



**Student Success Committee
Minutes
March 28, 2019
3:30 – 5:00pm
Room 2314**

CALL TO ORDER- 3:30 PM

ROLL CALL

Kari Aranbul	x	Rochelle Morris	x	Brian Spillane	
Dan Bryant	x	Cherish Padro	x	Heather Wyile	
Jim Crooks	x	Barbara Perry	x	Zhanjing Yu	
Cheryl Cruse	x	Sonia Randhawa			
James Crandall		Student Rep – VACANT			
Camelia Mihele	x	Susan Sawyer	x		

Guests		
Sandra Hamilton-Slane	Robert Bowman	Matthew Macias

- APPROVAL OF MINUTES – 11/29/18
 - Susan Sawyer motioned, seconded by Cheryl Cruse, unanimously approved.
- DISCUSSION/ACTION –
 - **2019-2022 Student Equity Plan**
 - Academic Senate had its first reading. Since then new data has come in from the Chancellor’s Office. An updated copy of the changes was sent out earlier in the day.
 - Originally were reporting based of gender. Chancellor’s office has removed that.
 - Cherish asked how the percentage increase determined from 17-18 year to 21-22. Sandra explained that the equity gap should be closed by 40% in three years. They take the difference between where our overall population is and the equity population is and add 40%.
 - Jim asks about page 2, under access successful enrollment, under activities- one of them mentions dual enrollment. He would like to know what that means. Sandra answered that they are pursuing accreditation to gain recognition. Would require them to meet certain standards. Jim mentioned that some English online classes are entirely Dual-Enrolled students, and he would like to understand the context a little more. Sandra added that Dual-

- enrolled students are not a part of the metrics. It was mentioned by multiple committee members that their Dual Enrollment students often perform better.
 - Jim asks about page 2, transfer to a four-year institution, how do we get that data? Sandra answers that is why the year lag is there in the data because we have to wait until National Clearing House can obtain that data and report out.
 - Charts on page 2 vs. page 10- very different. Sandra explains that there was some data that didn't get updated and she will make those corrections.
 - Page 14, Activities, who comes up with those? Sandra answers that she will reach out to the people in those areas, otherwise it is whatever goals that were already specified in the past Integrated Plans. Most were pre-determined.
 - Kari had questions about page 4, there are a few places for Black/African Americans specifically, should that be more inclusive to the entire student population?
 - Page 15 mentions Puente, but we no longer have a Puente Program.
 - Page 15, why would minimum GPA go from 100% to 30% for deaf/hard of hearing population. Sandra explained that she doesn't have an exact answer, typically those students do really well. Rochelle adds that there was a lot going on community wise that might be worth factoring in.
 - Measuring transfer readiness, only looking at ADT's – Sandra answers that is what is being measured by the Chancellor's Office. The more prevalent data should be "vision goal obtained".
 - Sandra wanted to add that after the vote takes place here, it will still go to Academic Senate for approval so it will be looked at again.
 - Kari motioned, Cherish seconded, motion passes unanimously.
- **First Generation Students as Equity Population**
 - Interest primarily because it might be consistent with other equity population groups. Could potentially be some cross-over.
 - Benefits and issues could be similar.
 - Established local goals in five different areas.
 - Bringing more awareness and visibility to this population.
 - Population that is dominant in retention and success is first generation.
 - Able to pull in data from Shasta College Application.
 - Cheryl motioned, Rochelle seconded, motion passes unanimously.
- **Including Formerly Incarcerated Students as an Equity Population** (Matthew Macias)
 - Up to the district to determine
 - Can start collecting data locally
 - Matthew Macias joined and shared his story regarding being a formerly incarcerated student. He is first generation, PACE and former foster youth. Receives support for all those areas, but would like to see more direct support for formerly incarcerated.
 - A benefit to adding them to the Equity plan would be for those who wouldn't qualify for Step-Up or other programs, they could still receive benefits.
 - Create more awareness with Faculty and Staff regarding the barriers formerly incarcerated students face.
 - Sandra added that this is a somewhat invisible population, by recognizing them as an equity population it shows those students that we know they are here.
 - Robert Bowman introduced himself as the Program Director of Step-Up. He points out that this will immediately affect FTEs. Shasta County has 2000 people on their case load, superior court has double that. So there are thousands of students out there who would benefit from support, that Step-up is not large enough to cover. If the college can commit to providing resources to these students, it can truly change lives.
 - Jim asked what the possible consequences would be by adding this group as an equity population. Sandra answered that collecting data would be an

issue. However, it would allow the college to start looking at the specific resources that these students need. Also, helps us with the funding formula because equity population success weighs more.

- Cherish added that the percentage of the students she mentored at the Good News Rescue Mission we're Shasta College students and being able to move on from their old lifestyle, be excited about school and feel productive, boosted their confidence.
- Jim wanted to bring up the possibility of diluting funds with adding this group to the Equity Plan. He asked if anyone wanted to add anything before voting.
- Camelia asks what the implications would be regarding students taking advantage of the extra funding. Robert points out Step-Ups accountability requirements. That is something that could be put into place. Sandra explains that there is no real difference in success metrics for the current Equity populations as compared to the general population.
- Kari motioned, Cherish seconded, motion passes unanimously.

- REPORTS –

- OTHER –

- ADJOURNMENT – 4:45 pm