STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

SEA WEBSITE

September 12, 2022
1:00 – 2:30 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: 928 8883 9255  Passcode: 419332

Members in Attendance: Co-Chair Paloma Arnold, Co-Chair Roxane Byrne, Jeanette Chian, Andrew Gil, Liz Giles, Robin Goodnough, Akil Hill, Elizabeth Imhof, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Co-Chair Brittanye Muschamp, Vanessa Pelton, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez, Chelsea Lancaster, Julio Martinez, Sara Volle

Members Unable to Attend: Aurore Bemard, Vandana Gavaskar, Jennifer Hamilton, Aika Person, Kristy Renteria,

Resources in Attendance: Cheryl Brown, Nicole Hubert, Mark Bobro

Guests: Sabrina Barajas, Jennifer Maupin, Nicole Oldendick, Al Solano

1. Call to Order

2. Introductions

   Committee members and guests introduced themselves.

3. 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.

4. Approval of Minutes

   5-12-22 Minutes - Draft

   The minutes were approved.
5. **Information (5 minutes) (Laurie)**

   a. The SEA expenditure report is due Oct. 1 to the Chancellor’s Office

   Laurie Vasquez, Paloma Arnold and Roxane Byrne met with Cheryl Brown last week to review and submit

   b. Laurie Vasquez shared the SEA proposals that were approved Spring 2022

   i. **Spring 2022 list SEA funded proposals**

   ii. SEA proposal notifications went out on June 12, 2022

   iii. Some SEA proposals were denied based on impacts in other areas.

   Three proposers were notified:

   - ESL IPads (impact on I.T. and Business Services)
   - Non-emergency direct aid to students (not an allowable SEA expenditure)
   - Bridging the hardware gap for non-credit CDCP students  (impact on I.T. and Business Services)

Chair Arnold added a caveat regarding the IT requests. One of the discussions the SEA committee had was, they would try to work with IT and Business Services to see how they can support the Chromebook needs for the college overall moving forward.

iv. Laurie Vasquez provided a picture forwarded to her by Science faculty member Patty Saito. Patty wanted to give thanks to the committee for supporting the work through SEA funds.

   “...**Week 0 event which was SEA funded was amazing. We had over 100 students attend!”**
6. Discussion

1.1 Presentation of DRAFT Student Equity Plan 2022-2025 (Paloma, Britanye, Roxanne)

Note: The Chancellors’ office provided the colleges with reminders about changes implemented for the 2022-2025 plan -

“SEA-ing” the Racial Possibilities”

- Race conscious design
- No disconnected equity activities
- Emphasis on data
- Go beyond students services and into the classroom and curriculum
- Leverage existing work and build efforts across campus reforms
- Systemic inequities, require systemic responses

SEA co-chairs asked the Committee to review the 2022 - 2025 Student Equity Plan and they reviewed the timeline to present to constituent groups for review.

Over the summer, email updates were sent to SEA members regarding the development of the Student Equity Plan. The Student Equity Plan timeline was shared..

**Historical context:** In Fall 2021, the SEA and SEC committees merged to align resources with equity goals. Prior to merging, the SEA committee was responsible for the funding and allocation of funds from the Chancellor’s office, and the SEC committee was responsible for the student equity plan and oversight of activities related to the plan.

The Student Equity Plan was originally due on June 30th. Al Solano joined us as a consultant and support person. He presented on the student journey framework and got us thinking about how we were going to approach the Student Equity Plan. In late fall, the due date changed to November 30, 2022.

In Spring 2022, Nicole Oldendick (IR) created data sheets with all of the charts, graphs and information about disproportionate impact. As a group, we analyzed the data and began to identify who our most disproportionately impacted students were in relation to the various metrics that the Chancellor’s Office had given us.

Over the summer, each one of the co-chairs took on the metric to lead and support in developing what our plan might be for that particular metric. The core group (the four co-chairs) and often Akiil Hill, Robin Goodnough, Nicole Oldendick, Z Reisz, and Al Solano, and occasionally others, met on a weekly basis. They brought in other faculty as needed to enhance understanding, questions and provide additional information based on their specific department and metric. (i.e. transfer metric – Transfer Center counselors).
The core group created a “close to final draft.” As of today, they’re sharing the draft with the SEA committee.

**Next steps:** Take SEP to constituent groups on campus. After the Board of Trustees second reading on October 31st, the committee will have close to a month to do all of the final edits and revisions before submitting it to the Chancellor’s Office.

