

Equity Emergency Meeting

Minutes

9/2/15

Attendance: K. Moberg, E. Cervantes, J. Stewart, S. Sweeney, A. Ratto, F. Lozano, R. Brown, B. Barr, K. Warren, E. Talavera, J. Richburg, B. Lawn

I. Proposal Updates

K. Moberg asked that any proposals related to funding needed to be supported by research. Things that have been done in the past are okay because state didn't say no. The budget could go anywhere from 75%-100% more than what we currently received. If we can identify items that can be implemented quickly, and provide direct services to students would be more likely to be funded.

II. Data Discussion

B. Barr overviewed the data that was compiled. The data distributed is score card data, which is tracked from 6 to 7 years ago. The data being tracked was any math or English course in the 6 year period, where less than 10% completed the college level courses. Forty percent of the new annual class drops out by the second semester. By the following fall, 60% from the fall semester have disappeared. The students are swirling. The data also shows that 9% of an entering class is still at the campus after 6 years. The data that can be compared is the prior year before the campus was in equity mode. The Chancellor's Office tracks students taking 6 units and a math and/or English course for completion (degree, certificate, transfer).

Many colleges have gone deeper into the data, such as athletes and others, who don't do well in terms of transfer. They will be added to the queue. Athletes do well because they have direct intervention and support that the other students do not get. The ratio between student and counselor is lower with the athletes than the other students. The part-time student group needs to be targeted to increase success. The screening is for 6 units and attempting an English and/or Math course. If a student gets into a program of study early on, they will graduate 3 to 5 times the rate than students who don't. The BOG used was low and there was still a 3 to 5 times difference.

K. Moberg added that when the program part of Kickstart is implemented, there is a hope that it will focus students. R. Brown stated that last year's line was 80% which is a federal mandate. One difference is transfer because the longer term outcomes exponentially increase. The campus needs to continue looking at transfer. K. Moberg announced that there was a webinar that may provide a solution which deals with scheduling. There are a lot of students who could have earned a degree or certificate but they didn't go through the process.

III. Equity Report Draft

The committee can consider into the draft the items that the campus hopes to do next year that require time. If the campus has to return money, then the campus will have to

return money. The accountability measures are bigger now and the state wants it tied to SSSP. Future discussions need to be held on what the campus perceives is the linkage between SSSP and Equity. The existing budget is approximately \$90,000 for this year's allocation. The campus needs to think about spending these funds.

F. Lozano suggested that maybe hiring counselors will be possible in the spring semester. K. Moberg responded that there are a lot of infrastructure questions because since the person would be housed under equity that person would have to report to K. Moberg. The question asked is if a counselor is hired, should they be a general Equity counselor under the umbrella of Equity. This is a bigger discussion. Other parts of proposal beyond the staff are great that can be done if there were enough staffing to support the proposal.

It was asked if the projects can be identified and categorized. The report will include discussion on what was done last year and a forecast of the upcoming year with data. B. Barr pointed out that the research that is compiled may not be what the proposals needed. This is important because it will be part of the deliberation of the future work. What is proposed is that B. Barr takes the data and enters it into the Equity report template and writes the narrative of the data. K. Moberg and E. Cervantes will work on the draft and others are invited to read the draft. The bigger piece of the problem will be the budget, which is up to the equity committee. The items funded last year will be funded the upcoming year with the same parameters and build the budget based on the increase. The discussion should happen soon.

It was asked if there was a way to create an EOPS-lite program that would be a home base for those who aren't part of the existing programs. K. Moberg commented that the Basic Skills area is the area of focus that would give the greatest return. Maybe an EOPS-lite can be built for Basic Skills students. The barrier is that there is no extra space to place counselors and staff. Need other models that would actually work within the limitations.

F. Lozano asked for a couple of people to get together and create an EOPS-lite program. A. Ratto pointed out that support staff is key to the program EOPS, beyond the counselors. E. Cervantes suggested that maybe a support staff person could be used to provide aid and be a liaison to the financial aid office.

R. Brown pointed out that the transfer part is a big part to look at. Maybe do some focus groups with students in these specific populations. Maybe do some more of the research and drill down more into the issue of the transfer students.

IV. Timeline

B. Barr will have a first draft of the data portion by September 15th to send to the committee. E. Cervantes K. Moberg will work on the anecdotal part from last year and others will work on proposals and submit them. In the meantime, K. Moberg will go by the current base to build the funding. She asked the committee to think practically on what can be done this year and next year.

Everyone's proposal is needed by September 24th for a quick discussion and to place in report. Shared governance will begin in October and be submitted to the Board of Trustees at the November 10, 2015 meeting then sent to the chancellor's office by the end of November.

V. Other Discussions

- a. A question was asked about who will be making the decision on the proposals. The committee will make a recommendation which will be added to the report then sent to Presidents Council. A draft of the bylaws was brought to the retreat. E. Talavera will send out the bylaws again to those on the mailing list.
- b. A concern was raised if the meetings should be extended. It was asked to send recommendations via email.

VI. Meeting ended at 2:57 pm.