



Diversity Action Council Minutes

March 28, 2023

Present: Sravani Banerjee, Claudia Barbosa-Daniels, Vince Cabada, Juan Gil, Tammeil Gilkerson, Raniyah Johnson, Alyssa Larios, Thu Nguyen, Madison Seto, Shreeyukta Singh, Brandon Yanari

Also Present: Emily Bahn, Cristina Leal, Eric Narveson, Melissa Nievera-Lozano, Bryana Perez

A. Meeting was called to order

B. Adoption of Agenda

C. Public Comments

D. Information/Discussion

1. **Introductions** Members and non-members introduced themselves.

2. **Overview of Charge & Summer Training**

Raniyah Johnson reviewed the history of revitalizing the DAC and focusing in on what we are trying to accomplish on the campus with all the amazing work happening (Humanizing Curriculum & Instruction, EMP, Equity Plan). She reviewed the new charge approved through College Council. Shared the rationale for committee membership by divisions, special programs, student representation & how we can better support campus-wide goals and planning.

Eric Narveson asked if we include Veterans as the charge and noted it wasn't included on the list. Raniyah noted that the charge wasn't focused on any one specific group but recognized the intersections for individuals who also identify as Veterans. Eric said there are also unique situations to themselves regardless of their race, gender, ethnicity, identity. Tammeil Gilkerson added context that DAC is overarching institutional piece that then leads to the programs and services we offer (like Veteran's program).

Emily Bahn asked about whether we would include language as well because culture was listed. Raniyah responded that language would be embedded into culture. Tammeil talked about how DAC can dig deeper into

Brandon Yanari asked about the difference between DAC and Student Equity Committee. Raniyah explained that the Student Equity Committee is focused on the student equity gaps we've identified in our Equity Plan. Their charge is what activities they are doing, how they are interacting with different committees and

constituency groups to close those gaps with a focus on the disproportionately impacted groups that have been identified. Diversity Committee is more of the umbrella and there may be ways to interconnect and find opportunities to drive the changes. Tammeil shared this is also about this connection to employee capacity building to be able to do their own self-reflection, training, and support—building up our capacity to drive the mission Alyssa Larios shared it is more like we are working internally on our employee staff culture and then going out and supporting our students. Everyone agreed with her great summary.

Tammeil shared that there is a commitment to the day-long training annually on the Wednesday before PDD. Asked everyone to mark the date to build the committee's internal capacity for leading the work next year. Sravani asked if the date is August 23, 2023. It was confirmed that this is the date to hold.

3. Draft Institutional Definitions for Opportunity, Equity, Social Justice & Anti-Racism

Tammeil shared that College Council had a good discussion and adopted definitions yesterday so we can institutionally operationalize them at EVC. The current values of opportunity, equity, and social justice in the Educational Master Plan (EMP) cited the District's definitions and College Council felt there was a need to have institution-specific ones. Committee took turns reading the new definitions.

Equity definition: Melissa Nievera-Lozano commented that she liked that there are active words—reviewing, changing, addressing—and that it isn't just this thing that is out there, but we do the work of making equity real. She appreciated that. Alyssa commented that one of the words she liked was intentionality—in general—in anything, especially working with students we need to be intentional. For example, if this form is too long or the way I did this invite, or the way we support colleagues who we may see saying something. Brandon also appreciated the active words.

Opportunity definition: Claudia Barbosa-Daniels asked is this any circumstance at all, like undocumented or newly enrolled—and asked if that means there are no barriers for these students. Tammeil clarified that she believes these statements are aspirational and is what we are trying to strive for and documenting the definitions help us elevate and have the discussions. For example, there is a pathway for undocumented students to go to school—and the work happening in the background to help facilitate. Intentional about trying to recognize student's unique circumstances. She also shared that these definitions came from the leadership of our student leadership on what the students said for their definitions when they hear these words—unique circumstances came up a lot for the students.

Social Justice definition: Sravani shared that it is a powerful statement.

Anti-Racism definition: Sravani liked the idea of not mentioning any one group and liked the use of “one racial group over another”. She noted, every cultural group has racists and likes that we don’t make it a black and white issue, but we make it an issue about race in general. That’s the way it should be.

Eric asked if there is a working definition of racism—you can define it in different ways. However, he is thinking ethnicity itself, but if you think about race you can think about the three races in the world and that’s it. He is reading between the lines of people’s ethnicities, cultures, etc. rather just simply appearance. Tammeil said it is a good question and share about the rich discussion at College Council meeting and feedback she received from individuals who said that every time there is a discussion about prejudice or discrimination that’s racialized or about racial equity, why are we talking about queer folks or other categories? She shared that it feels like every time we want to center that our students by racialized categories are not succeeding at the rates that are equal to each other or that there is disparate impact, it feels like it gets diverted with comments that say we aren’t being inclusive enough. What the group tried to do with the definition is about what Eric instituted—racism, race, ethnic identity, and culture as being the umbrellas. Being intentional about not trying to dissuade or make us uncomfortable about talking about the issues related to race and racialized outcomes for our students because we will never solve it if we don’t sit with the discomfort and trying to do something around it. The goal of DAC is to help us create spaces for students and employees to have these kinds of discussions and have safety in the discomfort to get to the goals we’ve set. Eric asked about the categories we are going to use and the goals and how we can communicate this—or clarify—how we are going to define things for those who aren’t participating. Tammeil said it was a great comment and will need the help of the group to clarify this together. She shared that the EMP goals and the Student Equity Plan has benchmark goals of how we want to see students succeed and complete disaggregated by different categories. We are looking at our operationalized plans as being the definition for folks and recommended referring people back to those documents as how we are defining things as examples.

Juan Gil offered that maybe broader definitions allow more people to see themselves in them versus defining them more stringently and causing people to feel excluded. Alyssa offered, that people who might be bi-racial or have different lived experiences leaves more room. There is so many different things we can label. We are going from the macro of changing staff culture to help achieve student outcomes. Madison Seto appreciated the discussion on being biracial because she identifies as being biracial (Hispanic and Asian) but she looks more Asian but grew up more culturally Hispanic. She feels like people assume she can relate to being Asian, when she actually relates more to her Hispanic side. Juan added that there are students who have a different level of culture—coming from blended families or immigrant students who came to the U.S. at different times and the percentages of those cultures may show up differently. Sravani said this is a great starting point and

this is the conversation we need to be happening. We need to be consistently evolving. Tammeil shared that this committee has the opportunity to continue lead the evolution and the charge can be reviewed every year as well.

4. Review of Student Equity Plan & Goals

Raniyah reviewed the Student Equity Plan and the overarching goals for the next three years. Some differences between the former plan and Plan 2.0. Be intentional about the work versus being a checkbox. The former plan tried to address every group/population and do an activity and then we were surprised when we didn't move the needle. This plan is much more focused on smaller more disproportionately impacted populations and more collaborative to reach the goals.

- Transformational-how can we change the institution through the work we are doing
- Community Driven-how do all of us individually and within divisions/departments support the work.
- Fluid and Dynamic allowing ourselves to see if it is having the impact, we want and if not pivoting to respond.
- Race-conscious-not being afraid to talk about race and equity gaps
- Integrates with other plans, braiding funding & other committee work

Sravni asked how the \$25,000 mini grants are being used and planned right now. Melissa shared that ASPIRE is working on their plan.

Given the time, discussion will happen at the next meeting.

E. Adjourn-M/S/P (Banerjee/All)