

# STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

## [SEA WEBSITE](#)

Thursday, October 1, 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/91610694377?pwd=OUx4VUIHUKFJVjRUR3V2TFZnOTdDQT09>

Meeting ID: 916 1069 4377

Passcode: 954209

---

**Members in Attendance:** Lydia Aguirre-Fuentes, Co-chair Paloma Arnold, Roxane Byrne, Cosima Celmayster-Rincon, Jana Garnett, Vandana Gavaskar, Liz Giles, Pam Guenther, Elizabeth Imhof, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Jose Martinez, Suzanne Obando, Vanessa Pelton, Steve Reed, Kristy Renteria, Co-chair Laurie Vasquez, Sara Volle

**Members Unable to Attend:** Dolores Howard

**Resources in Attendance:** Robin Goodnough, Cesar Perfecto, Z Reisz

**Guest:** Marit ter Mate-Martinsen (for Dolores Howard)

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

##### 1.1 Call to Order

*The meeting started at 3:04 p.m.*

#### 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 [Minutes for SEA Meeting 9-17-20](#)

*It was noted that absences were not on the 9-17-20 minutes. They have now been added. Sara Volle made a motion to approve the minutes. Elizabeth Imhof seconded the motion. There were eleven yes votes, zero no votes, and two abstentions. The minutes for 9-17-20 were approved.*

### 4. REPORTS

#### 4.1 Co-chairs report - L. Vasquez

A. Chancellor's Office "Pathways to Equity Conference" - the archive and materials will be available in the [Vision in Resource Center](#).

Once you are logged in, hover over "Communities" and click "All Communities." Browse the community list for "**CCC | Webinars, Conferences and Events**" and click the community title. Select the "Join Now" button and you will immediately have access. Look for the Pathways to Equity discussion and materials in the "Topics" page of the community.

B. Center for Urban Education, presented the findings from a comprehensive review of 113 student equity plans submitted to the Chancellor's Office, June 2019.

Select Findings:

1. Minimal use of deficit minded language within the activity descriptions
2. General or "all inclusive" equity, not racial equity
3. Lack of attention to transfer and transfer equity
4. Equity effort for the majority of colleges was fragmented, not campus-wide

*The report will be posted in the Vision Resource Center within the next three weeks.*

C. The link below provides a helpful checklist that came out of the analysis. "We hope this is something that can be used as your college revisits and continues to implement your equity plan."- [Tools for creating an actionable equity plan](#)

*Co-chair Arnold heard positive things about the conference. She noted that one of the most important aspects going forward with the SEA proposals and funding is to be mindful of what is written in the equity plan, and how the equity plan is being shaped.*

## 5. INFORMATION ITEMS

### 5.1 2018-2019 Student Equity and Achievement Program Term-End Expenditure report due 10/2/2020

*Co-chair Arnold noted that tomorrow the term expenditure report is due for the 2018-19 year.*

*Today, however, as Cesar Perfecto was trying to submit the expenditures for year two, he discovered that last year's report was submitted incorrectly. Instead of being submitted as "Santa Barbara Community College District," it was submitted as "Santa Barbara City College." Therefore, nothing is filled out for Santa Barbara Community College District, and he does not have access to the incorrect one.*

*Mr. Perfecto notified the Chancellor's Office, but he may be asking for an extension because of the circumstances. He will have more information by tomorrow.*

*Co-chairs Vasquez and Arnold will discuss the situation with Mr. Perfecto after the meeting. Mr. Perfecto noted that Dr. Pamela Ralston has not been made aware of the situation, pending him hearing back from the Chancellor's Office.*

*Mr. Perfecto also told the committee that payroll was just processed for September. He has already set up meetings with some budget managers, doing an overview of the budgets in their area. Now he will start reviewing the budget to see if anything is being posted incorrectly. Over the next 30 days, budget managers may start hearing from him if he has any concerns.*

