Equity Committee Minutes

November 8,2016

1:30-3:00

TLC

**ATTENDANCE**

E. Cervantes, E. Talavera, D. Achterman, J. Richburg, C. Traver, E. Luna, C. Velarde-Barros, R. Rivera-Sharboneau, K. Warren, O. Lopez, R. Shook

1. **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:39 pm

1. **Roll Call**

The roll call was read by E. Cervantes

1. **Approval of Agenda**

MSC (R. Rivera-Sharboneau/C. Velarde-Barros). Vote: unanimous. Approved as presented.

1. **Approval of Minutes from October 25, 2016**

MSC (E. Luna/R. Rivera-Sharboneau). Vote: unanimous. Approved as presented.

1. **Assessment of Equity Plan Activity**

E. Cervantes went over the assessment of the Equity Plan Activity. A form was developed to assess what is occurring within the plan itself on a narrative and data format. The idea is to make it reflective of what areas are being funded through the Equity budget. There may be a possibility of having a mid-year assessment and an end of the year assessment. The mid-year assessment will help in developing feedback.

E. Luna asked a question about item 3 and if this is the institutional program plans. If we don’t have the program plans who will write them. E. Cervantes replied that the campus is in the process of developing program plans. R. Rivera-Sharboneau sees that the academic year piece is missing from the assessment. She suggested adding a column of how much was received each academic year and if it was listed in the program plan for that academic year. A majority of areas have received the funding and it should be in their program plans. It was also suggested to add a projected need and how the data has been evolving. The equity funding should be within the individual program plans that received funding. R. Rivera-Sharboneau would like to see Equity have its own program plan in the near future. E. Cervantes pointed out that the Assessment form is done by the areas being funded and the Equity Committee would see these forms. J. Richburg asked who should submit a program plan or assessment form. E. Cervantes replied that it should be those areas that have received equity funding. E. Luna pointed out that there are different areas working on Equity without equity funding. This could be one place that information and data gets scattered. There is the funding portion and the overall equity portion. R. Rivera-Sharboneau added that this would be the opportunity to list the goals whether you receive funding or not. E. Cervantes pointed out that this assessment is to assess the Equity Report. He asked that all revisions be forwarded to E. Cervantes via email.

D. Achterman agrees with the addition of tracking academic yearly funding and the notion of the projected need. What needs to be added is pushing the data from the program plan to the Equity Committee, even if there was no Equity funding received. This will open up a stream of data. If it is part of the program plan then the data can be gathered. R. Rivera-Sharboneau replied this is difficulty since equity items being funded can’t be tagged through the program plan.

E. Cervantes added that a process can be created but the immediate concern is the equity plan. Much of the wording in the form points back to the program plan. C. Velarde-Barros suggested sending the forms out to the group that received funding and then move from there. D. Achterman views the requirements of the committee is to make suggestions of certain initiatives and then assess how those initiatives are working. A simple collection of questions can be added to a separate form that doesn’t have to fit in the required plan.

It was asked that if funding was received, what the overall outcome of the initiative funded was. E. Cervantes clarified that there were two different outcomes, one that was long-term and one that can be evaluated in an immediate term of time. R. Rivera-Sharboneau replied that there should be identified, legitimate markers within the assessment to see if the initiative was successful or not. E. Cervantes asked if markers need to be included how it would be included.

E. Luna pointed out that a lot of the weight is on student services but there needs to be some focus on instruction. He would like to include some information from the data which are the unknown/multi-cultural. There are a lot of students within this group. One thing to keep in mind is to focus on all students and not those that are underperformers. There is a lot of negative focus on students and there is a tendency to place stress on the lack of success. There has to be some way to change the dialogue on how successful large numbers of people are. These need to be acknowledged in some way.

