STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

SEA WEBSITE

November 13, 2023

1:00 – 2:30 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, Andy Gil, Liz Giles, Robin Goodnough, Jennifer Hamilton, Elizabeth Imhof, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Christina Llerena, Jennifer Loftus, Julio Martinez, Maureen McRae Goldberg, Vanessa Pelton, Kristy Pula, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez

Members Unable to Attend: Akil Hill, Jennifer Maupin, Sara Volle

Resources in Attendance: Nicole Hubert

Guests: Monica Campbell (representing SEL), Elizabeth Mares, Melissa Mendendez

1. **Call to Order**
   The meeting started at 1:04 pm.

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**

   Minutes 10/23/23 - Draft
   The approval of the minutes were put on hold due to not enough members in attendance.

4. **Information**
    a. 2022-2023 SEA Annual Report Due to the Chancellor's Office 12/29/2023
    b. Due January 1

5. **Discussion**
    a. SEA Committee (Participatory Governance) Membership Structure (cont)
        i. Draft v1.0 (Based on discussion from 9/25 Discussion)
        ii. Draft v2.0 (Based on discussion from 10/9 Discussion)
        iii. Draft v2.1 (At the end of 10/23 Meeting Discussion)
        iv. Draft V3.0 (Revised based on the 10/23 Discussion)
        It was noted that Maureen McRae Goldberg had to step out of the meeting.

        We added to the agenda the different drafts of the membership that we have been discussing and moving forward. Draft 2.0 is the draft that we started the last meeting with. Draft 2.1 reflects all of the discussion that happened during the meeting. There were a couple of minor revisions that were made to Draft 3.0.

        Chair Arnold shared Draft 3.0 with everyone. There's no change to the charge of the committee. This is what we discussed when we did the consolidation work last year, so that is essentially rolled over.

        The structure of the committee reports to the VPSA position. The VPSA designates the Administor Chair, and the committee reports out to CPC. The model for the [Tri-] Chair is one Administrator ALA, one Faculty Academic Senate President or Designee, and one classified staff person designated by CSEA.

        For the voting members, there was a discussion last time around the number of people from each constituency group. We reflected the final discussion here on version 3, so four members from CSEA, three from Faculty Senate, two from ALA, one confidential, and one ASG student representative. The difference in the constituency representation is intended to reflect the fact that in the area experts, we tend to be a little bit heavier on ALA administrators, so this is an attempt to bring a more equitable group of people to the voting table and to all have a voice in the committee.

        The area experts (voting members) are: one representative from SEL noncredit VP SEL or Designee, the Director of Student Equity and Engagement Programs representing Umoja, Dream Center, Rising Scholars, BNS, LGBTQ+, the Academic Counseling Department Chair or Designee, the Director of Financial Aid or Designee, Director of DSPS or

Designee, EOPS/NextUp or Designee, Veterans Resource Center (those last three are per the Chancellor's Office definition of the SEA committee), the Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair or Designee, and the Chair of the Professional Development Advisory Committee. And then one Dean appointment (either a Student Affairs Dean or an Academic Affairs Dean or Instructional Dean, whichever one is not the PDAC Chair.

Co-Chair Arnold wanted to make sure she captured that correctly, because at the end of the last meeting, we had that discussion, but it wasn't actually captured on the notes.

The positions/people/representatives on the Advisory membership might change potentially each time a Student Equity Plan changes or updates, depending on the activities and goals written into the Student Equity Plan.

Advisory members would be: the Math Department Chair or Designee, English Department Chair or Designee, representatives, specifically from the Umoja Program, and the Transfer Center Director or Designee. There was some conversation about making the Transfer Center Director or Designee an area expert, thinking that that might be an ongoing area or goal, and it may be. But Co-Chair Arnold thinks having it be an Advisory member reflects whether or not it will be in the Student Equity Plan. And we did add in area experts, the Chair of the Academic Counseling Department, so we will have counseling and transfer expertise represented there.

Hopefully we will be able to get broader student participation through the LAEP internship program. That will need to be a collaborative project that we work on with Chris Phillips. In addition, somebody from Institutional Research, Fiscal Services, Guided Pathways Coordinator or Designee, and the Executive Director of Marketing and Communications, or a Designee from that area.