## 6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 [Calendar for SEA activities](#) (call for proposals, due date, review (advising those applying for funding, ranking, contacting awardees, evaluation outcomes))

*Co-chairs Vasquez and Arnold put together the first draft of the calendar. They want this to be collaborative with input from all of the members. They included some of the feedback that was discussed at the last meeting.*

*Before going over the draft, Co-chair Arnold told the members to feel free to put a comment straight onto the document. They would like to have a working document that is finalized in the next meeting. Co-chair Vasquez put the 20-21 academic calendar at the top. She said when providing feedback, insert a comment in a particular row and go to “insert” and hit “comment,” and it will be attributed to you.*

#### *Questions, Comments, and Concerns:*

- *Vanessa Pelton noted that Admissions & Records and Enrollment Services hourlies should be two different line items. Co-chair Arnold explained that they were just listed there as areas that had recently been awarded funding.*
- *There was a concern that in the calendar, there needs to be a place for evaluating projects. Co-chair Arnold explained that she put in a space in the calendar for current funding recipients to report back to SEA at the last meeting (May 6) since she thought it would be hard to present whether or not expenditures have been successful until the year is almost over/ resources had been expended. Her thought was to only ask the people who received funding this year, as to go back further could be challenging.*
- *Marit ter-Mate Martinsen thought it might be helpful to have those reports before the ranking happens, so that it could also inform the ranking. Co-chair Arnold put a note in regarding Marit’s request. However, due to timeline constraints, it is not possible for this year but that is the intent with inviting former recipients to present “best practices” in November.*
- *There was a discussion about getting data, which led to a larger discussion about the difficulty of getting data that supports whether or not a student services initiative was successful.*
- *Two types of workgroups were discussed – one that would focus on measuring student services metrics, and one that would develop training for people/programs applying for funding. The training would provide concrete information, be equitable and allow everyone to get the same information, with a clear understanding of the expectations for applying.*

*After some discussion, it was determined that one workgroup would suffice, first focusing on measuring student services metrics, and then developing the training. It was also suggested to provide individual coaching when necessary for applicants.*

*Workgroup members so far are: Z Reisz, Steve Reed, Sara Volle, Vandana Gavaskar, Kristy Renteria, Liz Giles. Co-chair Arnold will put a call out to see if anyone else would like to participate in the workgroup. From there, dates will be set for the workgroup to meet.*

- *It was determined that there will be a firm deadline for proposals.*
- *There was a question as to what metrics are being used. Z Reisz suggested sticking with the Student Equity Plan and Vision for Student Success goals and the metrics that go along with them. Longer term, he would like to see an alignment more with the institutional set metrics.*
- *Eventually there will be a larger conversation with the Student Services Leadership Advisory Committee regarding the directives for student services. Co-chair Arnold said that that is a future agenda item.*
- *There was a suggestion to have tiered measures (Vision for Student Success [VSS] at the top), and then smaller measures for individual programs.*
- *There were a couple of questions regarding the VSS goals. First, were the different stakeholders' part of the decision-making process for the percentages? And second, were they realistic percentages? Dr. Reisz explained that there was some share-out, but he couldn't say there was 100% buy-in from everyone. And for the second question, these were aspirational goals. The focus is, there is disproportionate impact in this group, let's start to think about what we can do to ameliorate that.*
- *Co-chair Vasquez suggested maybe having a retreat with SEA and IEC. Dr. Reisz explained that it landed with IEC because it was the one body that was convened at that point, the committee had some sort of content responsibility in that area, and it was representative. He believes it was a one-time occurrence.*
- *It was determined that the committee doesn't need all of the measures in order to develop the rubric.*
- *There was a question regarding whether there would be some kind of communication to people prior to December 7<sup>th</sup>, when the*

*application is released. Co-chair Arnold said they could, but that she hadn't planned on it. She noted that the application period is open for three months.*

