

STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

[SEA WEBSITE](#)

Thursday, September 17, 2020

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/97941662888?pwd=NFpwTzVBd0ZkNEM1MlIYSCtkODFOdz09>

Meeting ID: 979 4166 2888

Passcode: 280721

Members in Attendance:

Lydia Aguirre-Fuentes, Co-Chair Paloma Arnold, Roxane Byrne, Cosima Celmayster-Rincon, Jana Garnett, Liz Giles, Pam Guenther, Dolores Howard, Elizabeth Imhof, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Jose Martinez, Vanessa Pelton, Steve Reed, Kristy Renteria, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez, Sara Volle

Members Unable to Attend:

Vandana Gavaskar, Suzanne Obando

Resource Members in Attendance:

Robin Goodnough, Cesar Perfecto, Z Reisz

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.1 Call to Order

1.2 Introduction of new committee members

It was noted that ASG representative, Suzanne Obando, was not able to attend today's meeting due to a family emergency, Jose Martinez, ESL Coordinator for the Community Education Center, student services, and parenting classes, introduced himself to the committee.

1.3 Membership Updates

A. Reminder of voting membership

The SEA website shows who the voting and non-voting members are. Co-chair Paloma Arnold emphasized the importance of voting members to regularly attend the SEA meetings. If someone will be absent, please notify the SEA co-chairs. If appropriate, where a designee may need to be assigned.

B. Clarification of School of Extended Learning Membership – Jose Martinez is the returning member.

The membership calls for the Vice-President of the SEL or designee to be on the committee. Jose Martinez will be representing the SEL. Noncredit Coordinator Sachi Oates was assigned to be on another committee, so she will not serve on this committee.

C. Replacement for Dolores Howard/Senate Appointment

Dolores Howard confirmed that she will be able to remain a participating member of SEA.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 [May 7, 2020 Minutes](#) (Request for minutes amendment has been withdrawn)

3.2 [September 3, 2020 Minutes](#)

The amendment withdrawal was noted on the minutes.

Pam Guenther made a motion to approve both the 5/7/20 and 9/3/20 minutes. Elizabeth Imhof seconded the motion. There were 13 yes votes, zero no votes. Both minutes were approved.

4. REPORTS

4.1 Co-Chairs report

A. Budget Updates

Cesar Perfecto said in the last meeting he would be connecting with all of the budget managers who had SEA funded positions or allocations. He apologized for not being able to do that yet, as he has been busy working on accreditation.

Co-chair Arnold confirmed that the Center for Equity and Social Justice has hired a substitute student program advisor, Alondra Lazaro Gonzalez. This position is SEA funded, and it was already factored into this year's operating budget. The position is backfilling Roxane Byrne's position while Ms. Byrne serves as an Interim Coordinator.

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

5.1 Data Report of DI Student Populations at SBCC (Z. Reisz)

What is disproportionate impact

- Course success: [Presentation](#), [Dashboard](#)
- [Vision for Student Success 2019-2022](#)
- [Student Equity Plan 2019-2022](#)

Co-chair Arnold reiterated that having an equity lens is going to be the primary focus for the work this committee does. Z Reisz was asked to make a presentation to the committee about the identified disproportionately impacted populations at SBCC, as has been reported to the Chancellor's Office and previously reported in the student equity plan.

Dr. Reisz displayed a chart that looked at core success rates disaggregated by several of the institution's ethnic identities. The average success rate is generally flat, however American Indian, Black/African American, and Hispanic students consistently have success rates that are below the institutional average. Although the college has had equity plans since the mid-1990s, these groups continue to be disproportionately impacted.

Another chart showed course success disaggregated by course modality pertinent to COVID-19. There is a notable success gap between online and face-to-face classes. Dr. Reisz noted that there is a very large disproportionate impact for Black/African

American students, and a notable disproportionate impact for Hispanic, Pacific Islander, and American Indian and Alaska Native students.

Dr. Reisz shared with the SEA group the current plans that look at disproportionate impact -- the Student Equity Plan and the Vision for Student Success (VSS). Moving forward, the two areas will need to be integrated. Whereas the Student Equity plan focuses primarily on equity work, the Vision for Student Success has [four] goals for everyone, and a [fifth] goal that removes disproportionate impact among all of those.

Dr. Reisz shared the outcomes that the Chancellor's Office identified to plan around in the 2020 Student Equity Plan: Access, Successful Enrollment; Retention, Fall to Spring; Completion of Transfer Level Math and English; Transfer to a 4 Year Institution; Attain a Vision Goal Completion (certificate or degree).

The Chancellor's Office used the college's Management Information System (MIS) to report back to us where we had disproportionate impact. They use their own analysis, which limits us to what information they provide, but it also keeps all community colleges on the same metrics and the same methodology for determining disproportionate impact.

In the Student Equity Plan, all of these groups are intersected with gender. The Vision for Student Success is looking at just primary characteristics. Dr. Reisz shared with the committee the areas that the Student Equity & Achievement funding should be working to improve, such as successful enrollment, retention from fall to spring etc.,

Reducing disproportionate impact, and removing an equity gap is not an easy thing to do. No colleges have been completely successful. Resources in community college systems tend to be people.

This first version of the Student Equity Plan is rather high-level in the activities it describes, so it leaves a lot of room for this committee to think through which areas they want to fund. It also leaves a lot of room and responsibility for people in these areas to start to develop those activities and pursue them.