Co-Chair Arnold asked if everyone feels like this accurately represents the conversations that we've had over the last few meetings. This will be a large committee. The idea is to bring a lot of important voices to the table and to make sure that the equity work is happening campus-wide.

Questions, comments, and concerns:

-*Jennifer Hamilton thought that it's a good start. Her opinion is to move forward and then if there are things that we need to address, we can have that agendized.

* Co-Chair Byne agreed with Ms. Hamilton. This is also a starting point in the sense that we have to take it back out to the constituent groups. A conversation came up in ALA and there was some concern about there only being two constituency members.

* Co-Chair Vasquez thinks this current draft is enough to share with the groups, and just start having conversations about it.

* Co-Chair Arnold thinks we will probably want to add something about a year from now, going back and reflecting on, how did these changes work? Are there areas that we need to modify or things that we need to add? Did our concerns about it being a large committee impact it in any way, or was it a nonissue? Making sure that we prioritize in the future semesters, re-examining the membership and what worked well and what didn't work well, would be an important thing to keep in mind. Ultimately, the structure of the membership is essentially up to us.

* Co-Chair Arnold asked everyone to take this proposal back to their constituent group. It will be an opportunity for for those liaisons to have conversations with people who might have questions, thoughts, or concerns about it, and being a member of the SEA committee, and having been a part of these conversations, you can perhaps answer those questions, and help people understand why we got to where we are, before it comes to CPC as well.

*We will also need to agendize it at CPC, and that's where Co-Chair Arnold thinks a lot of the input will need to come from because everyone is represented at CPC.

* Co-Chair Arnold added that officially CPC is where all of the representation is. We can take it to our groups to have smaller discussions, but CPC is ultimately where we are taking it for input, feedback, and information.

* Kristy Pula wondered why the Director of Enrollment Services was not listed under the current area experts moving forward.

    - It was determined that the position had not been discussed at the previous meetings.

    - Co-Chair Arnold said it was a carryover and area expert for SSSP. She thinks an appropriate place for SEA, moving forward, might be under the advisory membership component. Vanessa Pelton agreed.Co-Chair Byrne didn't think the Director of Enrollment Services actually was one of the members from either of the groups as far as our document shows.

    - Ms. Pelton disagreed, saying she sat in both spaces for as long as she can remember.

    - Co-Chair Vasquez asked, if Ms. Pelton wasn't on this committee right now, where would she get the information about this committee? She said she has two CSEA members from the Enrollment Services department that are sitting on this, so she would get the information from

them. But going forward, if they were not on the committee, then we would rely on the constituent groups to share out the information.

*   - Kristy Pula advocated for at least the Director to be in some capacity, considering we don't know in the future if the participants from CSEA will be in Enrollment Services. She'd like to see initiatives and things from SEA start with Enrollment Services, especially if we're looking at enrolling students and really focusing on student populations. It would be important in some capacity whether that would be advisory or otherwise. Ms. Pelton agreed. She would like to advocate for this department to be in the loop and to be part of that committee at least as an advisory role.*

   b. Additional Structural Discussions
      i. What is the function of SEA given limited funding?
      ii. When would the new structure become effective?
      iii. Should meeting dates/times/frequency/modality be revisited?
        Are there more effective times for our committee to be meeting? Do we need to be meeting as frequently? Should we all be meeting in person? Is everybody on campus? Should this become an in-person meeting?

        A large chunk of what we had done historically in the spring semester was review proposals and do the proposals for one time funding. Knowing that we do not have any set aside money this year in order to support that, we will not be going through that process this spring.

        One of the big questions is, if this goes through CPC without any major changes, when would we want to put this new structure into effect? Do we want to try to put it into effect for spring? Fall?

        Questions, comments, and concerns:
        * Ms. Hamilton would like to see it done for spring. But she also wants to have a conversation to clearly outline what is the charge? What are we needing to accomplish? Because that will also affect how we meet and how often we meet.
        * Ms. Hamilton is not opposed to meeting in person. She finds that collaborative work is missing from a lot of committees post-COVID. Some people are not always on campus, so even having it alternate [between Zoom and in-person].
        * Maybe in increments, whether it's by the end of spring 2024, What are we setting up for fall 2024, and ultimately, spring 2025?
        * Co-Chair Vasquez thinks the first thing we should look at is the Student Equity Plan so that everyone's on the same page in terms of the work that we have right now. She's begun some of that work in terms of summarizing the work from Spring.