E. Cervantes pointed out that the assessment piece is to assess the actual plan. E. Luna replied that the tendency is to push resources to those who are already receiving funding. Instead, the focus needs to be across the board. R. Rivera-Sharboneau added that it is important to look at the number of students who are unknown/multi-ethic groups and address that information. It would be a disservice to ignore this category. E. Cervantes replied that the data group’s purpose is to drive down in the data. The gateway the campus has is via the model of the chancellor’s office.

C. Velarde-Barros asked to see an example of what has been proposed before a decision is made. K. Warren added that there are two levels to assessing the plan. Level one is what activities have been funded. The other level is an overall assessment plan. She suggested forming another sub-group or reforming the activity group to look at best practices addressing equity gaps and then match that up to the Equity Plan via a matrix. E. Cervantes will add those additions and submit them to the committee for review. The timeline will be set at the next Equity Committee meeting.

1. **Retreat Planning**

E. Cervantes asked if exploring what other campuses are doing should be done before planning the next retreat. E. Luna replied that the campus has enough information but instead should focus on how to use that information. C. Velarde-Barros asked if it was possible to bring Veronica to facilitate the next retreat in terms of structure. E. Luna replied that a lot of time is spent in planning to plan and instead the actions the campus is taking needs to be the focus. K. Warren added that there has not been a lot of statewide focus on assessing equity. If the campus doesn’t have a way to look at best practices then equity can’t be assessed. These conferences tend to focus on best practices and the bigger picture discussion has not been held on campus. Attending other conferences can help the campus steer equity. D. Achterman pointed out that there are assumptions that faculty have in terms of basic skills, such as the belief that they have no basic skill students in the class. It’s important to do the work and not focus on meetings. The Equity committee needs to decide what is working and what is the community doing to learn and grow towards the equity goals. These would be reasons to have retreats. E. Cervantes will explore the possibility of bringing in a facilitator and will provide a doodle poll to help determine a good date for the retreat.

1. **Data Workgroup**

E. Cervantes informed the committee that the intention of the group is to dig into the data and how it impacts the overall inequalities not captured in the plan. When it comes to the unknown/multi-cultural group, there may be a greater inequality within that group. E. Luna pointed out that the practices that need to be used are those that lead to success. This will move the group as a whole to be successful. Efforts on Basic Skills and more functional tutoring can lead to better data outcomes. D. Achterman pointed out that the missing piece in the committee and conversation has been instructional, which is a key piece that needs to be captured. Carla pointed out that the best practices should become the norm. E. Cervantes pointed out that this group has not met yet and will be brought back at the next meeting.

1. **Budget**

This will be discussed at the next meeting.

1. **Additional Funding**

E. Cervantes announced that there is roughly $20,000 extra for the upcoming funding. C. Velarde-Barros pointed out that maybe these extra funds could be used on the instruction side, specifically in-class instruction. E. Luna pointed out that there are broad activities and more detailed activities, such as structuring success and measuring the content. There are practices that can lead to success within a course.

1. **Next Steps**

* Forms will be updated and brought back to the committee at the next meeting.
* Create the next steps and a timeline, which will focus on outcomes.
* Find a facilitator for the Equity Retreat
* Find a date for the retreat through a Doodle poll.

J. Richburg brought up the possibility of celebrating the success of students to push students further in their success. E. Cervantes pointed out that MESA & TRIO do a milestone event each fall semester with the family in attendance to celebrate the student’s success at certain milestones, such as GPA and units completed.

K. Warren added that the campus needs to look at what needs to be done to improve outcomes. She pointed out that a long-term problem on campus is that there is no coordinated professional learning plan as one shared effort. Equity could possibly lead the way to get the other groups to buy into the effort. E. Luna added that it sounds as if the campus is looking for ways to spend the money instead of pooling the funds together to fund what the campus needs. E. Cervantes pointed out that the turnaround time for the Equity Plan was short. Now the campus needs to evaluate what was placed in the plan. Carla added that the committee needs to assess the plan currently and where it is going. E. Luna appreciates the work that the committee is performing.

1. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 3 pm.