

Student Equity Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
November 16, 2022

Quorum?	Met quorum.
Public Comments	No public comments.
Approval of Minutes	Approval for March and April minutes deferred to next meeting.
Next Meeting	December 7, 2:00-3:30.
Review Student Equity Plan	<p>Overview – Dan and Jennifer briefly highlighted the Student Equity Plan (SEP) structure.</p> <p>The SEP has three parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction – looking back on previous plan and reflecting on approach to this plan and our definition of equity.</li> <li>• Body – covers five metrics (bulk of the plan) focusing on two student groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ enrollment,</li> <li>○ transfer level,</li> <li>○ English in math, passed in the first year,</li> <li>○ primary to secondary term persistence, and</li> <li>○ transfer and completion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• End – answers questions on Student Services</li> </ul> <p>The Introduction attempts to talk about things accomplished from 2019-2022. Covid impacted the ability to assess data; many factors affected the data and Covid was a big one.</p> <p>Year one is an inquiry year, making it unique. The intent is to, qualitatively, better understand where the gaps are. Constituencies, our stakeholders, were drawn from throughout the campus, especially – but not only – our students. We want to learn what the needs really are rather than assuming we know what they are. From this, develop activities and approaches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a race-consciousness focus, rather than tip-toeing around these issues. Work is targeted as equity work, not equality. The State encouraged us to choose fewer student populations to do a lot of work there, rather than trying to be all things to everyone. The focus was completely derived from the group that reviewed the equity data. There was a disproportionate impact in two areas: men of color and part-time students. These were chosen to be the focus groups.</li> </ul>

There is a mention of an equity-navigator using a campus effort, not just with one person. This was not in the previous equity plan. We want an accountability space with a possibly shared role in project management to keep us on task. Hopefully by Spring, the equity-navigators would be assigned – with a recommendation for the team to be comprised of a manager, a faculty member, a classified, and a student.

The work group has been working on fields common across all five metrics. Each metric has:

- Identified Challenges or current structures at Ventura College (VC) that are impediments for success in the student groups. Then imagining what an ideal VC would look like if the impediments didn't exist.
- Plan of Action to address equity gaps in the student groups.
- Support Needed, such as budgetary requirements. (The State Chancellor's Office is asking what VC needs from them.)

The meeting was then opened for questions and discussions on the SEP.

Question: Has the team given any thought about how the Equity Plan will be communicated to the campus and to the areas listed within the plan?

There was initial discussion about starting off the year with a summit with a panel of people from the writing group to introduce the Plan to the campus. Otherwise, nothing has been established yet. The group recognizes that much of the campus doesn't even know what is in the SEP; there is a need to communicate this. The hope is the equity-navigator(s) will help with spreading information. They would ensure the various areas learn about things presented in the SEP. However, in an inquiry year, more questions will be asked than requests made to engage in tasks.

Recommendations/suggestions made include:

- Start introducing the SEP next Spring
- Email announcement (to the campus) to go out after Board approval
- Do presentations in major committee meetings
- Round-table discussions
- Create info-graphics / PowerPoint to minimize extra reading – (more visual / less text)
- Use faculty/staff professional development (PD)

The goal would be to get the word out as much as possible to prepare people for a running start in the Fall. Next year will be a big year because action plans need to be solidified, along with implementation plans for the following years.

	<p>The SEP review is on all three senates' agendas as well as on the Board's. The ASVC has already read it and had very informed questions. They vote on it on November 29. The students are eager to get started and be involved. For the other two senates, the final read is around December 2<sup>nd</sup>. It is on the Board's agenda for December 13. (Drinks are on Jennifer! : - )</p> <p>Question: In the following year, what is the budgeting plan?</p> <p>The Exec Team has already initially reviewed this and will be having a more detailed discussion. Finding funds to support the Equity Plan efforts is their responsibility. Some of the funds will come for the SEA budget. Part of the process will be to identify where money is being spent on equity already because this is happening from a lot of budgets (general, categorical, grant, HERRF). Without being specifically earmarked, the campus' total spending on equity cannot be accurately determined or reported.</p> <p>Question: Could Marketing or someone help to create the visuals?</p> <p>Heather will submit a Marketing request to start the process. Additional assistance, for bullets/highlights to use, will have to happen via email since the work group has already had its final meeting. Some of the members could meet with Marketing to develop this.</p> <p>Question: Should the Equity Plan be continued as an agenda item?</p> <p>Changes/revisions to the Plan are acceptable until it is approved by the Board. Any input should be provided to the work group.</p> <p>Future (standing) agenda item – Communicating the SEP.</p>
SEA Budget	<p>Damien presented a breakout of SEA funds from FY20 thru FY23. This involves the past three years and present year. Funds are usually committed to specific things a year in advance, but requests can be made for the next year. The FY24 funding is not yet known. The draft budget is now in the committee folder.</p> <p>As a reminder, the SEA funds are not the only source of equity money.</p> <p>Once the budget is finalized and reviewed by David and Cathy then it can be included in the executive summary.</p> <p>Funds are being looked for from the college, collectively, rather than from the SEP Team managing this budget.</p> <p>A question was asked about including the budget in the SEP to show direct links between funding and activities. Part of the idea was to be able to use this in future reports. As an example, Basic Needs was used because it had a tiny allocation of the SEA funds. The amount allocated from the SEA budget was done at the committee's request last year. There was a desire to include this as a funding prioritization to show the commitment of the</p>

