



HARTNELL COLLEGE

**Student Success and Equity Committee
Meeting Minutes
November 16, 2020
3:30 PM – 5:00 PM
Zoom Meeting**

Members

Name	Representing	Present	Absent
Cynthia Ainsworth	Faculty (Library)		X
Lisa Fischler	CSEA (PLL, Alisal)		X
Janet Flores	Faculty (Spanish)	X	
Ana Gonzalez	Management (Director, Continuing Ed)	X	
Guy Hanna	CSEA (O&A Specialist)	X	
Frank Henderson	CSEA (Tutorial Services Coordinator)		X
Melvin Jimenez	Faculty (Academic Follow-up Specialist)		X
Bronwyn Moreno	Management (Director, Equity Programs)	X	
Peggy Munoz-Meador	Faculty (Political Science)		X
Michelle Peters	Management (Director, DSP&S)		X
Meagan Plumb	Faculty (English)	X	
Heather Rodriguez	Faculty (COU, King City Center)		X
Jay Singh	Management (Director, PASS)	X	
Debbie Thorpe	Faculty (Nursing)	X	
Gemma Uribe-Cruz	Faculty (Veterans Program)		X
Senorina Vazquez	Faculty (Mathematics) Chair of Committee	X	
Laurencia Walker	Management (Director, College Readiness)	X	

Guests

Name	Title or Representing	Present	Absent

CALL TO ORDER: Nina Vazquez called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Approval of Agenda: The agenda was approved.
2. Approval of Minutes: The minutes from the 11/2/20 meeting were approved.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION/PRESENTATIONS

1. Equity Rubric Follow Up:

- a. Google Survey: Nina shared the survey that will be sent to faculty. Ideas were shared on how to finalize the survey wording and adding the actual rubric as an attachment. Should the survey results be anonymous? Yes, though a discipline needs to be added. Should it be required for all questions to be answered? Guy suggested to not make it a requirement to garner more responses. Nina will be meeting with O&A committee and will ask the best time to send out the survey.
- b. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations: Bronwyn mentioned that while preparing for the rubric presentation for Convocation, she and Laurencia noticed that dimensions 3 (Be culturally responsive) and 5 (Be race conscious) were less developed and that more examples and details were needed. Having more detailed information would make this part of the rubric more effectual.
 - Laurencia noted there is a tendency to conflate race and culture but they are not synonymous. She pointed out that we have an opportunity to work together and illuminate what it means to be race conscious and what that looks like in classes, services and curriculum. Language can be added to how these two inform each other; Laurencia volunteered to draft inclusionary wording.
 - Bronwyn discussed the hesitancy faculty may feel if they don't fully understand what being race conscious means. She suggested highlighting living examples, faculty who are already practicing being race conscious as a way to promote best practices.
 - Jay referred back to the webinars by Drs. Harris and Wood about what it means to be race conscious specifically in curriculum and classroom and what it looks like. He suggested the need to do some more research by reviewing the webinars.

2. Data/Research Questions:

- a. CUE Data Tools (Identifying Vital Signs)
 - i. Our Research Questions: Nina shared a summary table created by Jay who took all the data points compiled and organized the data into a table (following the USC Increase Series Data Tool) for us to review and discuss as we disaggregate by race, ethnicity and gender. The table is in the shared drive if others have ideas to add. Nina and Jay will be meeting with Matt Trengove to answer his questions: What do we want to know and how will it be applied? This information will ultimately be used to create a dashboard
 - ii. Jay explained the 4 headings used from the CUE tool: Access, Retention, Completion, and Excellence. Vital signs identified by the committee were added to the chart under each heading. Data will disaggregate by disproportionately impacted groups. What do we want to know: what groups are hidden behind big labels (i.e. Hispanic)...the level of granularity will give us a clearer picture than a broad brush stroke into one group.
 - iii. What will we do with the information? Guy suggested a deep discussion as a starting point as recommended by the ACCJC as well as design trainings with the PD committee and cross-collaboration with other faculty committees; Nina

suggested sharing document among faculty, staff, and students; Laurencia noted that the data will show pockets of excellence, uplifting the good work on campus as well as designing appropriate interventions as we identify those who are not being served.

- iv. Laurencia noted that as we identify subgroups this will influence the work for campus climate to better understand how students' college experiences are different. Guy

3. Research tools:

- a. CAGP Guide #1 Self-Assessment: Series of tools with the first Self-Assessment as a good starting place. It was agreed that the committee complete the assessment as a group; once we have a score we can share with other committees (and the equity task force). Meagan pointed made the good point that numbers are not as important as the discussion that will happen afterwards. Jay mentioned that this would be a useful model how other folks might be able to engage in this work. Laurencia suggested that everyone add examples and then as a group we determine a score. Nina will share the document in the shared drive.
- b. Other: Bronwyn mentioned she was working on an analysis of other bodies on campus working to advance equity efforts; identify basic goals of each group and then see how we all fit together. Nina mentioned she was asked by the Equity Task Force to present the rubric.

Adjournment: 4:59 p.m.

Next Meeting: December 7, 2020 3:30pm-5:00pm