

Equity Committee Meeting Notes

Thursday, September 8, 2016 1:00-2:30 p.m. / Room 229

Committee members present: **Classified:** Chuck Helms; **Faculty:** Mary Bogan (co-chair), Sylvia Pimentel, Rolando Sanabria, Perry Webster; **Managers:** Mark Greenhalgh (co-chair); Jennifer LaBounty; **Students:** Lyeah Mukasa-Wilson

Resource members present: **Cadena/Transfer Center:** Cecilia Arriaza; **Disability Support Services:** Ruth Sipple; **Equity:** Deb Perkins; **Institutional Research:** Carlos Ayon, Megan Sirna; **Library/LRISPS:** Michelle Garcia;

- I. 2015-2016 funds
 - a. The majority of the 2015-2016 funds have been spent. We don't anticipate a problem spending all funds by the state deadline of end of December 2016 since programs were asked to spend all funds by the end of August.
- II. 2016-2017 Proposals
 - a. Mark gave a recap of the June 2016 meeting. The committee members voted to allocate funds with a 10% increase for any project that asked for more money than 2015-2016 or at the amount requested (if it was the same or less than 2015-2016).
 - b. There was some discussion about not being able to sustain the way we are funding programs. The issue of focusing only target populations or including more broadly focused activities was raised. The State Chancellor's Office may make some decisions for us.
 - c. A list of activities and the amount they were funded was distributed. The Deans of the divisions overseeing the programs were notified in early July.
 - d. There is a new Business Office Specialist who Deb will be in touch with to discuss the budget.
 - e. Programs will need to start to be evaluated with the possibility of reducing or eliminating programs.
- III. Evaluation and Assessment
 - a. A memo from José Ramón will go out to all program coordinators outlining what they need to report on in order to be considered for future funding. There is a report template that will be sent out with the memo.
 - i. This will be sent out in the next few days with the expectation that program coordinators will return it before Thanksgiving.
 - b. Deb and Megan will be available for information sessions to answer questions program coordinators might have about the report template.
 - c. There was discussion about the template. One of the goals is to track the intensity of student participation; looking at what are the activities and how often are they happening.

- d. This report will also be an opportunity to really examine what programs are doing.
- e. In the 2015-2016 Student Equity plan, larger goals were identified so this will help to see how the programs are impacting the goals.
- f. Program coordinators do not need to attend all three informational sessions.
- g. There was a question about identifying the program goal on the form. The program coordinators should fill out a form for each goal.
- h. There was a question about disaggregating within a population. For example, we have a large Latino population on our campus so by default programs might be impacting Latino students but how can the programs ensure they are impacting students who would not have been successful without a program or intervention.
 - i. This is why we have a Research Analyst assigned 50% to Student Equity so that a relationship can be established with the individuals running the programs to better understand the data.
- i. The State Chancellor's Office says we need more coordination with Basic Skills and SSSP.
 - i. There was a question about whether we had received more direction from the higher up administration. At this time, the only direction the committee has been given is to not hire full-time positions.
 - ii. There was discussion about whether as a committee we should seek direction from the administration or whether we should be the ones to inform the administration about the equity needs on our campus.
- j. There was a recommendation to include a timeline for next year's plan when contacting the program coordinators. At this time, too many things are unknown to set a definite timeline.
- k. The Council of Chairs might be one opportunity to bring up what's going on and see the bigger picture of campus priorities.
 - i. We could also ask if José Ramón could attend a Student Equity meeting.

IV. IREC Response

- a. During the spring, the committee discussed the IREC survey that was sent to Mark and Mary. A response was sent to the IREC committee during the spring semester.
 - i. There was a follow up email that Mark and Mary received at the end of May asking for some additional information. A response was sent before the end of June.
- b. An Ad Hoc committee of IREC was created to look the processes followed by the Student Equity Committee.

- i. There was a suggestion to invite the Faculty Senate President to come to the Student Equity Committee meeting to give feedback on what IREC might be looking for and whether it is related to accreditation.
- ii. There was discussion about a member of the Student Equity Committee making a comment during the Public Comments portion of the Faculty Senate meeting about whether the IREC committee is functioning outside of regulations.
 - 1. Faculty members can also request a meeting with Faculty Senate Exec Committee if they wish.
- iii. There was a suggestion to invite members of IREC to attend the Student Equity meetings.
- iv. At this time, the committee will wait and see what response or other information the IREC Committee might request.

V. Committee Make-Up

- a. There was discussion about the make-up of the Student Equity Committee. The discussion started last semester when, for a number of reasons, several faculty members could not attend meetings on a regular basis.
- b. There was a proposal to have a faculty member from each division.
- c. Mary met with Faculty Senate Exec Committee during the spring semester to discuss the committee composition.
 - i. There was a recommendation from the Faculty Senate Exec Committee to fill the open faculty positions initially by putting a call out during the spring semester and then re-examine the committee make-up in the fall.
 - ii. There are currently three counselors on the committee so if the composition changes to include one faculty member from each division, two counselors could stay on the committee as at-large representatives until their term is up in two years.
- d. There was concern about increasing the number of faculty involved because in general as committees grow they can have trouble making decisions because a certain percentage of members need to attend in order to make decisions.
 - i. Two-thirds of members would need to vote.
 - ii. The increase in faculty would lead to four additional members so ten voting members would need to be present.
 - iii. There would still be two managers.
 - iv. There would be a request to increase the number of classified professionals from one to two.
- e. There was a question about whether the Student Equity Committee should be a PAC committee. For now, remaining a Faculty Senate Committee is best.

- f. There was discussion about whether the committee make-up should be changed at this point or whether it should wait until after the faculty terms expire in two years.
 - i. There was discussion about the goal of increasing the composition. The goal would be to have more faculty input from a variety of divisions.
- g. There was a decision to ask Faculty Senate to table the vote for another two weeks to allow the Student Equity Committee members to continue discussion at the next meeting.
 - i. There was a recommendation to invite Pete or Josh to give input.

VI. Upcoming Events

- a. Upcoming conferences and trainings were mentioned. Deb mentioned she had met with Jeanne Costello to discuss a campus or district Equity Retreat. This will be an agenda item for next meeting to get input on what that might look like.

Next meeting: Thursday, Sept. 22 at 1:00.