* At the end of the spring semester, we did a lot of work in those breakout sessions, talking about what we had done towards accomplishing some of the goals and activities written in the Student Equity Plan. Co-Chair Arnold thinks it's really important for us to continue to look at the Student Equity Plan, that it's something that we're really actively engaged with, evaluating, identifying things that we haven't done, and identifying where we are making some progress in certain areas. That's something we're doing pretty actively as part of the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee, where we've identified different leads. We've asked the leads to report back to the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee on the activities that were written in the SEM plan. We may want to consider doing something similar about how we are making progress to what we wrote in the SEA plan. What are things that we are not doing, and then identify resources we might need to accomplish some of those other activities that we wrote into the SEA plan? That is an important charge of this committee that we need to think about incorporating.
* Another area we might want to think about, is how are we really embedding equity across campus?
* Co-Chair Arnold also said there was a strong desire from folks on the committee to better understand the SEA budget. This could also be an opportunity for us to look at the SEA budget and delve into that a little bit more.
* Over the years, we've talked a lot about, how do we move some of the positions to the general fund so that we can free up SEA money to do specific equity work? Hopefully everyone has been following the budget conversations closely enough to know that we are definitely not in a position to do that right now, and probably won't be for a couple of years. So rethinking that conversation instead of moving positions. How do we bring folks along who are in SEA funded positions? That doesn't mean that we are looking to eliminate any positions. That is not the conversation that Co-Chair Arnold wants anyone to walk away with at all. The commitment is to the people who are being funded by SEA. The SEA budget total is about $4.5 million dollars. Almost all of it goes directly to positions.
* Co-Chair Vasquez checked with the Chancellor's Office, and the reason SEA did not get COLA is because it's not considered a program like some of our other equity based programs.
* There were some people who agreed with trying to make the new membership start in spring.
* Co-Chair Bryne wondered if it would make sense to just close out what we're doing, do our review and analysis that Co-Chair Arnold was talking about, see where we need to put more effort in, and do that together as this committee, and then move to the fall [2024]. And thinking about getting this through CPC and approved and ready in time for a January

start, might be a little bit challenging.

* Elizabeth Imhof suggested using spring as a time to recruit members and get everything in place and perhaps have our committee assembled by the end of spring. She agrees it's going to take time to get through CPC and get everything approved. But she would like to be in a position to start the ground running from the beginning of the fall, where we have everything in place during spring and we're ready to go. We're not starting to assemble a new committee in the beginning of fall.

* Spring would be our transition semester.

* Liz Giles agreed with Elizabeth. Using the spring is a good opportunity to put us in a position to get a running start in the fall. Co-Chair Arnold would worry, too, about trying to push it so fast that we're not really being intentional or hearing feedback that might be coming to us.

* Ms. Hamilton asked if there were any outcomes that need to happen by the end of spring for this committee specifically, or is it just restructure for the year? Co-Chair Arnold said our primary goal for the fall was the restructure. We knew that this would be an in-depth conversation that we needed to have. Part of the reason we put it off so long was because we knew we needed to get the Student Equity Plan written. We also knew that we needed to work on the budget last semester, as well as going through the proposals' discussion. So we just said we'll tackle it this fall because we don't have any other major task specifically that needs to get done. Although we can argue, we should be making sure that we're getting equity work done all the time.

*Ms. Hamilton agreed with using spring as a transition.

C-Chair Vasquez reminded folks that the Chancellor's Office is working with a group that's looking at all of our Student Equity Plans that we just finished writing, in order to give us feedback. She is sure that would probably give us additional information to work on when those are released.

* Co-Chair Arnold said the other thing that we should start reviewing as a committee is our student success data, specifically as it relates to race and ethnicity and other important disaggregations. She doesn't think that's something that we do regularly as a committee.

*We will probably have our new Director of Institutional Research in place by spring.

Co-Chair Vasquez said looking at Vision 2030 and the work of SEA and how that aligns with those goals. That's another huge push by the Chancellor's Office we need to be familiar with.