The Vision for Student Success is the Chancellor's Office push to bring a whole lot of our planning and integrate it at a community college system level and start to increase at least 20% the number of California community college students who annually acquire associates degrees, increase by 35% transfer annually to UC or CSU, etc. Goal # 5 is pertinent to this group, which is to reduce equity gaps across all of the above measures. Each of the five goals have a subset of goals in which the Student Equity Committee chose one or two to focus on (in bold on the slide he shared with the committee).

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Goals of SEA Committee

- A. Develop Equity training for people in positions currently funded by SEA
- B. Develop a process to call for one-time proposals
- C. Provide Training for applicants to help understand intent of funding, addressing specific needs of DI populations and proposed activities within proposal.

Co-chair Arnold noted that there are a significant number of positions funded by SEA (about 85% of the SEA budget is in the investment of people). Some goals for the committee that were discussed:

- *Develop and implement a training process for people in those positions and if applicable, their manager.*
- *Develop and improve the process to call for one-time funding proposals. Make sure that:*
 - *the proposal process goes out to the larger SBCC community*
 - *the proposal process is clear*
 - *there is enough time for people to submit their proposals*
 - *everyone is clear on what the rubric is for grading those proposals*
 - *the focus of the proposals that the committee approves are equity focused.*
- *Provide training for the people who are intending to submit proposals to make sure they are meeting the intent and understand it is a different focus now (no longer SSSP).*
- *As these long-time funded positions become open, develop a process that assures that if we are committed to refund these positions going forward, the equity lens has been applied.*

Questions, comments, and concerns:

- *There was a suggestion to have a firm, clear deadline when proposals are due*
- *Dr. Reisz had at one time put together a calendar outlay. He offered to bring it back as a starting point. [Here is the link to the calendar.](#)*
- *Making a very clear announcement for when we will start accepting proposals and what the process is.*
- *Co-chair Vasquez thought having a process similar to what they do for program review would be helpful, which includes a call in the fall, rankings in the spring, moving the recommendations to the committee and to the EVP for discussion.*

- *Submitting a proposal is open to everybody, even noncredit. Co-Chair Arnold is hopeful that committee members will feel confident enough in the process and in the rubric to be resources to others they know who may be submitting proposals.*
- *Co-chair Vasquez said that one of the opportunities would be to have conversations and buy-in ahead of time for proposals that would affect the department as a whole.*
- *The equity training is a way to expand equity on our campus and conversations about equity as we go forward into a year of deficit and perhaps positions getting eliminated. Co-chair Arnold's thought is to have these goals listed on each agenda as a guiding focus so the committee can spell out more specifically what these might mean at different times.*
- *There was a suggestion from Dean Elizabeth Imhof to have a baseline requirement for a certain amount of general equity training to be done in order to apply.*
 - *Some concerns:*
 - *If it was a requirement, then we would have to offer it.*
 - *We don't want to create any unintentional barriers.*

Dr. Imhof noted that there is a committee that is looking into general anti-racism training for staff and managers, and there is one that may be specifically for student services. It is not ready to be shared yet, but when it gets to that point, she will share the information with the committee.

Co-chairs Arnold and Vasquez thought that before the committee looked at the application and the proposal, it would make sense to look at the rubric to make sure it is where the committee wants it to be and that it identifies the needs. In addition, the questions on the application for proposals should be based specifically on the rubric.

Questions, comments and concerns:

- *There was a suggestion to have some success stories of what some other schools have done that have shown improvement in moving the needle. There was another suggestion to hear from currently funded SEA programs, about what is working (or not) on our campus. Maybe from that, the committee would be able to identify the gaps that perhaps could be addressed through a proposal and its accompanying rubric.*

For an upcoming meeting, Co-chair Arnold said it would be helpful to share best practices in the following:

- *Other colleges that have done something really well in your areas in 'moving the needle.'*
- *Currently funded SEA programs that have been effective on campus.*

Co-chair Arnold asked if there was some motivation for making sure the application went out in fall. Pam Guenther thought that many faculty might like to have it before winter break so they could work on it during that time. This would allow people time to do research and come to the committee with questions.

Co-chairs Arnold and Vasquez will map out the following and bring back to the committee:

- *Develop a calendar*
 - *Look at how many meetings are left in the fall and how meetings are planned in the spring. Base calendar off of that.*
- *Develop an understanding of what will give people the best opportunity to submit strong proposals and understand what we're hoping to help people do through that proposal process.*
- *Best practices*
- *Committee agreement to focus on goals*
- *It was decided not to look at the rubric now, and instead put that on the new calendar as it is developed.*

7. ACTION ITEMS

7.2 Group/Committee Agreements

A. Create a SEA focused committee agreement

B. [Example of other committee agreement](#)

There was a discussion on having a committee agreement.

In looking at the examples, Co-chair Arnold thought it would make sense for the committee to develop their own agreements, specific to the SEA committee. She shared a Google doc in the folder with the committee so they could add things that would help the committee run effectively, collegially, and smoothly. The document will "live" for a while, and there will be a deadline at some point. She will also send a follow-up email to the committee with a quick link.

Here are some of the points members wanted added to the agreement:

- *Clarity – Clear Process*

- *Communication*
- *Commitment to Transparency*
- *Making sure enough information is provided for people to make informed choices and votes and decisions.*
- *When information is requested, that it be provided if possible*
- *Collegial problem solving*

Co-Chair Arnold asked the committee to consider the possibility of making the SEA meetings an hour long. She noted the difficulty of people staying attentive after an hour, especially with Zoom meetings. There was no decision made, but it was noted that in the spring, when presentations are being looked at, the meetings probably couldn't be shortened.

7.1 Review current [Rubric for Proposals, for later.](#)

8. SUMMARY/FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

9. ADJOURNMENT

Z Reisz made a motion to adjourn. The meeting ended at 4:22 p.m.