July 29 my notes

#4 category - name change to "Equity" (student equity)
* demographics?
* issues with connecting students to a program.
* don't forget that we're restricted by (quality/type) of data we actually have.
* limit #4 to just ethnicity & move other criteria to #5?
* providing great access to those in need should be evaluated.
difficulty: how to measure #4 & #5 etc.

Surveys aren't very good (?) one measurement that may work:

Visible community programs get funds from the community (donors etc.) a reflection of community support. Foundation (sales/events/donations)? something measurable

auxiliary accounts
- how do we measure gender/age - for CTE but socio-economic?

- a majority of our students get Bog values - mostly socio-economic disadvantage over 50% women

- broadly affected by all "public represented students over a certain % in a program over X% from Y demographic. Example: deaf students or disabled students in adaptive PE
- define "predominantly"
- significant loss of access to Cabrillo
- 90% of our students are under-prepared.
- 2 std deviations for #4 (37%)
- median
- data? 30% at zero - upwards & down → run test data to see what it looks like
- points only above
- consistent w/procedures for other data.

Discussion of 10% #4 & 50% #5 → come back to this after #5 criteria better defined.
#5 Community
where start for metrics

- $scaled by size (geneal fund?) or program - not constant $ ? geneal agreement...
- external funds.
  (excluding grants - not stable very different etc.) →
  and not really community.
  (state, federal etc.)

→ built around community for
  student learning e.g. dental clinic
  run by students (learning outcomes)
  ongoing vs. 1-time $
  hard to determine people's intents.
Foundation Data may clarify discussion.

2nd category — donor funds weighted less than ongoing funds (?) ticket/event sales?

→ not general college(s) → designated for a program or program-specific...

→ combine or separate different sources/types of $ student-centric $ or not?

student opportunity (focus)
after discussions

Weights #4 & #5

equally at

7 1/2 0 % each