JOINT

STUDENT EQUITY COMMITTEE (SEC)

STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

SEA WEBSITE

Wednesday, January 19, 2022

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

MINUTES

Due to the COVID-19 crisis, and in compliance with the Governor's Executive Orders N-29-20 and N-33-20, Santa Barbara City College has temporarily moved meetings online.

Join Zoom Meeting:

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

Meeting ID: 916 1069 4377

Passcode: 954209

Members in Attendance: Adrienne Arguijo-Morgan, Co-Chair Paloma Arnold, Mark Bobro, Co-Chair Roxane Byrne, Vandana Gavaskar, Andrew Gil, Liz Giles, Pam Guenther, Akil Hill, Elizabeth Imhof, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Chelsea Lancaster, Christina Llerena, Julio Martinez, Jennifer Maupin, Co-Chair Brittanye Muschamp, Sachico Oates, Vanessa Pelton, Z Reisz, Kristy Renteria, Carola Smith, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez, Sara Volle

Members Unable to Attend: Jennifer Baxton, Aurore Bernard, Robin Goodnough, Jennifer Hamilton, Maureen McRae Goldberg, Aika Person, Margaret Prothero, Kyle Rasmussen, Martha Swanson

Resource Members in Attendance: Cheryl Brown, Cesar Perfecto

Guests: Sabrina Barajas (subbing for Jennifer Hamilton)

Call to Order

The meeting started at 3:04 p.m. Members from both committees introduced themselves.

Public Comment

1. 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.

There were no public comments.

Information

- 1. Co-Chair update on SEC/SEA Merger (Paloma A.)
 - 1.1. Update on Consolidation Process

The Student Equity Committee (SEC)/Student Equity & Achievement Committee (SEA) merger: At the end of last semester, discussions were held about the reasons why SEC and SEA were two separate committees. The two committees had evolved organically from previous committees, but there had not been intentional steps to decide what the most logical committee structure was, especially recognizing that there was a lot of crossover between the committee members and the goals and purposes of both committees (to increase diversity, equity, inclusion, belonging, student success for all of our students).

1.2 Coach Al Solano (bio) currently working with Guided Pathways colleagues on campus

Over the break, the three existing chairs of SEC and SEA (Paloma Arnold, Laurie Vasquez, and Brittanye Muschamp), classified representative Akil Hill, and Z Reisz met with Dr. Al Solano, under the recommendation of Dr. Murillo. Dr. Solano has worked closely with California Community Colleges, most recently with SBCC's Guided Pathways implementations. The workgroup met four times over the break to discuss how and when they wanted to move forward with the merger. The timeline, charge, and why statement were the culmination of their work over the break.

One of the reasons for having this first joint meeting right away is because the new Student Equity Plan is due to the Chancellor's Office on Nov. 30th, and the co-chairs want to make sure that it will be the primary task of this group for the next semester until it is due. They want to make sure that there is enough time, focus, and energy to make the best plan possible. 1.3 SEA/SEC Co-Chair model Spring 2022 and Fall 2022 Co-Chairs:

The workgroup and Dr. Solano agreed that it made sense for this current semester to keep the three existing co-chairs from the two committees, and recognizing that the Executive Director of DEI is no longer here, to have the Coordinator, Roxane Byrne fill in as the fourth co-chair. Dr. Reisz will also be supporting the committee, as the focus will be on the Student Equity Plan. The co-chairs, Mr. Hill, and Dr. Reisz will be meeting regularly before each meeting to develop the agendas and decide who will lead each meeting.

Starting in the spring, the committee will start looking into the chair structure, and possibly having a tri-chair model for the fall semester.

1.3.1 Membership

For the next year and a half, the co-chairs are hoping that everyone will continue to participate in the consolidated committee. Throughout next year, the committee will look at what type of membership makes most sense starting for Fall 2023.

The committee functions (i.e. if somebody served as a CSEA rep in the SEA committee), won't necessarily change, they'll just have that role in the joint committee.

Some of the important work for the Student Equity Plan will be parsed out into smaller workgroups.

There was a concern that the meetings might conflict with Academic Senate meetings, and that could affect people's levels of commitment and participation. Co-Chair Arnold said that the meeting dates and times would be discussed in today's meeting.

The combined committees have 37 people, and Co-Chair Arnold believes there are a lot of people who have the skills, ability, and the knowledge to develop a really strong Student Equity Plan. Dr. Solano will also be a valuable resource to help the committee build a plan everyone can be proud of.

1.4 2022-2025 Student Equity Plan

1.4.1 Due to CCCCO 11/30/2022

Dr. Reisz discussed the timeline: In the spring semester, the goal is to

draft the Student Equity Plan. This will allow much of the fall semester to take it around to the constituent groups for broader feedback at the college level.

