

## Equity Committee Meeting Notes

Thursday, February 22, 2018 1:00-2:30 p.m. / Room 229

**Committee members present:** **Faculty:** Cristina Arellano-Duenas, Carolyn Facer, Annie Bianchino, Amber Gonzalez, Cynthia Guardado, Sylvia Pimentel; **Managers:** Jennifer LaBounty; **Classified:** Dolores Cornejo; **Students:** Michael Marnell, Patrice Sistante

**Resource members present:** **Equity:** Deb Perkins; **OIRP:** Megan Sirna Tagley; **Transfer:** Cecilia Arriaza; **Student Support Services:** Elaine Lipiz Gonzalez; **Veterans:** Scott Thompson

**Guests:** Santiago Sandoval, Stachia Boylan, Diana Ascencio, Kimberly Arauz, Ashley Carrasco

- I. March 8 meeting
  - a. This was not on the agenda but there was discussion about the March 8 meeting. There is scheduling conflict so many voting and resource members will be attending the Women's Forum hosted by the Cadena Cultural Center. There was discussion about possibly cancelling this meeting.
- II. Presentation to Faculty Senate and upcoming PAC presentation
  - a. There was discussion about the presentation that Mary gave at last week's Faculty Senate meeting. Those who were in attendance shared some of the questions and feedback from the meeting.
    - i. There were questions about calculating disproportionate impact and why the committee decided to use local versus state data. There were some questions about the creation of the subcommittee to review proposals and how the proposal were reviewed.
      1. There were some comments from individuals in Faculty Senate that some information should have been shared with Faculty Senate prior to any changes to the decision-making process in the Student Equity Committee.
      2. There was discussion about the rubric process and that the rubric score didn't weigh as heavily in the decision making process as expected.
    - ii. Mary asked Faculty Senate a number of questions about their level of involvement in the process and decision-making going forward. This was tabled for old business for the next Faculty Senate meeting.
    - iii. There was a question about whether Faculty Senate has expected presentations from the Student Equity Committee and what type of follow up is needed. There was a recommendation to get a concrete list of expected updates.

iv. There was discussion about the next proposal process and timeline. If there is a new proposal process, it would most likely occur during the fall 2018 semester in order to allow for more time to review and discuss proposals. Decisions would be made by early spring 2019 for projects to be funded beginning July 1, 2019.

b. Mary requested to be put on the agenda for an upcoming PAC meeting in order to give PAC the same presentation as Faculty Senate.

### III. 2017-2019 Proposal Recommendations

a. Deb shared some information from an email President Schulz sent prior to the meeting. The email outlined some next steps for proposals that were not recommended for equity funding. Information about these proposals will be shared with the Planning and Budget Steering Committee (PBSC) and then discussed in PAC.

i. There were questions about whether all proposals will be considered for funding or if this is related to those projects that were previously funded with equity funds.

ii. There was a question about whether the Student Equity Committee would be able to give any additional input on why proposals were not recommended for equity funding.

b. Deb will try to find out additional information about what this process will entail.

### IV. Update on food insecurity and providing showers for homeless students

a. Deb learned that Campus Safety is overseeing the showers for students who are homeless. She will contact Jim McKamy to see if he can attend a future meeting to provide an update on the process for students to be able to take advantage of the showers.

b. There was discussion about a concern related to communication between individuals involved with providing resources for students who are homeless. Someone shared a story about a student who was directed to multiple offices for assistance.

c. There was discussion about the possibility of a student forum for students who are homeless in order to better understand their needs. This might be one of the first areas the committee wants to address related to institutional barriers.

## V. Institutional barriers

- a. The committee spent time discussing what they feel are the most pressing institutional barriers. During these discussions, some questions the group considered were: What do we hope to accomplish after these discussions, Should these issues be addressed in smaller subgroups or by the full committee, and What data or evidence do we have to support these concerns? Discussion included:
  - i. Funding for supplies and books
    1. Access codes and other required material
    2. Financial aid staffing and communication (do we have the same amount of support as other similar sized institutions?)
  - ii. Access to services
    1. Early morning (7 AM) classes—do students have access to library, computer lab, dining hall, bookstore, and child care?
  - iii. Poverty
    1. Food insecurity
    2. Homelessness
    3. BOG A & B
    4. Transportation (OCTA passes)
  - iv. Psychological services
    1. Support groups with trained facilitators (peer leaders, counselors, etc.)
  - v. Campus climate
    1. Are we including adjuncts in the training?
    2. Equity-focused flex day
    3. Do we have an equitable application process for faculty?
    4. Do we use equity-minded practices in instruction?
  - vi. GPA recalculation is not automatic. How is that communicated to students and can that process be changed?