committee. (The State already provides a lot of money specifically for Basic Needs.) Actually, these funds had not even been used.

A past report to the State was shared with the team. No narrative is included in the reporting; the State only requires numbers.

Some named programs listed on the budget are now obsolete. For instance, Pirates' Cove doesn't exist anymore and the funds were reallocated to something else. There were no funds allocated to the Cove this year. Funds can and do get reallocated when things change. Similarly, funds once allocated to Student Activities were reallocated to Outreach and Student Engagement.

An intent (of the SEP) was to identify the groups that were disproportionately impacted. The same areas were identified: enrollment, math & English, transfer, completion, and retention. Emphasis was placed on helping instructional faculty learn to teach students of color. What will move the needle in terms of making this happen in terms of the budget? There is a big need for this.

It seems that people are looking for the link from the funds to activities. Hundreds of thousands have been spent on activities but they come from different sources, not just the SEA budget. This doesn't mean they can't come from the SEA. We can't assume that the SEA budget is only being used for equity work. The SEP does not specify the funds have to come from SEA as long as the work is being done. Just because it isn't reflected in the budget, doesn't mean it isn't being done.

We need to work on demonstrating where the money is coming from beyond SEA. While the idea of something like the use of a hashtag (#Equity is great) is nice, it can't be plugged into Banner. The use of other funds – such as the LGBT grant – are not reflected in the equity budget. This doesn't mean the work isn't being done. Something has to be established to earmark the things within Banner to show, in a more holistic way, the spending on equity efforts.

The present budget format is helpful but possibly could be more so. It was described as opaque, vague, and loose. For instance, a large percent of funds is allocated to FYE, and it shows it's going to salaries. What if it's a salary? Are we able to show that we're accomplishing tasks that are really impacting our equity? We don't know if that's the right fit. How will the budget contribute to moving the needle when the FYE students are not educationally disadvantaged? FYE students don't fall into the two student focus groups.

Even using other funding resources, the SEA budget should still be looked at. Is the current funding still in the right place? Things have changed, like Basic Needs which has its own on-going source of money now. It currently doesn't need the assistance of the SEA funds though it may again at some future point.

Whenever the committee is shown a budget, there's always so much work to understand it. Even once understood, there's still more questions to be asked. Can this be put on future committee agendas? Does the committee want to spend a lot of time focused on the budget? Or do we want to spend a lot of time focused on tracking the equity efforts and initiatives? Or does the group want to do both? Would the committee's time be wisely spent if it goes over the budget with a fine-toothed comb?

Opinions on this are varied with some overlapping. There is a desire to really understand the budget. There are also some who want to be able to recommend where the money should go. Enough people want to do this, to the point their opinions can't be tossed aside. Then there's also the continuing conversation (from last year to this year) that, as long as the funds are provided, it doesn't matter where it comes from. There are those that feel as long as we can understand where it is coming from, we can focus on the equity work and not necessarily the budget.

There should be some accountability. Are we doing what we said we would do? It would be nice to have something that identifies the priorities and the funding source/allocation to spend on them. This could be set up in the First Year, so that starting Year Two, we know the money's there.

The presented version of the budget was helpful. What else would you like to see happen? What's a realistic expectation for the group? What are we looking at? Guided Pathways is also one of the budgets, as is Basic Needs. The Dreamers' budget? It could be done but how frequently is a different question. Perhaps only on a semester basis.

It would be beneficial to really add budget to the equity plan. We haven't quantified what the initiatives are. How much is going to be needed to truly meet a metric? This will be key. Then things can be delineated. Some of these things are funded from other programs and sources. This is like the chicken and egg. We don't know how much there is to ask for if we would like to expand or do something here. Both need to happen. We need to identify where there could be money, but we need to identify what the needs are. Then we can come up with solutions.