

STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

[SEA WEBSITE](#)

October 9, 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, Akil Hill, Elizabeth Imhof, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Chelsea Lancaster, Christina Llerena, Jennifer Loftus, Jennifer Maupin, Kristy Pula, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez

Members Unable to Attend: Jeanette Chian, Julio Martinez, Maureen McRae Goldberg, Vanessa Pelton

Resources in Attendance: Elizabeth Mares, Melissa Menendez, Monica Campbell

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

[Minutes 9/25/23 - Draft](#)

Melissa Mendendez wanted it acknowledged in the minutes that CSEA Reps Akil Hill and Liz Giles both supported the tri-chair model. The minutes have been amended to include that.

4. Information

- a. SEA Grant budgets will now be supported by Tonya Yescas in Fiscal Services.
This past year, Cheryl Brown worked really closely with us to get the SEA budget

in order and correct. Now that all of that work is done, Tonya Yescas in Fiscal Services will be responsible for the [categorical funded] SEA budget, as she is generally responsible for all of the categorical budgets. Ms. Yescas couldn't make this meeting, but she will be attending in the future.

- b. SEA [21-22 Y2/FY23 Expenditures Report](#) Submitted 9/29/23
As mentioned at the last meeting, the Fiscal Expenditures Report for the SEA budget for the second year of fiscal year 21-22 was submitted (as a reminder, the SEA allocation is a two year allocation. We have two years to spend each allocation). The report shows very general categories of how the SEA allocation is spent.

As a reminder, the operational expenses (the ones that are positions and permanent or ongoing expenses), are the year one allocation. That's why year one is so much larger. Anything that we don't spend goes into the year two allocation as a rollover.

The SEA allocation this year is the same as last year. With all of the raises factored in from last year and this year, we do not anticipate having any rollover. SEA didn't receive a COLA (it's one of the only categoricals that didn't receive a COLA). This has limited our ability to use funds on some of the other projects we had talked about. A lot of colleges are in the same position. Fortunately, we have enough to cover all of the positions here.

5. Discussion

- a. SEA Committee (Participatory Governance) Membership Structure (cont)
 - i. [Draft](#) (Based on discussion from 9/25 Discussion)
After we met last time, the Chairs met and started to pull together some of the ideas that were presented at the last discussion to develop the draft. There are still quite a few questions that have not been addressed.

The committee went into three different breakout groups to consider how we want to structure the SEA committee.

The first question under number 2 is "Structure": Who does the committee report to? Co-Chair Arnold has a meeting with Dr. Endrijonas on Friday to discuss who SEA reports to.

Co-Chair Arnold went over the "Proposed SEA Membership Structure" document before people went into breakout groups. She explained that the "charge" included in the description was what we decided on last year when we put together the consolidated document. At the bottom of the document, we also included the charge from the Chancellor's Office for the SEA committee. Co-Chair Arnold continued to read aloud from the document.

Co-Chair Arnold mentioned that we would love to have more students on the committee, but the reality is, it's challenging for students to participate. We had talked about including students more in the advisory membership, in a paid internship capacity.

At the last meeting, we had also briefly discussed the question of having area experts. This is an area that we fleshed out a little bit more – one from the School of Extended Learning (Noncredit), and one for the Director of Student Equity and Engagement programs. We added the portion around deans, because previously on the SEA committee, there were deans specifically assigned as voting members.

Co-Chair Arnold would encourage folks to discuss the area experts and the dean appointments. Again, the advisory members are non-voting members. The advisory membership would include positions aligned with our Student Education Plan, and we listed some examples there. Those positions would be updated every time we write a new Student Equity Plan.

We included who our current advisory members are, coming from both committees.

Co-Chair Vasquez added that so much change has happened, and included in our thinking is the reimagining of what our future is going to look like, especially in light of the Vision 2030 plan that our new Chancellor put out. The key areas are basically equity, access, and success.

Questions:

Jennifer Hamilton: Are the only faculty members on here the constituency members from the Senate?

Co-Chair Arnold said what was discussed was there's a faculty chair in addition to however many people represent each constituency group. Whatever number is decided on would be the same for faculty.

Jennifer Hamilton: Is there anything about Student Affairs or Student Services faculty on here, especially counseling faculty?

