Equity Committee Meeting Notes
Thursday, March 23, 2017   1:00-2:30 p.m. / Room 1246

Committee members present: **Faculty:** Kathy Standen, Mary Bogan (co-chair), Jill Kageyama, Carolyn Facer, Annie Bianchino, Perry Webster, Amber Gonzalez, **Managers:** Mark Greenhalgh (co-chair)

Resource members present: Cadena/Transfer: Cecilia Arriaza; **DSS:** Ruth Sipple; **Equity:** Deb Perkins; **LLRISPS**: Michelle Garcia; **OIRP:** Carlos Ayon, Megan Sirna Tagley; **Umoja:** Antonio Banks; **Veterans**: Elaine Lipiz Gonzalez

I.   Meeting calendar and fall meeting time
    a. A meeting was tentatively added to the calendar for April 6.
    b. IEPI will bring a group to campus on April 3 to look at campus efficiency. The Student Equity Committee members have been invited to attend to give feedback.
    c. There was a question about whether the meeting time should be changed in the fall to make it easier for faculty to attend. No one voiced concern about the current time so the meetings will continue to be on the 2nd and 4th Thursdays from 1-2:30.

II.   Next steps with outside facilitator
    a. Mark, Mary, and Deb spoke with Dr. Dawn Person about facilitating some conversations with the Student Equity Committee.
    b. She is interested and available. There was discussion about some possible meeting dates including April 6 or April 27. The meeting will be a 3-hour meeting that will include lunch.
        i. Deb will follow up with the committee after hearing back from Dawn about her availability.

III. Share Program Update Themes
    a. Each group had an opportunity to share some feedback after reading and discussing the Program Update forms.
    b. After discussion of the themes, there was discussion about follow up steps.
        i. Individuals overseeing programs will need to schedule an appointment with Megan to develop an evaluation plan. Funding will be conditional until this evaluation plan is turned in.
        ii. If programs are not requesting additional funds, they still need to provide the information so we can report our progress on outcomes to the State Chancellor's Office.

Program Update Themes

- Programs identified ways to measure data that could be used in the future, such as more surveys
- Clarification about what the information actually means
- Clarification about the control group—who are they, how is the control group different from the impacted group
- Recommendation to have a guide for individuals completing Equity fund request proposals that may include language such as:
    o For this type of proposal, you should plan to compare against a control group
    o For this type of proposal, you should plan to use quantitative data
- Without knowing exactly what the program is or what it is doing, it's hard to give feedback
- What is the number of surveys a program would need to show a representative sample (or ratio of surveys taken vs number of participants)?
- There was some discussion/concerns about selection bias. How can instructional support programs (SI, tutoring) show they are not only impacting the students who would have succeeded without an intervention?
- There was a recommendation to have more opportunities for individuals administering programs to share with each other about what they are doing and how they are evaluating their activities.
    o This is important as well as individual meetings with the Equity Research Analyst
- For 2017-2018 funding requests/feedback, funding may be identified as tentative
    o Communicate expectations
        ▪ Meet with Megan to establish an evaluation plan
        ▪ Activities need to focus on disproportionately impacted students (at least reach a certain percentage). Megan is working on breaking down the data to show more "layers" within groups—for example ethnicity, gender, economic status, etc. That way the activities can be more focused on reaching students who are actually showing disproportionate impact
- Are asking "what are the barriers" and asking what students need or making assumptions by filling in what we think they need?
- There was discussion about the possibility of looking at new programs to fund, including looking at enrollment
    o There are a number of students (12% in the fall semester) who registered and enrolled but never came to class; could equity help with that?
- Program Update needs more clarity of how it relates to equity goals
- More demographic information is needed
- Tables should include a (narrative) summary of the findings
- There didn't seem to be consistency among program updates about whether programs were identifying the goal/indicators/data for every activity or identifying an overarching goal and summarizing the activities.
- There was a request for programs to include original or baseline data that could be used as a comparison to see if there has been an improvement.
- There was question about how or whether to give feedback about programs that don't seem to meet equity goals or populations. These concerns should be expressed so programs can provide further explanation about how these activities meet equity goals.
    o For example, a program to support students who have been accepted and are transferring to CSUF. There was clarification that these students might not actually transfer if they didn't have support through the orientation.
- Even if a program is not requesting additional funding, they are accountable for reporting their data.
- Programs need to include more specific information such as the classes they are working with (or for tutoring, what class students came in for).

- If a survey was given, provide a summary of the results.

4. Follow up on District Equity Symposium

    a. The District Equity Symposium was held on March 17. Those that attended were asked to share a little bit about the experience.

    b. Megan shared about the presentation she gave which gave an interactive way of seeing disproportionate impact.

    c. Antonio shared about a presentation he heard on the Ally Program that is offered at Cypress.

    d. Michelle shared about a presentation she gave on the Incite program and how athletes are more engaged with the program.

    e. Jennifer shared about listening to Dr. Frank Harris and his discussion on microaggressions.