

STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

[SEA WEBSITE](#)

December 11, 2023

1:00 – 1:50 p.m.

MINUTES

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://sbcc.zoom.us/j/92888839255?pwd=T2xFeUpNeEdjMjNnK3hEN3dMWjZYZz09>

Meeting ID: 928 8883 9255 Passcode: 419332

Members in Attendance: Co-Chair Paloma Arnold, Co-Chair Roxane Byrne, Andrew Gil, Liz Giles, Robin Goodnough, Jennifer Hamilton, Akil Hill, Elizabeth Imhof, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Christina Llerena, Jennifer Loftus, Julio Martinez, Jennifer Maupin, Vanessa Pelton, Kristy Pula, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez

Members Unable to Attend: Chelsea Lancaster, Maureen McRae Goldberg, Sara Volle

Advisory Representatives in Attendance: Kyle Rasmussen

Guests: Elizabeth Mares, Melissa Menendez

1. Call to Order

2. Public Comment

Public Comment Guidelines - Limited to 2 minutes per speaker to ensure the committee has sufficient time to address committee business. Committee will not respond to comments during public comment.

3. Approval of Minutes

[11/27/23](#)

There were not enough people to approve the minutes. We will do that at the first meeting of the Spring semester.

4. Information

a. Review of Financial Information in NOVA report (Paloma)

The SEA Program Plan is due to the Chancellor's Office at the end of December. As we shared at the last meeting, the Chancellor's Office wasn't able to

appropriately bring over the activities from our current Student Equity Plan, so we were told to skip two sections of the plan (Metrics and Activities).

The part that we are required to do is the expenditures part. The Chairs met with Tonya Yescas, who is now our liaison for the SEA budget. She sent us several reports to include into NOVA the report. Co-Chair Arnold realized that there was a mistake in NOVA, and that the Chancellor's Office had put that our allocation for 22-23 was \$0. She contacted the Chancellor's Office, and they fixed it. Then, when Co-Chair Arnold started inputting all of the numbers, it was showing negatives...li has been fixed, but the report is not yet completed due to the delay. Co-Chair Arnold showed what the report looks like so far in the NOVA system. Co-Chair Arnold updated all of the contact information.

The portion that Co-Chair Arnold has not yet completed is asking us to identify certain areas of the budget, and what percentage of the budget was used towards these different areas. It's a bit challenging because our Simpler System doesn't necessarily use these same categories. She's trying to pull together different pieces from Simpler to get this information here. For example, for Professional Development, she's using Travel and Conference as a way to determine professional development. For tutoring, we have a way to do this, but we don't necessarily have something specific. She is going to reach out to Beth Taylor Schott or maybe Jens Kuhn can answer this question that tells us how much of the money was embedded into tutoring specifically.

Some of these areas, Co-Chair Arnold put 1%, but they really are closer to half a percent, but it doesn't allow her to put half a percent into the system. As soon as Co-Chair Arnold finishes the report, she can share a pdf copy with the committee before we submit it. Again, it's due December 29th.

5. Discussion

a. CPC Feedback on SEA Membership Structure

Feedback from CPC and other committees:

** Not a lot of feedback from CPC.*

*** Academic Senate**

- Melissa Menendez reported that the Academic Senate meeting had previously been shared at the last meeting.

- Look into adding more student representation on the committee.

** One of the things Co-Chair Arnold pointed out at CPC was that the DSPS Director was listed as an ALA member, when that person is actually faculty.*

** Another question that was raised at CPC was around the designees and that they do not necessarily have to be managers, they can be staff or faculty within the departments.*

** Co-Chair Byrne said ALA had a discussion about that, too, and also that constituency representation is different from having representation for*

departments or areas. For instance, an EOPS Director, while being ALA, if they're not assigned as the ALA constituent representative, holds a different role. After a discussion, ALA was satisfied with the two constituents.

* Co-Chair Arnold added, as we're onboarding new members, we should be communicating to the membership that, for example, for the EOPS person, the person's role in this committee is not to represent managers. Their role in this committee is to represent EOPS. Same with Financial Aid. Whereas the constituency rep's role is to represent their constituency, and not necessarily the department they work in. She thinks that responsibility will have to fall on all of us to make sure that that's really clear. Part of it will need to be onboarding our new membership, and really making sure that our membership feels informed about their role on the committee.

* Co-Chair Vasquez reported the Senate and CPC were in alignment in terms of what the comments were.

* Dr. Menendez said that it seemed like the Senate was also fine with the timeline of using Spring as the transition to figure out who's going to be serving on the committee, and then starting it in the fall. Co-Chair Arnold said that's good, as it was sort of different from what we had originally proposed, but she thinks it makes more sense.

* Co-Chair Arnold is going to suggest that we vote on our new membership at our first meeting in Spring. Use Spring as our transition, and then also be sure that in fall, we revisit, and see if there are any additional changes to be made.