Co-Chair Arnold thought that would be a good discussion item in the breakout groups. As you're talking about voting members and faculty, CSEA, and ALA, would it be important to stipulate that one of those people should specifically be from Student Affairs? If we don't want to do

it that way, do we consider adding area experts?

In reflecting about last year, Ms. Hamilton also thought that the Transfer Center needs to have a voice and be a voting member, as transfer is a big piece.

Co-Chair Arnold said the draft was based on what we had talked about at our last meeting. We had included the Director of the Transfer Center or Designee as an advisory member because such a huge portion of the Student Equity Plan is focused on transfer. But another way to approach this could be the people who are representing major portions of the Student Equity Plan, maybe they should be voting members, and not advisory members. Co-Chair Arnold encouraged the breakout groups to have that discussion.

Melissa Menendez agreed that the Director of the Transfer Center or the TAP Coordinator should be a voting member, an area expert. She also thinks the EOPS Director should be an expert with a vote, as well as the Director of DSPS. She thinks some of these advisories should be at the table with voting.

Co-Chair Arnold added another question under advisory that says, "Should some of these positions be voting instead of advisory?"

Co-Chair Vasquez noted that according to the Chancellor's Office, DSPS can tap into the SEA money.

Some other representation that Dr. Menendez suggested: Student Health Services, the Well, because that's an access equity issue as an area expert. Also, in relation to what Ms. Hamilton was raising about faculty participation, we do have a Faculty Professional Development Coordinator and an online Faculty Professional Development Coordinator. Those are area experts when it comes to equity in terms of curriculum and pedagogy. Also, a program that's not represented here is Raíces

Ms. Hamilton thought it's great that we want to include all these people, but they also need to know that the work needs to be put in as well, and have input on a regular basis. She recalled that last year it was a large committee, but the work got done by a minority of people.

Co-Chair Byrne cautioned about making a committee too large, where it can become ineffective or it can stall the work that we're trying to do.

Another thing Co-Chair Byrne brought up was area experts, and their tie

to the Student Equity Plan. That might also require us to think about term lengths and the cycles of when things are happening, because if we're saying we want voting members to be people who have a stake in what's happening in the Student Equity Plan, and that plan gets rewritten every three years or so, then our cycles might need to align in some way with that. Those advisory roles, whether they're voting or nonvoting, might be contingent on what's happening in the plan.

Co-Chair Arnold said we had tried to include some of that language [under # 5 in the draft].

A lot of the suggestions are good ones, and can be a way that we use the advisory membership, where it maybe isn't as critical that somebody's there every single meeting and in the weeds doing the work. But it's still important to hear their voices and get their input. Having the advisory membership can be used as a tool to make sure that we're getting broader input.

Ms. Hamilton agreed with what Dr. Byrne said, but she said we need to have some historical reference point. Ensure that yes, we might want new participants... based on the Student Equity Plan, but also to remember to hold that [historical] piece as well, because that is really valuable information.

Dr. Byrne thinks we would have to have a core membership that runs on a certain cycle, and then have the advisory, perhaps on that plan.

Chelsea Lancaster respectfully pushed back a little bit on the notion of only directors or faculty being experts, because she thinks that's a kind of classist approach for us to take. As we're doing new hiring, we have a lot of new leadership on campus with a very steep learning curve. As people learn the position, learn our campus, learn the central coast, she thinks it's important for us to really interrogate that assumption.

Co-Chair Arnold said that's a good point, and that she didn't think that was an intention, so she was glad it was pointed out. That was historical stuff that we pulled, so looking at that and having that conversation as you're having your breakouts is a good conversation to have.

- ii. What is the function of SEA
- iii. Breakout Discussion
 - 1. [Draft](#) (Based on discussion from 9/2523 Discussion)
 - 2. Guiding Questions:
 - a. What should the new structure be?
 - i. Chair/Co-Chair model?

- ii. How many reps from each constituency?
 - iii. Content Experts?
- iv. Advisory members?

The breakout groups discussed the questions in the draft for 15 minutes. When they returned, they gave a summary of what was discussed.

Summary from group 3:

Christina LLerena was the spokesperson for this breakout group. The other members in her group were Melissa Menendez, Elizabeth Imhof, Elizabeth Mares, and Raquel Hernandez.

