

**FOOTHILL COLLEGE**

**Student Equity Workgroup (SEW)**

**Tuesday, December 12, 2017**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**LOCATION:**  Room 5609

**TIME:**  1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ITEMS** | **TIME** | **TOPICS** | **LEADERS** | **EXPECTED OUTCOME** |
| 1 | 1:30-1:35 | Minutes—11/28/2017 | Trichairs | Approval |
| 2 | 1:35-1:45 | Budget Update | SEW | Discussion |
| 3 | 1:45-2:15 | Choosing Language - continued | Holcroft | Discussion |
| 4 | 2:15-3:00 | Exploring a COR | Starer/Holcroft | Discussion |

**PRESENT:** Micaela Agyare, Pauline Brown, Donna Frankel, Katie Ha, Kevin Harral, Carolyn Holcroft, Debbie Lee, Jiin Liang**,** Lisa Ly, Betsy Nikolchev,Josh Pelletier, Paul Starer, Ram Subramaniam**,** Voltaire Villanueva

**Consent Calendar:** The trichairs approved a $400 request for STEM Center brochures.

**Minutes approved** from 11/28 meeting

**Budget Update**: Going forward all funding requests should be forwarded to the Office of the President through Peter Chow. Andrew will provide a budget update at the January meeting.

**Choosing Language – continued**

Holcroft reviewed the discussion from the last meeting and the SEW continued brainstorming more equity-minded language to use:

**Achievement gap**: achievement disparity, achievement parity, equity success, achievement inequities, inequities in achievement

**At-risk**: attention equity, at promise, unsupported, prioritized, student who may leave, exceptional, opportunity youth

What is the definition of At-risk? The State defines in through the 3SP: students on probation, basic skills, no educational plan, facing suspension. Suggestion was made to think of these students in terms of their potential.

There was some discussion about the process of how “appropriate language” is chosen. The following comments were made:

* Just making language the focus of discussion is useful and there was a suggestion to make a contest for the language we use.
* Observation that new language eventually becomes negative.
* Recommendation to explore the cultural significance of the language used and it must also reflect our standards.
* Some expressed concern that we are just imposing a top-down structure in approving language to use that is related to our power structure. For example, who came up with the language of illegal vs. undocumented?
* A repeated theme came up about how to get student voice in our equity discussions. We need to have students in this conversation.

The agenda item ended with a question of where does SEW go from here?

**Exploring a COR**

Holcroft first presented a framework for applying an equity lens to a COR. This was based on a presentation she had given earlier to the Curriculum Committee (please see the CCC minutes from 11/14/17 for an overview of the presentation and exercise: https://foothill.edu/curriculum/pdf/ccc/2017-18/CCCMinutes\_2017-11-14.pdf)

Next, the SEW applied the framework to the MATH 105 COR. The group brainstormed the stereotypical math instructor:

* Men
* Asian/White
* Socially inept
* Glasses/pocket protector
* introvert

If students don’t see themselves in that stereotype, then it can undermine learning. It is important to try and bring in a counter-narrative to the stereotype.

Other points that were made include:

* Alternative language for SLOs: “Student experience outcomes”
* Check to see if textbooks confirm stereotypes
* Who is the audience of the COR? Student? College? State?
* De-emphasize high-stakes assessments in the methods of evaluation