* Dr. Menendez said there was the question around the Director of Financial Aid, and why that was a voting position and not an advisory position. And then that was in line with again, the Director of Enrollment Services, because that's an advisory position. She didn't know if that's something that needs to be discussed, or if we're happy with it being a voting member. Co-Chair Vasquez said it was in the minutes.

Co-Chair Arnold said historically, Financial Aid was the original equity initiative on college campuses. In many ways, the Financial Aid department probably represents one of the largest groups of students who are essentially low income students, and that's probably one of the biggest equity populations. As conversations have evolved over time, that has changed and shifted. Focus has changed to really center other populations as well, which she thinks is good. But she still thinks it's important to acknowledge that financial aid, and being financially disadvantaged or coming from a financially disadvantaged place, is still a really important equity population initiative component. For Co-Chair Arnold it makes sense for that person to have a voting role in the committee.

* Co-Chair Arnold appreciated Dr. Menendez taking it to the Senate and doing that presentation. Same with everyone else who took it to their respective divisions. We'll go ahead and put it on the agenda for early Spring to vote on.

b. Office of Institutional Research/Governance Committee Survey Results: SEA
(Laurie) 19:27

Review of common themes - how does the information in this survey help inform the committee we want to be?

Co-Chair Vasquez went through an agenda item on CPC, which was the Spring 2023 Biennial Governance Committee Survey Results. Nine college committees were surveyed. Melanie Rogers put together questions with the responses. Then there were comments at the end of the survey. Co-Chair Vasquez went through the results with the committee.

2: I understand the charge/purpose of this committee:

62% strongly agree

3: members work collaboratively to fulfill the committee charge and purpose:

Strongly agree 44%; Agree 44%. Disagree 11.1%

#4: Agendas are provided electronically at least 72 hours prior to the meetings:

73% said always

5: Meeting minutes or notes were provided to members for review modification as needed and approval:

84% always

6: Meeting discussions followed the agenda:

65% said always; 34% said most of the time

7: The committee completed the agenda within the meeting time.

26% always; 69% most of the time

8: Length of meetings is appropriate:

38% always and 57% most of the time

9: Online is an effective modality for the group to meet and complete the committee's charge:

42% strongly agree; 50% agree

10: How often have you attended committee meetings this academic year?

66% said they attended more than 75% of the meetings; 11% said they never missed a meeting; 11% attended between half and 75% of the meetings; 11% attended less than half of the meetings.

11: All members were encouraged to be actively involved:

48% strongly agreed; 37% agreed; 14% disagreed.

12: Committee members were given adequate information to make informed recommendations and/or decisions:

25% strongly agreed; 55% agreed; 18% disagreed.

13 Discussions were collegial and differing opinions were solicited, respected, and heard:

33% strongly agreed; 40% agreed; 22% disagreed; 3% strongly disagreed.

14: I regularly communicated to the constituent group I represent about key items discussed in actions taken during committee meetings:

11% strongly agreed. 65% agreed. 23% disagreed:

15: Please list the strengths of the committee.

16: Please list the areas of improvement for the committee.

17: Please provide any additional comments in relation to the effectiveness of this committee and/or its meetings.

In an effort to understand the comments and determine if there were repeating categories the committee could work on, Co-Chair Vasquez developed a draft document for easier reading and review to try and identify themes that could use improvement. Co-Chair Vasquez shared the draft themes on the spreadsheet. The committee will further discuss and fine-tune these areas in the spring to identify areas of improvement.

Co-Chair Vasquez thanked everyone for their input to the survey. She said the co-chairs and committee members will take it all under consideration. The goal is improve the work, the voice and increase the contribution from each member,

Comments and concerns:

** Dean Llrena noted it was Important that people participate in the meeting and offer up their feedback in real time with support from all members of the committee. The goal is to increase each voice and perspective. To contribute to the conversations.*

** Goal - Review overall budget education to better understand the context of SEA funding within the general fund, current budget crisis, and system budget impacts*

** Co-Chair Vasquez mentioned that the Legislative Analyst Office has published California having a \$68 billion deficit for the coming year. She understood that for K-12 and community colleges, it's a \$19 billion deficit.*

** Increase people being heard and reduce the perceived feeling the Chairs are making all the decisions*

** The committee can explore ways to increase committee member contributions during discussions*

** Akil Hill, who sat in on all the meetings last semester, believes that as Chairs or people on the committee, the only thing that we ask of the Chairs is to create the space where people can actually communicate their thoughts, ideas, and their vision behind this work. He has noticed at Santa Barbara City College that people don't speak up all the time. And then when the survey is done, that's their moment to speak their thoughts.*

** Mr. Hill said that one of the things that concerned him was the first response to question # 16. He felt that that response was steeped in anti-blackness. He thinks that's something that at some point we may need to circle back and address, where we have this idea of pitting Latino or HSI against black people. The comment he referred to said something about millions of dollars were allocated. As someone who's worked closely with our black students on campus, Mr. Hill can confirm that funding isn't going there.*

** Another Concern from J. Hamilton is that there's not a lot of consistency with*

the people that do show up and who are doing the work. When we do show up, we need to be doing things for our campus and our community and our students. Last year, when people broke out into breakout rooms, her breakout rooms were always composed of different people, and it didn't seem like anything got done.