** There was a need for more voting members, and to really represent the diverse population of equity work on campus. This is specific to, for example, MESA, Raíces, and other specific programs that are not being currently represented.*

** A lot of people resonated with Ms. Lancaster's comment around looking at people's capacity to serve on the workgroup.*

** Speaking also to Ms. Hamilton's attendance or commitment piece.*

** There were some observations around advisory folks not feeling like they have much skin in the game, and that might be part of the reason they're not attending, so the voting piece could be really important around engagement.*

** Historical, somewhat recent context of decisions being made in SEA that others felt were controversial, and that there may be some hard feelings around that. One of the ways to really broaden that conversation is to think through and potentially open up this whole idea of more diverse representation. That is really about giving folks more agency and voice, and more sharing around what equity work is actually happening at the college.*

** Ms. Hernandez feels strongly that ESL may need a representative, just because of the population they have as a Hispanic Serving Institution. 99% of our students are from that population.*

Summary from group 1:

Liz Giles was the spokesperson for this breakout group. Other members included Akil Hill, Sara Volle, Robin Goodenough, and Virginia Estrella.

[Group 1 Summary](#) The comments/questions they added are in blue font.

** ESL came up in their discussion.*

**Expanding on some of their bullet points, under "Communication and Transparency," Ms. Giles said, as the committee changes, we don't*

want to lose sight of retaining communication and transparency.

* Also, there was some discussion about, with all of these different constituency groups, how important is it for them to be a voting position versus a non-voting position, but still being there to provide commentary and feedback?

* Being from the [original] SEA committee, we were very focused on funding, so if there are no carryover funds, there's not a lot to vote on. That doesn't mean there's nothing to vote on, so we still want to take that into account. But maybe for the next couple of years, it's not as critical.

* With less resources, that means there are often more groups on the table that need funds. A lot of those groups may not be currently represented on this committee, but maybe they should be.

* The group also suggested having four members from each of the constituency groups.

* The group suggested having an Information Technology rep (maybe non-voting), but noted how helpful it was when Steve Reed was here and part of these conversations. That could be beneficial moving forward, as resources are kind of tight.

Comments:

Ms. Hamilton said we also need a bigger conversation on what the SEA committee is doing on campus that has to be at the President level. If we have IT needs, we may think we are a huge priority for the campus and for our students, but we may not be the priority in IT's queue.

Co-Chair Vasquez noted that she doesn't think SEA would supersede Program Review, because a department will set their own priorities based on the things coming at them as opposed to a Program Review process that's a part of accreditation where the institution is seeing the need. But there's no pathway to get those needs met because there isn't alignment or coordination in terms of what the priorities are for those people asking for IT support. That's something that needs a higher level conversation. As CPC starts to reimagine what their structure is, that's certainly something that needs to come forward, because she's hearing about it in different areas with different projects.

Ms. Giles said it would be nice to know if SEA puts forth recommendations, and they go all the way through CPC etc., that we are somewhere in that ranking for those [IT]resources, so we can actually do what we say we're going to do. IR, too, as sometimes they go hand in hand.

Ms. Lancaster said a part of what we're missing is actual data. How do we know if we're doing the things we say we're doing? One of the things that frustrates her about the way everything is structured is students having "single issue lives." What, for example, happens to the black single black mother who's formerly incarcerated and also a Guardian Scholar or NextUp student? How are we really thinking about coordinated allocation of proper support of resources? That really fragmented approach is frustrating because we're not really meeting the needs in a holistic way. We've got a huge influx of parents coming back into the system, which looks similar to 2009-2010. Now, all students that are parents with children under 18 are going to have priority registration. We need a coordinated approach to meet those students' basic needs (e.g. childcare and other supports). We're not signing those students up for 18 units without really being curious about what their lives look like.

Ms. Goodnough agreed and said that ESL students have the same multiplicity of challenges, and there are more groups across campus.