Co-Chair Byrne said that over the summer, the group was continually getting updates of items they needed to shift or change to meet the Chancellor’s Office’s new direction. The Chancellor’s Office new Student Equity Plan structure included target outcomes, structure evaluation, planning and action steps.

Guided Pathways is incorporated throughout the Student Equity Plan, and other plans like the Strategic Enrollment Management, Equal Employment Opportunity Plans were also utilized.

The metric worksheets went into the metric work group folders. Information was taken from the worksheets and included into this first draft, which is what you are seeing today.

*2022 - 2025 SBCC Student Equity Plan - Draft 1*

**Assignment for SEA Committee:**
Do a read-through of the draft, and provide comments in commenting mode, by this Friday. Think about things that might be missing, or are glaringly important. Review any overlooked information, provide ideas or feedback that you would like to see potentially included in the plan. We’re in the draft phase, so what you see is not necessarily the final language. However, the structure and the concepts we are adhering to is based on the criteria from the Chancellor’s Office, and we’re not going to do major overhauls of those.

The co-chairs will be hosting a drop-in this Thursday from 9:00 to 10:00 a.m. for people to ask and clarify any questions. You may also email the Chairs, but make sure you include all four of them (Arnold, Byrne, Muschamp, and Vasquez), so they’re all on the same page.

You’ll notice that there are recurring themes written in the plan through all five of the metrics. Right now, we have three out of the five metrics in place. The only thing we need to do is enter **Retention** and **Successful Enrollment**, which we’re hoping to have in there before Wednesday.

Co-Chair Arnold reminded everyone that the intention, and the
Chancellor’s Office direction, was not that we are going to fix everything for everyone with this Student Equity Plan. The intention was to be very specific about which populations we were identifying within each metric. You’ll see that there is definitely a recurring theme with our disproportionately impacted populations on the metric.

We had two options for the data. One was either from the Chancellor’s Office provided data, or we could use our own internal data that Institutional Research had developed based on the same metric. What we ended up finding is that the data essentially gave us the same populations. The populations that were identified as having the most disproportionate impact within each metric are basically the same populations. The way we selected the populations was to look at the magnitude of the disproportionate impact that the specific population experienced, how many students were being impacted (we chose to focus on a population that had a larger number of students), and then persistence over time (populations that consistently experience disproportionate impact year after year).

Initially, our Institutional Research did not have data on our Enrollment metric, so we relied exclusively on the Chancellor’s Office data for the Successful Enrollment metric. A month ago we learned that their data was incorrect. The data they provided us changed, and that impacted the population at SBCC. Simultaneously, Institutional Research developed that data set. Now, the Chancellor’s Office data is the same as our own internal data.

This is our first time approaching the Student Equity Plan in this manner, where we are being very intentional and deliberate about how we are identifying our disproportionate impact group that we want to address. In the past, we took all the groups and tried to address all of the disproportionate impacts for them. This time, we selected down to one, two, maybe three groups for each one of these metrics. You’re going to see a lot of continuity throughout the plan. It is showing us that this significant disproportionate impact for Black and African-American students is pervasive. And that requires us to make some really significant structural changes in order to support them.

It allows us to really hone in, focus, and see progress in ways we haven’t seen before, because if we’re really strategically looking at this group, and doing what we’re doing well, we should see some shifts in those numbers.

Co-Chair Arnold added that’s also the philosophy behind designing for the margins, which is, if we take the population that is experiencing the most
disproportionate impact, and we design our services etc. for that population, everyone will benefit.

Co-Chair Byrne suggested using 10 minutes to answer questions, and then, end the meeting early and give everyone an opportunity to start reading, reviewing, and commenting..

Dr. Solano said what you want to focus on is the metrics. What is the population you’re going to focus on? What are some target outcomes? What is it that we don’t do well? What ideas do we have to improve our practices? And then, what are our action steps? Dr. Solano showed another visual for this, that shows the structure for each of the metrics. When you look at the metrics, the data has already been established. He said to comment more than ask questions.

The committee took a moment to give Co-Chair Brittanye Muschamp a huge shout-out for all of the extra work she put in on the Student Equity Plan this summer.

Co-Chair Muschamp will add the table of contents a little bit later. She will send an email out once Retention and Successful Enrollment get entered (before Wednesday afternoon).

The meeting ended at 2:00 pm.

Action

Additional Resources