- 1.4.2 CCCCO sponsored webinar anticipated in February 2022
- 1.4.3 Three major challenges in developing a Student Equity Plan

1.4.3.1 Develop and recommend which characteristics to base the disproportionate impact analysis

For the last Student Equity Plan, the Chancellor's Office provided us with the data and we had no choice in that. We are moving away from that a bit and we're going to crosswalk to whatever requirements they do have. We have a little more breadth in what particular characteristics we would like to disaggregate by and base the disproportionate impact analysis.

1.4.3.2 Recommend a process for determining which disproportionate impacts to plan for in the Student Equity Plan

Our second large hurdle and discussion we need to have as a group and bring forward as a recommendation, is whether or not we want to do every disproportionate impact that we can find. If we decide not to do every disproportionate impact, how do we prioritize?

1.4.3.3 Develop focused activities to remove equity gaps

Dr. Reisz is hoping that the committee can spend much of the last half of the semester working on this one. With all of our constituents and all of the various departments around campus, develop focused activities that are tailored to those student groups who are experiencing disproportionate impact.

The Center for Urban Education at USC did an analysis of equity plans and found that only about 2% of them actually had focused tailored activities to remove disproportionate impacts. As we move forward with this, we want to be thoughtful and considerate of what the challenges are that disproportionate impact groups are facing, and really tailor our interventions to their needs.

Dr. Reisz recommends that the focus be at the college-wide level, and leave the program review planning to do the more departmental-focused efforts on those student outcomes. Co-Chair Arnold added that this was part of the rationale for joining these two committees – to make sure that we're looking at this from an institutional and college-wide perspective and trying to do this together as a whole instead of in smaller pieces.

Although the Chancellor's Office provided the college with data about who our disproportionate impact populations were, Dr. Reisz does not recommend that we particularly use that. He would like to crosswalk that data set, developing a set of metrics that can be brought down to the program or college level.

Co-Chair Muschamp added that these pieces will be very data driven, which Dr. Solano will be helping with.

Discussion

1. Joint SEC/SEA committee proposed timeline, charge, and why statement for

Under the direction of President Murillo, her two goals for our committees were to merge both the SEC and SEA committees and make a Student Equity Plan that would be something she would approve of for the college, especially in light of our previous Student Equity Plan.

Co-Chair Arnold said that the joint committee name would be called the SEA committee, as that is what it is essentially known by at the state level. The "E" in SEA is equity, so calling it the SEA committee appropriately encompasses what both committees have been doing.

Co-Chair Muschamp read aloud the <u>timeline, charge, and why statement</u> document to the members, which explained why the committees are consolidating. Dr. Reisz went over the document section-by-section for feedback.

Feedback on membership:

Regarding committee membership, it was Co-Chair Arnold's understanding that the committee would determine the membership as a group in spring 2023 to be effective for Fall 2023. Dr. Reisz made a correction to the document.

Dr. Reisz asked if anyone was opposed to a tri-chair with a CSEA co-chair, a faculty co-chair, and an Admin co-chair. No one voiced any objections.

Kristy Renteria brought up the importance of the student voice being

represented in this committee. Co-Chair Arnold agreed. She said they have invited both student reps on the committee, with the hope that at least one of them can attend. Dr. Reisz said that there is a task force trying to work on this problem, too. Essentially, they are trying to figure out how students on committees like this can be paid as a student worker. Ms. Renteria supported that idea.

Feedback on the charge:

The charge was made by joining the SEC charge with the SEA committee charge. Dr. Reisz explained that the first part is straight out of the SEC charge with language changed according to the new designation as the SEA committee.

Andy Gil had concerns of this feeling retroactive instead of proactive, that we're reporting on things that have happened in the past. Also, he no longer feels well-informed on what is happening around campus, and is concerned that there may be duplicate efforts because not everyone is on the same page.

Dr. Reisz agreed that a lot of our Student Equity Plans have reported on past things, and not really hitting on how we are going to change the atmosphere. His hope is that with the new committee, with the combined knowledge of everyone, a Student Equity Plan will be developed that goes in that direction.

Mr. Gil reflected on 2016, when there was literally something going on every day. He asked, if the SEA committee are the planners, the ones that organize these efforts.

Ms. Muschamp said we have a lot of awesome things happening on campus, but there's just not one source of information or committee to go to to say this is happening. That is one of the goals with this new committee.

Sara Volle had a question about the last bullet point. In the past, the SEA committee made recommendations to the EVP. And then with the new structure, how is that all going to work?

Dr. Reisz explained that the new SEA committee is a participatory governance committee. SEA will report recommendations to the College Planning Council. And then their recommendations go to the President and the President's Cabinet for whether they are going to follow that recommendation or not. To make the bullet point clearer, Dr. Reisz added that "the committee makes recommendations to the College Planning Council..." Although in the past, the SEA committee was an operational committee, Co-Chair Arnold explained that Dr. Murillo thought that with funding and initiatives as important as this, she felt that it would be best to make our recommendations to CPC and essentially to the President directly.