Summary from Group 2:

Andy Gil was the spokesperson for this group. Other members in the breakout group were: Chelsea Lancaster, Kristy Pula, Jen Loftus, and Monica Campbell

** From a very holistic standpoint, based on the current model, there are 27 voting members. There aren't even 27 people in this room. We're kind of looking at this from a very large perspective.*

** It's figuring out the "why" for each person, and why they're not showing up, or what else is going on in their lives in terms of why they can't be here. We're looking at it from the student perspective, especially. Mr. Gil has been in this room for three years and he has never once seen a student in here. It's critical to know what's going on there and what we can do to make their why more important.*

** The group agreed that 27 votes is not doable. Kristy Pula brought up a point in terms of being very strategic in terms of how we allocate each spot. The group never got in depth with the numbers.*

** The group agreed with the tri-chair model. They agreed that we need less votes, and we need to figure out why people are not showing up to these meetings.*

The group wanted clarification on what the one confidential voting member is. Co-Chair Arnold said they are a very small constituency group on campus, but we currently don't have a confidential member in the group

Regarding the “why” piece when it comes to students, both Ms. Lancaster and Ms. Pula brought up suggestions and examples in their group (e.g. Fund for Santa Barbara’s youth making change group, and mentorship model).

Co-Chair Arnold said that one of the things that we had talked about at the last meeting was using the Learning Aligned Education Program (LAEP) to fund a group of students to participate in the committee as a paid internship model, sort of like developing a leadership internship and using that pot of money which we have to support that work, to support students participating on the Equity committee, and potentially, if they could join other committees as well. That’s where we had talked about expanding the advisory members, the group of students who are those paid leadership interns. And then having potentially the ASG rep be the voting member of the committee, also knowing that ASG are now paid stipends for participating in ASG. We were thinking about it from that model to try to engage and encourage and increase the student participation, and the ability for all students to be able to participate.

Summary of the 3 breakout groups:

Co-Chair Arnold said the one thing we have consensus on is the tri-chair model.

The thing she wants to flip back to everyone is trying to find the balance between having a manageable sized committee, where work is done on a regular basis and committee members are involved and engaged, and having a more diverse representation in the voting membership. Those things may be a little bit at odds, if we’re talking about expanding the membership and making sure that we have a more manageable membership. She is wondering if, when we look at the constituency numbers, we go to 3 instead of 4, so that we can add other representatives to the committee as voting members that might be area experts. We look at 3-3-3, and we increase the area experts from different places. That might be a way that we do both.

Ms. Giles said she is game for that, and that in this first year, we can find out what works and what doesn’t.

Co-Chair Arnold said, if we look at 3-3-3, that’s 9 (from the 3 constituency groups), plus the 3 chairs is 12, plus the confidential, 13, the student is 14.

Ms. Goodnough agreed with that idea. She also noted that it's really important as we're defining the committee, that we think about what our actual work is, because that will determine a lot – people's investment and what they're coming to this committee for. We have to update the Student Equity Plan; we're not going to be spending a semester on teaching people how to write proposals; we're not ranking proposals. We need to be thinking about what it is that we do on this committee, that it has to do with being part of the bigger conversation on campus about how funding is allocated, how priorities are set, and how equity is part of that conversation. Until we define that, it's hard to determine what representation we need and who will really want to be at that table and need to be represented here.

Co-Chair Arnold said the other piece that we need to do is checking in at the end of every year on what we've done in the Student Equity Plan. What activities have we actually done that we wrote into the Student Equity Plan? That's a piece that we need to be incorporating into our regular work, because that's something we need to be reporting out to the Board and CPC.

Ms. Goodnough agreed, but she didn't feel like the method that we tried as our first shot at doing that last year was the most effective and efficient way to go about that, because a lot of times we did breakout rooms, and we didn't have anything to report because we weren't the ones doing it.

Co-Chair Arnold reminded everyone that one of the things we talked about at a previous meeting was maybe modeling that process after what the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee is doing, where we designated a liaison. That's why we went back to having as the advisory members certain key positions, but that we designate liaisons on the SEA committee to go out and reach out to people in X, Y, and Z programs, finding out what they have done. And then, being able to bring that information back to the SEA committee to be able to report out and put it all in a spreadsheet so that we have it all documented. And in the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee, that probably took a portion of 3 or 4 + meetings to get that report out. We're doing more this fall for activities that were completed last year. Co-Chair Arnold thinks using membership as a way to have appropriate liaisons to some of those different committees is something for us to consider. She thinks we've actually been doing a good job thinking about the equity work happening on campus, the equity work that we wrote into the Student Equity Plan and the membership discussions that we've been having so far.

Ms. Goodnough noted that as we have less or no funding to allocate to projects, that may not be as big a task as we think, since most of our funding is allocated to exclusively permanent positions now.

