

**Equity Committee Meeting  
Notes**

Thursday, February 25, 2016  
1:00-2:30 p.m. / Room 229

**Committee members present:** **Faculty:** Mary Bogan (co-chair), Sylvia Pimentel;  
**Managers:** Mark Greenhalgh (co-chair), Jennifer LaBounty; **Students:** Rita Wainess

**Resource members present:** **Campus Communications:** Lisa McPheron; **Disability Support Services:** Ruth Sipple; **Equity:** Deb Perkins; **Institutional Research:** Carlos Ayon, Megan Sirna; **Library/LRISPS:** Dani Wilson; **Veterans Resource Center:** Aghabi Rangel

**Guests:** Doug Eisner, Lizbeth Trujillo

- I. Update on 2015-2016 Equity Plan and Expenditures
  - a. There are currently three plans to think about: 2014-2015 plan which is almost completely closed out, 2015-2016 plan (current plan), 2016-2017 which we need to start discussing.
    - i. 2015-2016 Equity Plan submitted to the state in December. A call was sent out from the State Chancellor's Office for readers for early February so Deb is hoping for feedback sometime this spring.
    - ii. The goal for 2015-2016 funds is to have them expended by June 30, 2016 to get used to a one-year spending cycle and to assist with ease of reporting.
      1. The quarterly reports should give the committee a better idea if any programs are not planning on spending their 2015-2016 allocation.
      2. Deb will work on creating a form for any programs that would like to request additional funds. Mark mentioned that the additional funding should only go to projects that were included in the plan.
      3. There was a reminder that all purchasing requests need to be completed by mid-April.
    - iii. The expenditure report for the 2014-2015 was received in late January and was due February 18.
      1. Fullerton College received some additional funds from the district because SCE was not able to spend their entire allocation. The total 2014-2015 allocation was \$1,063,714.
- II. Planning process for 2016-2017 allocation of funds
  - a. Mark provided a brief summary of how funds had been allocated up to this point.

- i. Year 1—the college received money; faculty, staff, and administrators brainstormed ideas (mainly currently running programs) that met equity goals; a grant writer was hired to write plan; commendations were received from the state
  - ii. Year 2—there was a campus-wide call for proposals that were submitted and reviewed by the Equity Committee; the amount requested from the proposals almost met the amount expected to be allocated from the state; most proposals were accepted if they were in line with equity goals; some proposals were combined if they seemed to duplicate activities.
  - iii. Year 3—we are expecting to receive a similar amount from the state for 2016-2017 but may receive a larger portion of the district money because of growth. 3 possible options (to start discussion)
    - 1. Look at current funding and see what is working. Continue to fund currently funded projects to allow them to make an impact.
    - 2. Identify 2-3 main equity initiatives and put money toward those activities.
- b. There was discussion about looking at preliminary results of currently running programs and see what is working or not.
  - i. There was concern raised about the idea of only funding larger projects because it might not give an opportunity for smaller projects that do not have other funding sources to receive resources (example of Veterans using Campus Communications to help with marketing/outreach).
  - ii. There was discussion about the role of program review and that some categorically funded projects or activities are not integrated into the campus planning process.
    - 1. Doug mentioned some concerns he had identified including categorical programs acting in silos without others on campus knowing what they were doing, non-categorical programs using categorical funds, and when departments don't include all activities (especially ones funded by Equity, SSSP, or Basic Skills) in their program review.
    - 2. There was discussion and agreement that activities funded by Student Equity should meet the campus mission, purpose, and goals in addition to meeting the Equity goals set by the state.
- c. The discussion returned to the planning process and there was some concern about clearly communicating to programs about whether to include activities such as campus tours and marketing.

1. An example was given that any proposal with activities related to transfer should meet with the Director of the Transfer Center to discuss if the activities overlap with any current Transfer Center activities and/or if the Transfer Center staff can assist with the activity.
    - a. Cecilia mentioned that some programs want to try to coordinate their own tours or campus visits but the tours that are open to all students haven't been filling completely so in most cases, it doesn't make sense to try to coordinate another tour in addition to activities already taking place in the Transfer Center.
  2. Since funding is only in the second year, there are still some areas that can be improved to help coordinate activities and ensure the campus is staying in compliance with not supplanting activities.
- d. The committee discussed initially looking at currently funded projects and allowing them to request funding for 2016-2017. There will be a process and accountability to show that the programs are establishing goals/objectives and working toward those.
- i. There were suggestions for the funding request template (for currently funded projects) including connecting activity to campus mission and goals and key personnel (who will do what and focus on key activities).
  - ii. There was further discussion about concern about closing the loop of showing how activities link to the campus and documenting all activities through program review; not only ongoing projects.
  - iii. The committee may need to find a way to give feedback to programs before approving funding by defining the framework of what our campus want so to achieve.
    1. There was a reminder that the state will start requiring outcomes soon.
    2. There was a question about whether equity goals are defined. The response was that they are defined by the state.
- e. Before the next meeting, Deb will work on creating and emailing a draft of a funding request form (for currently funded projects) so that the template can be finalized by the March 10 meeting.
- f. The committee will meet on March 31 since the normally scheduled 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting in March falls during spring break.
- g. There are six meetings remaining so the tentative timeline is to have the template sent out in March with a due date around the end of April. This will give the committee two meetings to review request before the end of the semester.

- i. If funds remain after currently funded projects put in their requests, then there might be a call out for additional projects.
  - h. The process for funding will need to be communicated to campus leadership (faculty and classified senate, Vice Presidents, and President).
  - i. There was a discussion about setting aside a portion of funds for certain types of activities that might not be anticipated but concern because all activities should be included in state plan which will need to be done by next October.
- III. There was not time for an update on projects/discussion from last semester
- IV. Upcoming conferences were briefly mentioned. Anyone interested in attending these conferences should put in a request through Staff Development.

Next meeting: Thursday, March 10