work load and little capacity for additional tasks, she prefers only to take responsibility if there is an interest from the college.

Before voting on this proposal, the SEW would like to hear more from faculty and from other schools, such as Stanford and Pepperdine, that have used this service. Judy offered to send out a survey to faculty to gather some feedback on their interests. The SEW would also like to get by-in from the Academic Senate. This proposal initially originated as a request from classified senate, therefore staff should also be included in this discussion as it may be beneficial for staff as well.

Members of the SEW agreed by consensus to postpone the voting on this proposal. Andrew LaManque will speak to Carolyn Holcroft and request feedback from the Academic Senate. The SEW will follow up with this proposal at the next meeting.

5) OUT-OF STATE FUNDING APPROVAL FOR DAVID MARASCO

The tri-chairs have approved an out of state funding request for travel and conference for faculty member David Marasco. The CCCCCO was contacted and approved the use of funding for out of state travel.

David was appointed to the American Association of Physics Teachers Committee on Diversity in Physics. He will serve on the committee at the conference in Cincinnati, OH in July 2017.

David will return to the SEW in fall 2017 quarter to report on the conference.

6) SEW ACTIVITIES FOLLOW UP FROM LAST MEETING

At the previous meeting, the workgroup agreed to focus on the planning and implementation of two primary activities for the year and potential activities for institutional/cultural change and student engagement were discussed.

Activities for institutional/cultural change focus on implementing equity initiatives in the program review process including creating flex days for professional development and having open discussions on program review with a focus on equity. At the accreditation summit, participants discussed the possibility of including program review in the quality focus essay. The SEW can consider writing a plan that will expand the equity focus in program review.

There was a suggestion for SEW members to volunteer as ambassadors to help departments with program review. There is also the opportunity to have SEW ambassadors assist the PRC with revising the program review templates. The recommendations of the revised template can be submitted to the PaRC and ideally be approved by end of spring 2017. Administrators and staff could then begin their program review over the summer. In order for this to be achieved SEW members must be willing to help train others and lead discussions on equity. Once trained, data can be provided as a tool to lead discussions on the student success rate and disproportionately impacted groups.

There will be a follow up meeting to the accreditation summit in January, and at that meeting Andrew hopes to provide three topic areas for the accreditation team to choose from for the Quality Focused Essay (QFE). Andrew hopes to include program review as one of the topic areas and the SEW can contribute to this effort.

The student engagement activity seeks to create a multimedia action research project to capture student needs. Ideally, this project will be created by students and include student feedback and experience with the equity initiatives. The SEW will need student involvement for this activity. The questions will need to be carefully structured to guide the conversation and identify specific interactions students have with equity initiatives. The SEW will begin framing potential questions. To gather more student participation, the workgroup can partner with other programs such as honors.

There was a suggestion to base the program review activity on the multimedia project. The committee should begin by mapping out different types of activities and components that will be needed or preferred, such as research and the publication of students. This idea could also be incorporated into Thuy's initiative on service leadership, and the SEW should also consider other possible activities that can be included in her initiative. There was a suggestion to contact Daphne Small on possible leadership courses that could contribute to this activity.

A coordinator would be needed for this activity. In order for this activity to be a meaningful and proper learning experience for the students, it will require effort, coordination, and structure. This activity could be built in to the course and infused in the curriculum. Students could receive training from the faculty. This could help to infuse the equity activities in the curriculum. In order for this activity to be actionable, the SEW will need to identify the student needs and fund a position for someone to do the research.

The SEW should be using equity funding to support the workgroup's initiatives on campus. Funding should not be driven by the proposals, instead the committee should request proposals to fit the initiatives of the workgroup. Equity funding should support positions that could meet the needs of the SEW, perhaps a consultant or TEA. The committee will continue this discussion on strategies to meet the workgroup's needs. For now, Elaine can help provide preliminary information to begin with the student engagement activity.