

Equity Meeting Minutes  
October 8, 2015  
PS102  
12:50-1:50 pm  
Equity Minutes

**ATTENDANCE**

E. Cervantes, K. Moberg, A. Ratto, S. Sweeney, V. Martinez, E. Talavera, F. Lozano, J. Stewart, C. Marquez, F. Lopez, D. Achterman, M. Fard, J. Richburg, R. Brown, K. Smith

I. Proposals and Funds (20 minutes)

The committee reviewed the Budget Outcomes Grid.

- CalFresh Support Center: the proposal will be moved out of Access Gateway.
- The Tutoring Center: the proposal would entail the hiring a staff person who would supervise evening tutoring among other duties. Due to a lack of tutors, there is a limitation to tutoring on the off-site centers. The Equity Plan needs to reflect the off-site tutoring in the future, since this is a multi-year plan.
- Learning Commons: the proposal is for hiring a retention specialist in connection with peer mentoring. The retention specialist would work with the mentors and may be supported partially through SSSP and Equity. It's a half-time program/retention specialist. K. Moberg will suggest a similar position in SSSP. The cost would be \$50,000. Currently, Equity is spending \$30,000 on SI which is only focused on English. Instead, since the Writing Center is under the Learning Commons, it would go to fund peer mentors for the greater campus. It was asked if there could be intersection with Title V but it would have to be with SI. The peer mentor will identify the student needs and connect with the retention specialist for regular reporting. This is the chance to do something radical but needs to have someone who wants to oversee this item. D. Achterman pointed out that there is support already in place. Other colleges are reporting promising reports with retention specialists. F. Lopez pointed out that there is a model on campus which is peer to peer modeling, the Vet Center, which works. The question is why are the resources, such as tutoring, split up between campus services. F. Lozano responded that there are different models being used. The Learning Commons is a different model than the Tutoring Center, which has an instructional piece and peer support. K. Moberg pointed out that both Hollister and Morgan Hill off-sites are not viable places to place funding due to lack of students. It's great as a long-term goal but requires a specialized focus. Specific questions can be sent to E. Cervantes to forward to K. Warren.

- Veterans: The research done focuses on the success of the veterans. What is not known is how many veterans come in and drop out then come back to the campus again. The funding is for a position that would be partially funded by Equity and partially funded by DRC. The reasoning behind having a counselor over a paraprofessional is due to the knowledge and expertise of the counselor. K. Moberg asked if an intake specialist would make better sense since they can have the opportunity with proper training to refer veterans to the appropriate resource. This is something to consider, which would lessen the funding.
  - A questions was raised if the campus was still targeting the inequities on campus.
  - This could be a problem of access for the veterans.
  - The suggestion is move this item to Access and add outreach since Equity can fund outreach.
- Basic Skills: The funding is reduced since peer mentors were removed.
  - The peer person will reach out to the students. The function of counseling is not to go into classrooms. Optimizing the expertise of the counselor to do workshops may be better suited for a retention specialist in that area. Both a counselor and retention specialist can set appointments with students. SSSP can fund the Basic Skills counselor if orientation courses are taught by the counselor.
  - Retention specialists would give a greater benefit with a lower cost. The performance gap is needed for a realistic view of certain areas and successes.
  - The bottom line is for the counselor to meet the students face-to-face. There is a gap between the student and the instructor which a counselor can diminish. The counselor can focus the conversation depending on the classroom and the situation.
  - It was asked that F. Lozano look at the numbers and focus on a specific area that is manageable.
- EOPS: this proposal should be moved to the Course Completion gateway. This population targets the identified demographics: low-income, Hispanic and Foster Youth students. Another area that needs to be adjusted is to increase Pop Size to 160 within a certain time-frame (60 Foster youth and 100 General EOPS).
  - The total position is half SSSP and half Equity.
  - The infrastructure is in place but no more students can be added to the counseling. There needs to be a good baseline, Something to look at as a committee is to understand what the

data means and how all are contributing to the effectiveness of the program.

- MESA/TRIO: Asking for funds to hire a program specialist full-time and paying for part of it from Equity. With the STEM grant ending by September 30, 2016, there will be a loss of funding since it funds different.
  - MESA funding was cut by 40% in 2008 and very little is being replenished this year. Both the TRIO and MESA programs have many facets that can't be done alone.
  - The funding will help stabilize the current transfer rates, which is above the college average. This can't be sustained once the STEM funding is eliminated. It was asked to add "Stabilize transfer rates" to the Measurable Outcomes.
- Career/Transfer: This is not negotiable but measurable outcomes need to be inserted.
- OIR: the number can be whittled down but this is above and beyond the scope of work and this has to be communicated to the Chancellor's Office.

This is a multi-year plan. The legislature wants to see that the college is succeeding. The proposals will begin once the campus finds out the allocations. This will be the last time that the current funding will be extended for eighteen months. The Chancellors Office is looking for outcomes. For Spring 2016, these proposals can be started. What needs to be decided is what is being spent and get the paperwork out quickly by the beginning of November with actual hiring in January 2016.

The members are asked to look at the proposals and rank these from one to eleven. By next time we will have the allocation and decide if it is achievable under the current funding stream.

E. Cervantes and E. Talavera will get rankings and E. Talavera will create a ranking chart and graph before the next meeting, October 22, 2015.

- II. Equity Plan Writing (15 minutes)-not covered due to time constraint.
- III. Review of Documents from Equity Summit (10 minutes)- not covered due to time constraint.
- IV. Bylaws (15 minutes)- not covered due to time constraint.
- V. Adjourned at 1:55 pm.