Summary from Co-Chair Arnold:

* General consensus around having spring be our transition to get all new members into place so that by fall we're ready to go.

*Some of the ideas about what our charge would be:

- Making sure we're staying current on the activities in the Student Equity Plan
- Aligning ourselves to the Chancellor's Office Vision 2030
- Looking at student success data
- Looking at equity across campus
- Possibly taking a deeper dive into the SEA budget
- Making sure that we all feel confident in understanding the SEA budget.
- Thinking about modality about how our meetings are run. We don't have to decide that right now. We have a desire to move back to in-person, at least for every other meeting, which she thinks could be a good compromise.
-In the future we should take an opportunity to go back and see what worked well, or see what may be needed to change.
- Another area where we might have to pay close attention is attendance at the committee meetings. There are times when attendance is late, when it is not as good. So hearing from those folks over the next period of time about why they're not attending could be important. What would encourage people to attend? And then reinforcing the importance of attending the meeting if they're a voting member or even an advisory member on the committee. And really reinforcing the idea of a Designee or representative if you aren't able to attend the meetings.

* Co-Chair Vasquez thought that when the Chairs meet, they can set up a timeline for when these activities are going to occur and send that out to the committee membership so that they can share that with our colleagues so people have a sense of how we're moving forward.
* Co-Chair Vasquez asked, do we continue holding meetings for an hour and a half as opposed to an hour, meeting twice a month, once a month, for an hour and a half?

Ms. Hamilton had concerns about that. Spring semester might be okay, because we're still in the recruiting/transition semester, if that's what we're deciding on. But last semester, not everyone showed up even just once a month. When we were in our breakout rooms, trying to work on the goals for that and assigning roles etc,her group had low attendance. It made it very challenging.

Co-Chair Arnold explained that's why we were talking about restructuring how we provide input back into the committee about what the different activities are, because the breakout rooms were good to get discussion going, but maybe not always the right person was in the breakout room, or it was not clear who was supposed to be there and who was supposed to be doing what. That's part of the strategy to re-look at how we're

regularly updating the activities written into the Student Equity Plan.
* Ms. Hamilton likes the flexibility of Zoom, but there's just some point where you've got to be in person to really talk and have these conversations. together. She wants to hear what other people have to say, because maybe she's not think that or …someone has a great idea. Having in-person once a month and Zoom once a month might work. She doesn't know that the breakout rooms were working.

SEL:
*   - Monica Campbell agreed that having in person meetings once a month or one of the two monthly meetings is a great idea. She's willing to, or someone from SEL is willing to, come out because those [in-person] meetings are much more productive.*
*   - Having a representative from SEL was one of Co-Chair Arnold's concerns about maybe this should be a remote meeting. So hearing from her that an SEL representative would be willing to come to campus at least once a month is really helpful/. Maybe what we think about moving forward is that the first meeting of the month is in person, and the second meeting of the month is remote. And that could be a change that we could start in spring. We could try it out for the spring semester and see how it works.*

* Co-Chair Arnold asked anyone who is part of a different constituency to please take version 3.0 back. Track thoughts, suggestions, questions. Let everyone know that we will be taking it to a CPC meeting very soon. Try to navigate questions that come up. Invite people to give feedback at CPC as well. She's asking people not just go to their constituents and get feedback and bring it back here, but actually take the lead on having those conversations with the people in your different groups. So having the discussion. What is the question? Why is it a question? What is the concern? What was the discussion that happened at the committee that led us to that decision? And then if there's still something that seems to be a really significant issue or concern, then yes, let's bring that back or invite them to bring it up at CPC.

We'll let everyone know when we are able to get it on CPC, because it would be great to have everyone here at the CPC meeting when it's presented. And if anybody wants to volunteer to present it at CPC, please feel free to let the Chairs know.

The next CPC meeting is December 5th, so would it make sense to aim to get it on the December 5th agenda? That way people have time to take it and discuss it. Co-Chair Arnold will work with Paulmena to get it on the

December 5th agenda. CPC is online

We have a SEA meeting on November 27th, so that might be a good opportunity to report back before we plan to take it to CPC.

6. **Action**
   a. **SEA Committee Structure**

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**?