** It's not the Chairs' responsibility to have people show up. We need members to show up, and if not, then they need to relinquish their seats and have someone else who has the time...*

** Members need to know exactly what they need to bring to the next meeting.*

** We need some active participation, not just the act of participation in attending, but also in participating and speaking up.*

** This committee needs to have a smoother onboarding process for new committee members. This committee is big. There's going to be turnover.*

Possibilities for onboarding: written materials, maybe meeting with committee Chairs. Maybe this can be discussed in the Spring. It's important for us to set the stage for, especially new committee members, to feel like they're in an informed space to be able to speak on the topics that come up in this committee.

** There was a concern that we should have received these survey results earlier, as the survey was done at the end of the spring term. Co-Chair Arnold explained this was an IR survey, and the survey results were shared at the same time with everyone in the last CPC meeting.*

Li.Giles thought it would be really great to get this kind of feedback from IR at the beginning of the term rather than the end.

** Suggestion from the TIRO training. One strategy used in the beginning of each session, they reminded everyone on the committee, if you're one of those people who speaks up all the time, to make those spaces for the people who don't, and for the people who don't and kind of hold back, to push themselves a little bit to speak up and know that they are safe doing so.*

** Co-Chair Arnold said our goal is to really use this survey to try to see how we can improve the SEA committee. This is an opportune time to do that, given that we are changing the membership of the SEA committee. We are going to start looking at the meeting modality and frequency. Those are some conversations that we started to have in the spring. By reviewing the responses in the survey and grouping them by theme helps to see how we improve, based on things that we saw to be really prevalent in this survey, and the concerns raised.*

How can we improve as a committee? How can we improve as Chairs? What can we do differently to really make sure that this is a strong committee, and that all of these concerns are heard, addressed, and responded to? She is hopeful that we can take this and make that our charge for early spring. As we're thinking about moving through without membership restructure, we can also take a look at some of these more inner workings and think about how we can improve.

** Jennifer Maupin noted that she has been on the committee a little over a year, and it has felt very transitional to her. She saw all the hard work that the Chairs did, and it felt like there was a lot of hard work that really needed to be done writing the Student Equity Plan. Some of the charges of this committee make it very challenging to hear everybody's voices and still do the work that needed to*

be done in terms of making this document. When we're moving forward, hopefully, we can be very intentional about how we use our constituency groups. What is our process for involving all the people on the committee in the work?

** The Chairs who were spending many hours, weekends, all night long, writing the bulk of the Student Equity Plan and then bringing it back to us for feedback. There's a little bit of a mismatch in the workload. That's something we should try to do is think about our charge of the committee.*

** Using the data more.*

** Thinking of ways for us to all be involved in pulling in information from different areas.*

** Dr. Menendez mentioned we have to think of the culture that we create. We don't want to blame those who are silent for their silence. There needs to be a culture created where people don't want to be silent or feel that they need to be silent.*

** Dean Llerena said it's a delicate balance of also holding oneself accountable and also being a participant. If you really do not feel safe, then she would encourage you to potentially find someone else to advocate, because we all go through different places around our career in terms of sustaining ourselves and capacity and needs for self care. Culture is extremely important, but she also thinks that it's important to hold ourselves accountable. Mr. Hill agreed.*

Co-Chair Arnold said they will take these conversations and help start framing our discussion for the beginning of the spring semester.

- c. SEA Program Review Plan in NOVA - [Successes/Challenges](#) (Breakout Rooms)
Success Story Question (Workgroup): Please provide a success story for collaborative purposes and to help establish best practices. You may use this area to elaborate on any of the activities for which you reported progress, or on any other student equity-related efforts on your campus.

Challenges to Inform the CO what we need (Discuss as a group)

Co-Chair Arnold said what we had hoped to do was go into breakout rooms to do some of those success stories and challenges. She thanked Jennifer Loftus for all of her contributions there. Co-Chair Arnold made one more plea to please go in and add something there so that we have some good content to add into our program plan review.

6. Future Agenda Items
 - a. SEA Budget Update
 - b. Timeline for Spring Activities
 - c. Update of Activities, Metrics in SEP

- d. Additional Structural Discussions- cont'd
What is the function of SEA: implementation/funding?
Should meeting dates/times/frequency/modality be revisited

7. Resource

- Final [Student Equity Plan 2022-2025](#)
- SEA [Consolidation](#) Memo to CPC (3/2022)
- [Resource Guide to Governance and Decision Making](#)
- Current structure of consolidated [SEA membership?](#)
- **Membership Structure** [Draft V3.0](#) 11/13/23