

Equity Committee Meeting Notes

Thursday, December 14, 2017 1:00-2:30 p.m. / Room 229

Committee members present: **Faculty:** Cristina Arellano-Duenas, Mary Bogan (co-chair), Amber Gonzalez, Sylvia Pimentel; **Managers:** Mark Greenhalgh (co-chair), Jennifer LaBounty; **Classified:** Dolores Cornejo;

Resource members present: **DSS:** Ruth Sipple; **Equity:** Deb Perkins; **LLRISP:** Michelle Garcia; **OIRP:** Megan Sirna Tagley; **Veterans:** Scott Thompson; **VPSS:** Gil Contreras; **Umoja:** Antonio Banks

Guests: Josh Ashenmiller, Greg Schulz

- I. Response to Faculty Senate
 - a. Josh Ashenmiller is attending the meeting mainly to listen
 - b. There was an opportunity for individuals to discuss their reaction to the statement made during open comments of the Dec. 7 Faculty Senate meeting.
 - i. General feedback was that there was concern that some of the information in the statement was not accurate including the role of the subcommittee and how the recommendation was presented to the full committee.
 - ii. Although there is respect for the individual who made the comments, there was a feeling that the individual could have spoken first to the Student Equity Committee co-chairs.
 - iii. There were also concerns about thinking looking at programs at a cost per student level and implying that a shift occurred between funding instructional and student support services.
 - c. Josh shared some of his thoughts related to the comments from the Student Equity Committee voting and resource members and related to the open comments statement.
 - i. Because the Student Equity Committee existed prior to state equity funds being available, there seem to be some concerns that have been raised due to the new role of the committee. At some point, Josh would like to be involved in a conversation about the committee's mission and purpose.
 - ii. From what Josh can tell, the committee has established and followed a process that seems to be free from conflict of interest; however, more transparency about the process may be needed.

- iii. Josh also mentioned that there seem to be challenges with separating out the focus of identifying institutional barriers that lead to inequity and resource allocation.

II. 2017-2019 Proposal recommendations

- a. President Schulz shared some of his thoughts about the proposal process and the role the committee has taken. There are very few processes on our campus that are similar to what Student Equity does. Because the sum of requests from the proposals exceeded the available equity funds, the college is committed to supporting some of the programs that were identified as being not as equity-focused.
 - i. He mentioned that he will work with the Vice Presidents to think about how to support programs that were not recommended and those that were not recommended to receive funds up to their full request. The current timeframe of support could be up to 18 months.
 - ii. There some one-time funds and district funds that may be available to be used.
 - iii. President Schulz continues to support the work of this committee in focusing the equity funds on the disproportionately impacted students.
- b. There was some discussion about issuing a campus or district-wide statement about how the focus of the funds has shifted to be more in-line with the expectations from the state.
 - i. One way to address this will be to give a presentation to Faculty Senate during the spring semester. Possible dates for this presentation had already been discussed prior to this meeting.
- c. There was a question raised about institutionalizing programs that are not equity-focused while continuing to use equity funds (which could be temporary) for equity-focused programs. The reply was that all programs will be looked at for the 18-month timeframe.

III. Update on committee membership

- a. Amber volunteered to be the fill-in faculty co-chair for spring since Mary will be teaching a class during a portion of the meeting time. There was a 7-0 vote in favor of this change.
- b. There was discussion about having continued conversations with Faculty Senate about institutional barriers since this is one of their goals for the year.

IV. Presentation on STING Leadership training

- a. Antonio presented on a new leadership training opportunity for students. The kick-off will be on March 16 at Cal Poly Pomona. Areas of focus for the training will be on transformative leadership, community building, and social change. More information will be sent out around the beginning of the spring semester.