# MEETING MINUTES

Date: June 7, 2019

Time: 1-3 p.m.

Loc: Council Chambers

## NOTES BY TOPIC

| **ITEM** | **TOPIC** | **DISCUSSION** | **OUTCOME** | **NEXT STEPS** | **\*RESP** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Land acknowledgement  Norm Review, Courageous Conversations protocol review | Carolyn acknowledged that this meeting is taking place on the land of the Ohlone people.  Carolyn reminded us about the 4 agreements and norms. | All members agreed to take responsibility for keeping to the norms. | n/a | n/a |
| 2 | Curriculum:   * New AD-T in Human Nutrition * Cloud computing certificate * Bridge to English Certificate of Competency | The committee was asked to look at three new program proposals and provide feedback to the corresponding departments.  The first proposal discussed was the AD-T in Human Nutrition.  A member stated he was happy with 3rd outcome that talked about race & ethnicity and SES factors that impact human health.  Another member liked this program because FH already offers these courses; no new courses need to be created.  A member found that this was a good way for students to make connection between Foothill and the transfer institution.  There were no recommendations for changes to the certificates.  There were no other comments/feedback from the committee regarding the other two programs.\*  \*After the meeting, one committee member didn’t realize we were done discussing this issue and provided feedback that he had on the other programs to the corresponding departments.  In discussing feedback on new program proposals, E & E members are unclear on what the new program creation group like to get back from this committee. The committee wants to be mindful of not holding up departments from moving forward with the curriculum process. | Members offered positive feedback on new program creation proposals.  No revisions were recommended. | Feedback will be compiled and sent back to the respective departments. | Debbie |
| 3 | AB 705 values statement and implementation efforts | I. AB 705 and Assessment/Placement  Paul shared Kennedy Bui’s slides on assessment changes due to AB 705.  The state requires Foothill to share out with governance groups what the college is doing for AB 705.  Prior to AB 705, the college was not in compliance with Title 5 in terms of using multiple measures to place our students into ESL, English and math, so Foothill had been working on changing placement policies.  The new placement process will first look at placing students using high school GPA. If there is no high school GPA available, students will take a guided self-placement.  ESL is still using the Accuplacer test, and will need a different mechanism by Fall 2020.  All placement tools are vetted through English/math/counseling faculty and Institutional Research.  If a student has a high school GPA, the student completes an online survey providing self-reported high school transcript information. After the survey is received, students get a message about their placement  Paul showed the first 2 questions of the placement survey so the committee could get a feel of the survey.  If student doesn’t have HS GPA, students are sent to a link to take guided self-placement.  One member reported that a faculty member from De Anza said that implementation of AB 705 was a disaster, that students were not prepared and that the instructor had to dumb down the content in his course.  Another member responded that the faculty member in question probably had a limited understanding of what to do, that it’s a false choice to keep the curriculum the same or dumb it down, and that it indicates a need of professional development to expand their knowledge of the pedagogical approaches available to faculty.  Another person responded that AB 705 will necessitate change to how we think, but it does not come at the cost of academic rigor.  The placement survey for Math will be in place July 8th.  II. AB 705 & English  Valerie Fong, Acting Dean of Language Arts & TLC, presented these slides.  The dept believes that a non-credit corequisite is better than credit corequisite. This is largely due to  repeatability concerns.  If student passes coreq, then that student can not take it again. This is a problem if the coreq is for credit and the student doesn’t pass the parent class.  Faculty Association is working on MOU’s for “wall to wall” and “mirrored” sections.  There was a question about whether Foothill is ahead of the curve on AB 705 implementation.  There is a concern with articulation. Suppose a student gets credit for ENGL 1-T (4 qtr units = 2.5 sem units).  Valerie clarified that ENGL 1S & T was articulated as a package. UC takes 5 out of the 10 qtr units. Articulation officer will speak to this issue at a later time.  A member posed the question: “Might there be different pathways offered depending on who the student is?”  III. AB 705 Value Statement  Ram presented a 3rd draft of the AB 705 statement based on comments from the 2nd draft. An emphasis was placed on the statement as a starting point and that it will be brought back to the Math and English departments for vetting.  The statement mentioned “support”.  A member would like to see more detailed commitment of what “support” would look like.  Another member is concerned that faculty role is lessened in this statement. There is only one statement at the end about faculty.  There was a suggestion to send the statement back to department faculty and let them articulate what the faculty role is.  Ram pointed out the value statement did not include what faculty should do because he is a dean and not faculty.  Another member replied that since the statement uses “We,” it already includes faculty. They created the Guided Self-Placement and support courses in addition to being the core of what’s happened so far with AB 705.  A member felt that the pedagogical piece should be placed earlier in the statement, and not at the end.  Another suggestion is to rewrite statement so that we aren’t using future tense and that we use “transfer-level” not “college-level” course.  Add ESL to this statement, since ESL is also part of AB 705.  Another member commented that the statement should not come from just E & E, that the statement should not be something “imposed” on the departments, but rather something that the departments really own. Another member replied that it was never intended to impose the statement on faculty and we have always explicitly planned to bring it to math/English faculty for feedback and revision. We are hopeful that E&E’s values will align well with the discipline faculty’s values.  