

Equity Committee Meeting Notes

Thursday, February 9, 2017 1:00-2:30 p.m. / Room 229

Committee members present: **Faculty:** Kathy Standen, Tamioka Hunter, Jill Kageyama, Carolyn Facer, Annie Bianchino, Perry Webster, Amber Gonzalez, Jose Miranda, Rolando Sanabria, Sylvia Pimentel; **Managers:** Mark Greenhalgh (co-chair), Jennifer LaBounty

Resource members present: **Campus Communications:** Lisa McPheron; **DSS:** Ruth Sipple; **Diversity:** Cecilia Arriaza; **Equity:** Deb Perkins; **LLRISPS:** Michelle Garcia; **OIRP:** Carlos Ayon, Megan Sirna Tagley

Note: This meeting was intended to be a working meeting for the Program Update feedback groups so there was no agenda

- I. IREC Update
 - a. Mark and Mary are meeting with the Faculty Senate Exec Committee and representatives from IREC to discuss the IREC report that will be presented to Faculty Senate on Feb. 16.
- II. There was discussion about the Program Update forms and completing the rubric
 - a. There were some questions about the amount allocated to each program and how many students were actually served.
 - i. There were some suggestions about creating a one-page snapshot of each program to include the program, allocation, and category of student being served.
 - b. There was discussion about whether the state was looking at outcomes and if so, what was being asked. At this point, the state Chancellor's Office has not given clear direction on reporting outcomes from the Student Equity Activities.
 - c. There was a suggestion to invite the President to attend a meeting to get his perspective and feedback before moving forward with making decisions about certain programs continuing or not.
 - d. There was a recommendation to use the Program Update Feedback form and rubric to look to see if the programs are doing what they are supposed to do prior to looking at the resource allocation. After these have been evaluated, the committee can work to gather themes to give to Faculty Senate, the campus, or other appropriate groups.
 - e. There was discussion about whether there should standard information collected and the difficulty in making equal comparisons between groups that are doing such different things.

- i. There was a suggestion to think about each program individually; not as comparing it to what other programs are doing when determining if a program is showing success.
- f. There was feedback that some program updates were missing large amounts of information, particularly related to the number of students served.
- g. There was a suggestion (as a follow-up to discussion from last semester) to bring in an outside evaluator to help guide the direction of the committee and help the committee identify and focus on goals.
- h. There was a question about whether the Student Equity Committee actually made decisions about what programs were funded and at what rate they were funded.
 - i. This is one of the roles of the Student Equity Committee. An additional role might be to recommend the institutionalization of certain programs that seem to be working well.