Co-Chair Arnold said a lot of the work that's happening in the Student Equity Plan is not necessarily being funded by SEA. It's work that people are doing anyway. We can still bring that information back. And we can also point out where work is not happening. Why is work not happening in these areas? Is it because there are no resources? And then that helps frame the conversation about the resources that the SEA committee needs. How do we advocate for prioritizing the resources to fulfill the activities in the Student Equity Plan?

Ms. Goodnough agreed adding, we may move our focus towards identifying unmet needs, rather than, we're not allocating resources. That requires a broader sort of engagement with campus groups and things..., and it may affect how we want to determine representation on the committee, if we're shifting our focus from people coming to us with proposals, to educating ourselves as a committee about what the unmet needs are, and working to help the campus in developing priorities to fund those things or support them.

Co-Chair Vasquez added that with the Program Review process, that's the time for areas to report on needs, resources, and support. There might be a disconnect there that we aren't aware of. With all the changes that we've been undergoing, a lot of realignment and coordination is really the key to going forward. You can do that without money. She suggested making a spreadsheet down the road of what we don't know, and start building that out so we have a foundation to go out and talk to our colleagues, because a lot of the work is not only department based, it's grant based. It's in our planning documents. There are a lot of things that are happening that many of us don't know about.

Co-Chair Arnold asked what Co-Chair Vasquez' thoughts were on how that might impact membership.

Co-Chair Vasquez responded that people are only as engaged as they have some knowledge around the committee, and its self-interest as well.

Co-Chair Arnold brought up another point. An area where we all could improve is formalizing a process for reporting in, and encouraging and

reminding folks to report out.

One of the things that we as a SEA committee may want to consider is how Program Review informs allocation of resources. Where does the SEA committee fit into that process of Program Review and allocating resources? It's not certain that would fundamentally change or alter our membership, though, but it's an important discussion we need to have and think about.

Dr. Menendez agreed with that. The communication piece is very separate from the conversation about who has representation and voting rights in this group. That's something the committee can determine once those folks are decided.

Dr. Menendez also addressed the need for more votes, and the need for there to be an equal voice at the table. This is the Equity Committee, and that's what equity is. We need to make sure that the diversity of the vote is there. To address Ms. Lancaster's point raised about capacity rather than directors of certain areas to be included as area experts, they could be designees. Because that way, then it's meeting capacity, but it's also addressing the point that sometimes within a department there is someone who's better suited to be in this space because of their engagement and their role.

Co-Chair Arnold added that to the draft. What we're saying is, it's up to the department to decide who the designee is, right?

Ms. Lancaster thought that maybe the charge can temporarily shift a little bit. She knows we have a specific charge, but... she feels like, especially right now, with all the challenges, there has to be some joy in the things that we're doing on campus, and maybe we can get back to talking about some of that again.

Co-Chair Arnold said that one of the things she's going to add to the bottom of this draft is thinking about activities or responsibilities of the SEA committee. We included a little bit in the charge above, updating Student Equity activities. How do we align with budget resource allocation?

One of the things Co-Chair Arnold remembered very early on when we started talking about consolidating the Student Equity Committee and the SEA committee, was thinking about the activities that happen across campus, like the Heritage month celebrations. Those don't necessarily have a point person on campus. Is incorporating some of

those types of activities something that we want to think about as well, as part of the SEA committee? Do we think about different activities like that? We are a very institution-wide committee, and we have talked for a long time about trying to make different celebrations really institution-wide and reflecting different areas of the institution. Do we use this committee as an opportunity to do something like that as well?

Jens Kuhn thinks that there's real potential in this idea of ensuring that broad representation is at the table when these discussions are being held, whether or not that means voting or not. Maybe there's some middle ground. Anything we are doing really should be centered around the issues that SEA is trying to look at.

Elizabeth Imhof noted that after the decisions we made regarding funding last year, there were a lot of people who were upset. She thinks it would be best for the committee to invite in people who have interests in equity work, and figure out how to manage the committee with more voices included. It might be a bit of a challenge, but it's something we could do perhaps with subcommittees... She is concerned that if we make our committee even smaller, others will feel really excluded and voices will be left out.

Co-Chair Arnold said we will take all of this feedback and put it into another round of drafts and share it with everyone.

6. Action

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?](#)