- *Additionally, it was suggested to inform people about the general range of amount(s) they could request. Co-chair Arnold noted that last year's form explicitly stated programs could apply for up to \$50,000.*
- *Dr. Reisz suggested that for reviewing existing programs, given they were given the funding with no particular metric expectations, they could just give an honest report-out with how the money was used, and what was accomplished. If they have any, they can also include supporting data or metrics.*

## 6.2 [Rubric for Proposals](#)

- Language (equity, diversity, deficit language)

*It was brought to the Co-chairs' attention that the rubric that is in the shared SEA folder is not the rubric that was actually used last year. Elizabeth Imhof has sent Co-chair Arnold the correct one. The one in the SEA folder emphasized Guided Pathways, and that was not emphasized at all.*

*Co-chair Vasquez changed the name and added today's date to the correct one. The current rubric will be used as a starting base for the applications this year.*

*Questions, comments, and concerns regarding the rubric:*

- *In last year's rubric, there were some areas that needed to be more detailed. In other areas, things were asked that weren't necessarily deserving of their very own categories (such as breaking down silos).*
- *There were two categories – measurable outcomes, and evaluation and assessment – that almost no one knew how to address. It needs to be made very clear what we're asking in those two areas.*
- *There were some categories like recruitment, outreach, dissemination, and marketing that didn't necessarily apply to everyone.*
- *There was a suggestion to have "musts" and "optional" questions. The downside of that is that if not everyone is being graded on the same rubric, it will create a complicated assessment at the end.*

- *Maybe having a basic ordering of the rubric is needed. At the top, is what every proposal should have. Lower down, there can be those areas that might apply to some, and not necessarily others.*
- *A plan description should be one of the elements. An overall plan, and then if they need to, they can add a dissemination plan, marketing plan, etc.*
- *Clearly identify which disproportionately impacted population will be addressed with the proposal.*
- *Make sure the questions on the Google form that need to be filled out, match up with what is being evaluated in the rubric.*
- *On the rubric, where it has the number of DI students served, depending on the proposal, it may be difficult to pull that information together ahead of time. For example if someone has a new idea that hasn't served DI students in a particular way, there's a concern that the way things are phrased might close off opportunities to address gaps.*
- *There was a suggestion to either consolidate some of the areas or figure out a way to weight some more than others.*
- *For the application part, Cesar Perfecto requested including the org number(s) that are going to be involved.*
- *Some categories really aren't important enough and should be removed.*
- *There was a suggestion to add the question, "How are you going to measure the success of DI populations?" If their plan doesn't include a way to measure the success of DI students, it shouldn't be submitted.*
- *The rubric influences the application.*

## 7. ACTION ITEMS

### 7.1 [Group/Committee Agreements](#)

*Co-chair Arnold reminded the members that the group/committee agreements is an evolving document, so members can add comments or suggestions to it.*

*Questions, comments, and concerns:*

- *There was a question regarding permanent positions that go away [ex: someone retires]. If anything new comes, will it be tied to these new values of the committee?*

*Answer:*

*When a position becomes open, there is an opportunity to take it through an equity lens process and make sure that the department and hiring*

*manager have equity training, and that the hiring manager is looking at the position and work through an equity lens.*

*Also, have ongoing training for the people in these positions.*

- *There was a question regarding how much funding is actually available.*

*Answer: The one-time funding is more or less \$500,000.*

## 7.2. Summary/Follow-up items

*To the committee members:*

- *Take some time to look over the calendar and rubric over the next week or two. Suggest changes, add thoughts, questions, concerns, etc. so the Co-chairs can present an updated version of both the calendar and rubric at the next meeting.*
- *If anyone wants to participate in the metrics-leading-into-training workgroup, please send the Co-chairs an email, so the meetings can be set up right away.*
- *Continue adding to the committee agreements, and the committee will review them at the next meeting.*

## 8. ADJOURNMENT

*The meeting ended at 4:31 p.m.*