Ultimately, the value statement will be put into Equity Plan 2.0. The deadline for the plan is December.  The document is a living one and is not complete. Melissa would like to put something solid on AB 705 by the end of October.  Folks mentioned that the AB 705 statement should include input from TLC, Assessment, STEM, counseling, A & R.  Should department faculty and E & E vet statement first, then send on to student services or should the statement be worked on together.  Different messaging will come from different groups.  Should faculty work on one aspect and student services work on a different one?  When decisions are made, operational side needs to be involved.  In order for this to happen, logistically everybody should be in the same place. Could we have a retreat early in the fall?  IV. AB 705 and Math  The math department has implemented changes to their courses in complying with AB 705.  Ram went over the slides on what changes have happened.  It was noted that there is still a need to focus on lessening the disproportionate impact.  A member questioned how is AB 705 affecting students who are repeating? Another member pointed out that Math 180 serves as a prerequisite for allied health programs at Foothill, but this I not necessarily the case for other colleges’ allied health programs.  One member pointed out there was a need for more statistics tutors, especially for online courses, where currently there is no assistance.  It was pointed out that Foothill students of color tend to be more successful than students of color from other colleges, which is good, but our students of color also continue to experience significant disproportionate impact.  A question was directed to the math faculty and Ram on lessons learned from implementation of changes due to AB 705.  One math faculty says that students will be fine.  Another faculty member said to be aware of logistical issues dealing with enrollment, so that students can register for courses smoothly and that they aren’t prevented from accessing these courses.  Another member thought that AB 705 was transformative about questioning what you believe about students when they walk into the door and redefines your role and beliefs as a faculty member.  There was a concern from one member about how articulation with out-of-state colleges and private institutions will be affected especially with regards to English and ESL courses. | Members learned about the changes due to AB 705 from Assessment & Placement and Math.  Members learned about the English department’s plan on how they will change their course offerings due to AB 705.  Members provided feedback and comments for the value statement on AB 705. | Have a retreat in October to get all involved parties together to finish writing the value statement for AB 705, which needs to be in Equity Plan 2.0. | Equity Office |
| 4 | Tutoring and equity gaps | Kristy went over slides that provide an analysis of the tutoring budget over the last 3 years.  A question arose on how we balance the equity piece and the budget piece for tutoring.  In 16/17 and 17/18, the college was chasing FTES and not looking at productivity.  The college was told to switch gears in winter 2018 from FTES to productivity.  There was no mechanism to manage the tutoring budget from a strategic perspective. It was difficult to get a firm budget number from the District.  David Ulate created a calculator to help us with looking at scheduling courses.  To get apportionment, the college needed a faculty member to oversee tutoring facilities. We were no longer hiring tutors; instead, we were hiring supplemental instructors, which got a different pay from tutors. Tutoring had to go under the 1320 budget because “tutors” were classified as “instructors”. In doing so, Foothill overspent their 1320 budget.  The district has now put into place a policy that any money overspent in 1320 is up to the college to pay off; the district will no longer be absorbing the overspent amounts.  Tutoring in the spring quarter was restored using funds from Thuy.  The budget on 19/20 needed to decrease by $6M from 18/19.  The productivity target for tutoring is 506. If our 1320 budget requires future cuts, they will come from tutoring first.  One person noted that E & E is drafting value statements, but the discussion on tutoring has not been around our values on tutoring and that we need to include students in the discussion. Due to time limitation, the conversation is not as deep as it could be.  Hard to get behind value statement when we can’t live behind the statement.  There is anger, resistance to do things because we can’t be effective if we’re cutting.  Kristy says we are changing things drastically and that we are looking for a new way of doing things; that we don’t do things in a silo; instead, we do it as a college.  She is looking to provide a tool to give deans a way to do things.  We are changing rapidly, but keeping the dialogue open makes her hopeful.  There is concern that tutoring is the first to go if budget is reduced. We can’t make this statement and at the same time proclaim we plan to help students succeed by providing robust support.  A suggestion was made to make cuts proportionately rather than only cut tutoring.  Members acknowledged that the problem is complex and the system is changing.  One person noted that tutoring should not have used 1320 funds in the first place.  This conversation will continue into the fall. | Members learned about tutoring budget.  E&E recommended we remain conscious of the disconnect between our plan to help students be successful by providing robust [tutoring] support and our plan to look to tutoring first if/when more budget cuts occur. | Continue discussion on tutoring and how it is tied to equity. | Equity Office |
| 5 | Evaluation of meeting outcomes and norms | The group commented:  Appreciate people coming, there is much better attendance this time. Please come on time.  Next week’s meeting will be about Equity Plan 2.0 only. | The group did not have time to evaluate the meeting norms. | None | Carolyn |
| 6 | Good of the Order |  | The group did not have time for good of the order. | None | Ram |

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

## MEMBERS PRESENT

### Voting
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