

## Equity Committee Meeting Notes

Tuesday, June 13, 2017 11:00-1:00 p.m. / Room 229

**Committee members present:** **Faculty:** Mary Bogan (co-chair), Annie Bianchino, Perry Webster, Amber Gonzalez, Sylvia Pimentel; **Managers:** Mark Greenhalgh (co-chair) Jennifer LaBounty; **Classified:** Rabia Khan

**Resource members present:** **Cadena/Transfer Center:** Cecilia Arriaza; **Campus**

**Communications:** Lisa McPheron; **Equity:** Deb Perkins; **LLRISPS:** Dani Wilson, Michelle Garcia; **OIRP:** Megan Sirna Tagley; **Umoja:** Antonio Banks

- I. Additional funding requests
  - a. Program coordinators were given an opportunity to request additional funds when the mid-year funding requests were sent out. Three programs requested funds.
  - b. There was discussion about the requests and a recommendation to get additional information about the foster youth program.
  - c. There was a recommendation to set clearer policies about what to do if a program overspends the amount that was allocated as well as a recommendation to establish more concrete timelines for reporting use of funds.
  - d. There was a motion and vote about the funding requests.
    - i. Motion to request additional information about the number of students served and use of funds for foster youth program. Yes-8 votes, No-0 votes.
    - ii. Motion to fund EOPS lending library for fall. Yes-0 votes, No-8 votes.
    - iii. Motion to approve the request to cover the amount overspent by the SI Program and MAS program. Yes-0 votes, No-8 votes.
- II. Review of vision, mission, and purpose
  - a. Mary distributed an updated draft of the vision, mission, and purpose statements.
    - i. There was a recommendation to identify the disproportionately impacted groups particularly by race in the mission statement.
      1. This led to some discussion about whether certain groups would be left out if this was done and perhaps these groups could be identified in the purpose statement. This conversation will be continued.
- III. Feedback from survey and discussion about priorities
  - a. Megan provided some explanation about why we moved away from Tier A and B to get feedback about priorities. The discussion needs to start with identifying

committee and campus priorities and then determining what programs address the priorities rather than getting so caught up in looking at the programs.

- b. There was a question about whether resource members should complete the survey. The response was that resource members might have different insight or provide different expertise so if different areas were prioritized, we might want to follow up to see why.
- c. The survey provided an opportunity for individuals to rank the indicators, decide what percent of disproportionately impacted students a program should serve, and provide comments or questions about the disproportionately impacted groups identified by the data.
  - i. There were a few concerns raised about this approach. One concern is that certain programs (such as EOPS) can't only provide services to specific students so they might not be eligible.
    - 1. There was a recommendation that programs would be ranked and funded in order, based on how well they met the committee/campus priorities. There would still be an opportunity for discussion about programs that serve a broader student population if they are addressing the priority indicators.
- d. The survey will be resent and more time will be given to respond. This discussion will continue at the next meeting on Thursday, June 22.