Liz Giles had a concern that now that we will be making recommendations to CPC, it seems to be adding an extra layer that wasn't there before, when recommendations went directly to the EVP. For time sensitive expenditures, she wondered if this extra layer would complicate things. Co-Chair Arnold said that reporting to the CPC would involve submitting some regular update on the decisions that were made, but that it wouldn't necessarily mean that every small decision made would need to go to the CPC. Co-Chair Arnold would clarify, but that was her general understanding.

Marc Bobro thought it was important to make clear in the charge that we're going to be doing things in the here and now, and would somehow like the second and third bullet points to be just as important as the first one. Mr. Gil agreed, and reiterated that there needs to be more of a focus, like Ms. Renteria said, on students.

A question was asked if the charge of the Student Equity Plan was to do the activities. Ms. Byrne explained that it has never been the charge of the Student Equity Committee to actually design or implement the activities. The goal is to nurture and support the campus and the various different groups and departments and programs on campus that want to implement different initiatives and different programming events etc. Early on, the Student Equity Committee was tied to the Equity Department. At that time, they were doing a lot of the events and activities. As things have progressed and as the funding was integrated and moved out of the department, the shift became more focused on SEC helping other people on campus to enact these changes and do these things.

Ms. Byrne said coming from the SEC side of things, and also having been a member of SEA, this new committee is tying the two things together. What are all the initiatives we want to do and why? And how are we going to fund those things effectively? And then assessing. Is the funding reaching the goals we have?

Reflecting back on the 2015-16 period, Elizabeth Imhof asked how do we make the time and work to celebrate diversity, and at the same time take that programming and really have it change the culture and structure of our campus? It's the idea of the intentional design and the focus on intentional outcome. And we make that part of the requirement for how we approach

equity.

There was a request to change the emphasis on the bullet point from "minimizing duplication of efforts" to "increasing collaborative efforts."

Chelsea Lancaster commented that if we're going to do programming as a committee, there really needs to be an institutional commitment, because the way the things have been framed and structured thus far, it feels like equity has been the charge of a few departments or a few individuals.

Based on some of the comments, Co-Chair Arnold wondered if it would make sense to reword the second big bullet to not only say "champions and monitors progress on the Student Equity Plan," but to include championing and monitoring diversity activities. Broadening the scope of things that we champion and support, and putting our institutional structure, dollars [and resources] behind those needs.

Dr. Imhof expressed that one of the most important pieces of our charge is to ensure that efforts that are done in the name of equity are actually forwarding equity, and are actually tackling structural and systemic inequity. Something that can be really important about our committee in our charge is to ensure that equity money is actually spent intentionally by design on equity.

Co-Chair Arold doesn't want to lose the celebrating diversity component. Dr. Imhof said that in the celebration, we really need to make sure that we're still thinking towards tackling structural and systemic inequity.

Pam Guenther noted that while diversity programming is great for helping students feel seen on campus and belonging etc., it's going to be very difficult to see how many of those things might be making measurable change or growth in student success. So it's a good idea to make sure that we're monitoring that, to see if it's actually moving the needle.

2. Joint SEC/SEA committee meeting Dates and times

The co-chairs had originally thought Wednesday afternoons would work, as that's when the SEC had previously met. Meetings would be scheduled alternating from Senate meetings. Unfortunately, this meeting time conflicts with Senate meetings.

Co-Chair Arnold proposed to move this meeting back to the 1st and 3rd Thursdays from 3 - 4:30 p.m. Hopefully, if members are not able to attend that meeting, they would be able to participate in some of the work groups. One conflict with the 1st and 3rd Thursdays from 3 - 4:30 p.m. are the Board meetings, which start at 4:00 p.m. Co-Chair Arnold said it might not necessarily be the 1st and 3rd Thursdays, but two Thursdays. Dr. Reisz said the second and fourth Thursday wouldn't conflict with Board meetings.

Another suggestion was to have it on the 1st and 3rd Thursdays, but end the meeting at 4:00 p.m. on days the Board meetings meet. Co-Chair Muschamp said that because some of the Student Equity Plan work will happen outside in work groups, and then will be brought back for discussion as a whole, we may not need as much time.

Homework:

Continue to review the <u>timeline</u>, <u>charge</u>, <u>and why statement</u> and discuss with people in your areas, constituencies, and then add any comments to the document. We'll bring it back for final review at our next meeting to be scheduled. Keep an eye on your calendar.

Action

- 1. <u>Approve timeline, charge and why statement</u> for CPC
 - a. Moved to the next SEA meeting.

Future Agenda Items:

•