

Equity Committee Meeting Notes

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

Committee members present: **Faculty:** Mary Bogan (co-chair), Annie Bianchino, Perry Webster; **Managers:** Mark Greenhalgh (co-chair); **Classified:** Rabia Khan; **Students:** Patrice Sisante, Michael Marnell

Resource members present: **DSS:** Ruth Sipple; **Equity:** Deb Perkins; **LLRISP:** Michelle Garcia; **Registrar:** Rena Martinez Stluka; **Veterans:** Scott Thompson; **Umoja:** Antonio Banks

- I. Update on committee membership, budget, and data collection (moved up in agenda)
 - a. The open faculty positions for faculty representatives from Library and CTE are on the Faculty Senate agenda.
 - b. Mary will follow up with any faculty members who are not attending to see if they will be able to attend or if we need to find replacements.
 - c. There was discussion about Mary staying on the committee as the faculty representative in the spring even though she will have to miss a portion of the meeting because of her class schedule. The committee approved of her staying on.
 - d. There was again discussion about whether the meeting time should change beginning fall 2018. A doodle will be created to get feedback about moving the meeting time to 1:30 or 2:00 instead of 1:00.
 - e. Deb provided a brief budget update. All of the 2016-2017 funds have been spent and we have begun to spend our 2017-2018 allocation which expires in June 2019.
 - f. There was discussion about how often data would be collected and what would be reported.
 - i. Megan will be working on a new dashboard that will give the Committee and individuals overseeing programs easier access to specific information related to students who are impacted by an equity-funded project.
 - ii. Instead of completing full program updates, individuals overseeing programs should be able to submit their participant lists along with a narrative. Deb will work on contacting individuals to start gathering this information.
- II. Proposal subcommittee feedback
 - a. Mark reviewed the process that the subcommittee engaged in. Prior to any meetings, the members of the subcommittee reviewed and scored the proposals according to the rubric. During the first subcommittee meeting, the discussion

was only about the content of the proposal rather than the amount of funding that was requested.

- b. During the subcommittee meetings, the subcommittee members realized that the rubric only provided a certain amount of information about a program so we will continue to learn from this and revise the rubric to include items such as the percent of disproportionately impacted students served.
- c. The proposals came in requesting much more funds than what we will be receiving. The total proposal requests came in around \$5 million and we are expecting \$2.8 million for the next year and a half.
 - i. The subcommittee made recommendations to reduce costs related to non-high touch activities such as hospitality, professional development/travel, and marketing costs. The subcommittee also made suggestions related to reducing overlapping activities.
- d. A chart was handed out that included the subcommittee's recommendation, the funding allocation, funding recommendations, and feedback. This was reviewed line by line so committee voting and resource members could ask questions.
 - i. In the discussion, there was a comment from the subcommittee that all proposals highlighted great activities and there is a hope that there are other funds available to support programs that were identified as not being as equity focused.
 - ii. There was a clarification question about the percent of disproportionately impacted students served in Incite. Deb will follow up to make sure the numbers from the proposal were accurate.
 - iii. There was a concern raised that there was perhaps a mixed message given related to student equity funds being used for permanent positions. Some individuals may not have requested permanent positions because information had been given in the proposal and in the Student Equity Committee meetings about not requesting permanent positions. This concern will be shared with the President. There was a recognition that staffing will need to continue to be addressed especially since so many proposals requested professional experts to help support the programs.
 - 1. There was a question about a previous conversation about possibly consolidating professional expert positions into a full-time position but that won't be done at this time.
- e. The Committee voting members agreed to support the recommendation (all in favor) as it was written. The resource members also gave their support.
- f. There was a discussion about the process of moving forward with the recommendation. Mary has been talking to the Faculty Senate President about how often there should be reports from Student Equity to Faculty Senate.

- i. Mary will work on getting on the Faculty Senate agenda in the spring to make a formal presentation about what has been happening in Student Equity. Faculty Senate also has a goal to discuss addressing institutional barriers so we might want to try to coordinate on an event in the spring.
 - 1. There was a brief discussion about the difference between a climate survey and a needs assessment and how these might help inform areas to address. A climate survey focuses more on the experience for a student. A needs assessment helps identify where students see a gap.

III. The committee reviewed and discussed the Student Equity Committee mission and purpose statements in order to finalize them; the vision statement had previously been finalized. The final draft statements are:

- a. Mission: The Student Equity Committee identifies institutional barriers contributing to an inequitable environment, developing and recommending practices to remove those obstacles. Using state and institutional guidelines, the SEC also facilitates the development, implementation, and review of programs and services addressing the needs of disproportionately impacted students so they can achieve equitable levels of outcomes at Fullerton College.
- b. Purpose: To embrace its values and fulfill its mission, the SEC's purpose is to transform our institution by dismantling institutional barriers that impact specific student populations.
- c. Vision: Fullerton College will cultivate an equitable, inclusive, and just community that understands and responds to the strengths and needs of disproportionately impacted groups and empowers students to achieve their goals.