

Equity Committee Meeting Notes

Thursday, October 27, 2016 1:00-2:30 p.m. / Room 808A

Committee members present: **Faculty:** Mary Bogan (co-chair), Megin Debin, Jill Kageyama, Carolyn Facer, Spiros Dimitratos, Perry Webster, Amber Gonzalez; **Managers:** Mark Greenhalgh (co-chair); **Students:** Leyah Mukasa-Wilson, Troy Plummer

Resource members present: **Cadena/Transfer Center:** Cecilia Arriaza; **Campus Communications:** Lisa McPheron; **Equity:** Deb Perkins; **Library/LRISPS:** Michelle Garcia; **OIRP:** Carlos Ayon, Megan Sirna

- I. Introduction of new members
 - a. All faculty positions are filled and we are working on filling the classified positions. There are now eighteen voting members.
- II. Overview of student equity
 - a. Mark provided an overview of the Student Equity Committee. The Committee has been on campus for approximately fifteen years. For over ten of those years, there was no budget. The Committee identified and provided recommendations to improve student equity across campus.
 - b. Approximately three years ago, the state identified funds to be used to support student equity. The campus received money and then needed to submit a plan. The 2014-2015 received good reviews and was identified as a model for the state.
 - i. The programs supported in the first plan were identified by a broad-based request to the deans.
 - c. The next year the campus received twice as many funds. Programs were again supported after a call for proposals went out to the campus.
 - i. Originally the State Chancellor's Office did not intend for colleges to write a plan in 2015-2016 but new groups were identified to support.
 - ii. There was a question about when a student is considered having financial need. Carlos mentioned that for the 2014-2015 plan the State Chancellor's Office provided information about the standards for identifying a student as low-income primarily based on Pell and BOG Fee waiver.
 - iii. Many programs have long-term goals so Equity funds provided continued funding from the first to second year.
 - d. This third year of funding there were 34 programs funded. All programs are continuations of 2015-2016 projects. During this funding cycle, many programs wanted to ramp up their programs so the initial funding requests were \$1 million over our expected allocation.

- i. The committee decided that if programs requested the same or less than they had received the previous year, they would be funded at that level. For programs that requested additional funds, they received a 10% increase.
- e. The State Chancellor's Office has put a hold on plans for 2016-2017 in order to create a new template that will allow for integrated planning for Basic Skills, Equity, and SSSP. The template is expected to be released in February.
- f. The focus for this year is on evaluation of currently funded projects. The committee members recognize that there is a need to focus in on programs that are working and make decisions about what programs will be able to continue. One challenge with this is that some programs are harder to measure because they have long term goals but we will look at some of their initial results.
- g. Megan provided a handout with the updated equity data.
 - i. An explanation of the proportionately index and 80% index were provided. Across most indicators, Asian students succeeded at the highest rate. However, we can decide how to define the highest succeeding group. We might want to use White students since they have historically had the fewest barriers.
 - ii. There are actually three different methods that can be used to examine the data. The 2015-2016 plan currently uses two of the three methods because the third method (percentage point gap) was identified later by the State Chancellor's Office.
 - iii. There was a question about mixed methods and whether students were asked to identify barriers.
 - iv. There was discussion about using local data rather than data from the state because it might be more accurate.
 - v. There was discussion about looking at institutional change rather than supporting smaller programs.
 - 1. The state deadlines and changes have had an impact on these conversations so as a committee we should try to be more prepared for next year. This could start with conversations about what we value as a campus.
 - 2. There has been on-going discussion about a retreat. There is also benefit for providing space for coordinators of equity funded projects to meet to discuss how they are supporting students.
 - 3. It may be beneficial for a subcommittee to form to look at some issues more closely.

4. A possible topic for the retreat might be to bring in an outside consultant to help look at the data. Deb will work on finding out some additional information about what might be available.
- h. To summarize, there are three major components the committee needs to address this year.
- i. Evaluation of current programs,
 - ii. integration of plans (this will be discussed at the Student Success Committee),
 - iii. and pre-planning for spring. The committee will need to decide if we start from scratch or if some long-term programs are continued to be funded.
 1. Program data is being collected by the OIRP. The committee might want to set aside time to look at the information that is submitted and decide if the information provides enough information. At that time, the committee may decide that the program doesn't meet equity goals or might realize that there are needs that are not being addressed.
 2. There are a lot of new faculty on campus who might have new ideas.
 3. Some programs may need to be institutionalized or funded by another source.
 4. The committee also needs to make decisions about how to prioritize funds and if there should be more of a focus on larger programs or smaller programs.
 5. The committee will also need to formalize some procedures such as voting, attendance, and possibly a rubric to be used.
 - iv. There was a reminder to keep the focus on equity issues, not just the financial issues.

III. IREC

- a. Mark provided an overview. Last spring IREC requested some information about the Student Equity Committee decision making process. At first IREC asked a few questions, then some additional questions were asked during the summer. Additional emails have been received this fall requesting more information.
- b. The Student Equity Committee needs to decide how to respond.
 - i. There was discussion about why equity was selected. There is no formal process from IREC.
 - ii. There was discussion about stating we have concerns about the continued questions and would like to wait to respond to anything until after the Nov. 18 meeting.

- iii. Other than making a recommendation, it is unclear about what action IREC can take.

IV. Wrap Up

- a. There are two more Student Equity Committee meetings this semester.
 - i. Items to discuss include formalizing committee operations and mission as well as planning for an equity event in the spring. There was a suggestion to look for an outside consulting group and possibly having something prior to the start of the spring semester.

V. Upcoming events

- a. In addition to the events listed on the agenda, Dia de los Muertos is happening tonight. The Social Justice Summit will be on November 18. Attendees can register through Facebook or the FCStomp.org website.