

## MINUTES

### STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

[SEA WEBSITE](#)

Thursday, November 5, 2020

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

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:** Co-Chair Paloma Arnold, Roxane Byrne, Cosima Celmayster-Rincon, Jana Garnett, Vandana Gavaskar, Liz Giles, Pam Guenther, Elizabeth Imhof, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Vanessa Pelton, Steve Reed, Kristy Renteria, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez, Sara Volle

**Members Unable to Attend:** Lydia Aguirre-Fuentes, Dolores Howard, Jose Martinez, Suzanne Obando

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

**Guests:** Marit Ter Mate-Martinsen (for Dolores Howard)

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

##### 1.1 Call to Order

*The meeting started at 3:03 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 [10-15-2020 Minutes](#)

*There was a correction made to the time the meeting adjourned. It ended at 4:21, not 1:21. The minutes were approved.*

## 4. REPORTS

### 4.1 Co-Chairs report – L. Vasquez

a. Materials from the Pathways to Equity conference have now been posted in the Vision Resource Center.

To access: [Login to the Vision Resource Center](#). Choose Santa Barbara district > Click Go.

Highlight communities >select all communities> choose CCC|Webinars, Conferences and Events> Choose Topics> Select Pathways to Equity Conference. Choose recordings of different breakout sessions.

Example - Recording of "[SEA-ing](#)" the Racial Possibilities: [Statewide Analysis of Student Equity Planning](#)

*Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez shared with the committee, how to access the "Pathways to Equity" conference materials. The conference was sponsored by the Chancellor's Office. She also highlighted one recording, the "Statewide Analysis of Student Equity Planning," that everyone has submitted throughout our system. She recommended starting with that one.*

### 4.2 No budget update

*Cesar Perfecto is in the middle of finishing up all of the audits, so all of fiscal services is occupied right now. He does not have any updated budget information for the SEA committee.*

## 5. INFORMATION ITEMS

### 5.1 SEA Annual Report Due January 1, 2021 (Cesar and Paloma)

**The final, approved report must be certified within NOVA by 5PM on January 1, 2021**

*The annual report is now open for us to begin working on. Cesar Perfecto is going to input the financial portion, and Co-Chairs Arnold and Vasquez will work on the narrative piece.*

*Co-Chair Arnold shared that they finalized the previous report. It was corrected, resubmitted, and Dr. Goswami and Vice President Lyndsay Mass signed off on it.*

## 6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

### 6.1 [Metrics Chart](#)

*As she mentioned that she would do at the last SEA meeting, Co-Chair Arnold made a chart comprised of information gathered from the Student*

*Equity Plan, the college's alignment plan for the Chancellor's Vision for Student Success, and the information about the metrics that we are trying to achieve, who we are trying to impact the most, and some of the activities that were recommended, mainly in the student equity plan, to achieve these metrics and close equity gaps in these different areas.*

*Co-Chair Arnold put this in the discussion because she really wants to hear feedback. Is this something we want to use more? Is it not? She tried to pull together the information from the two different reports in a way that felt a little more digestible for people to be using as they were submitting proposals.*

*Some questions, concerns, and comments:*

- *These are examples of activities that were listed in the Student Equity Plan. It would be up to the people submitting the proposals to develop these activities themselves.*
- *For areas like tutoring, for example, that may serve these populations, if they do not have the drill down data, Z Reisz's office could probably help supply some of that support.*
- *The chart is a tool for people to help make a more informed proposal if they need help, but if they already have a great idea, they don't need to necessarily use it.*
- *As the Student Equity Committee (SEC) moves along, and their interest in identifying a specific equity gap, really centering and focusing a lot of their work on one area and seeing if they can close a gap, the priorities may shift, so that might be something to consider as well. Co-Chair Arnold thought maybe that could be put in a rubric. For example, if the SEC identified "access" as a priority, proposals with access as a goal, could be awarded more points.*
- *The college and the Chancellor's Office has already identified areas that we need to improve, so those metrics are there. For example, we know that our black and African American students are not finding jobs in fields related to their major. This information is coming from areas we know where we are not being successful.*
- *Elizabeth Imhof explained that measuring is hard, and when you don't do it, you don't find out if you're improving or if you're really serving students. For some areas it might be harder, but we absolutely need to require this. There are very simple ways to measure. Example, with the Food Pantry, you track the students who are using the Food Pantry. And you look at their success rates. And then you match to a similar demographic on campus or the general demographic on campus to see how they're doing against the general population, or potentially those who are not using the services. It's not a perfect measurement, but it's a standard measurement, and it's one that any area on campus can access.*
- *Is there a requirement to provide data up front that shows how it will help students? Or are we trying things out and setting up a good plan to track how it helps students if funded? Dr. Imhof noted that in order to really demonstrate that we are being data driven in our decision making, we need to ask for some level of evidence up front. That evidence can only be the bar that they want to change. 'We propose that if we do this intervention, this rate will change, and this is our plan for measurement.'*

*In most funding proposals, you don't need much more than that. You need a baseline measurement, and you need produced evidence of a baseline measurement because you need to commit to moving that baseline, and then a plan for changing it.*

- *Dr. Imhof also agreed with a suggestion that Liz Giles made regarding a need for training. She wants that to be something that this committee offers, because education, aside from the fact that it will make proposals so much better and more effective, is a way we can educate our campus about this kind of work.*
- *The baseline has already been generally established of where we need to improve and where we need to work and the areas and students we need to be working most specifically with.*
- *Dr. Reisz said he would set aside ½ an hour to an hour, for anyone interested in Tableau training. He also mentioned the SEP and VSS, which has already provided us with a starting place. Their choice with the headcount is both a benefit and a little bit of a limitation. It makes it very easy to think about, if I need to impact this many students, what will I need to do? It gives you an idea of the number of students that you need to impact with percentages. But it also makes it a little more difficult to map that as we have changes in enrollment. He said he is here to help with whatever training we think the committee will benefit from.*
- *Co-Chair Arnold mentioned the work group that will be working on the trainings, and for people interested to complete the Doodle poll.*
- *Although there was support to collect data and track students, there was concern that it might make departments or people who want to do proposals shy away from doing this because now it is going to be data driven, and they simply do not have the resources or the capacity to learn this. Another concern was putting a large workload on IR and people like Steve Reed. Co-Chair Arnold made a suggestion about only requesting data for proposals that are approved. They would make a commitment to doing the data, but only the five to ten approved proposals would have to show the data. Dr. Imhof asked, what if we just ask them to look in our equity plan, and pull something that already exists.*
- *Dr. Reisz was appreciative of everyone's concern about the workload, but he said this is one of the more important areas that his office deals with. To the extent that is a concern, they'll need to work around it, and try to do everything they can to make sure people have the data. Get people into the habit of coming to our plans to try and orient the activities that they want to do.*
- *There was a question about the correlation between multiple projects going on, and if we do in fact improve DI students' results, which one of those activities is the one that did it? Dr. Reisz noted that if we end up with that situation, we'll probably end up with different students that participated in different activities with some overlap between those. If we have enough students that did both or all three options, then we can start to isolate the variance between those. We're probably not going to get that fancy.*
- *Is this what we want in proposals, some way to determine that my project is the one that is affecting?*

*Dr. Reisz is thinking that's a little bit farther down the road, once we really start to feel comfortable with this. At this point, we start to get people comfortable planning around data. We're saying, "This is our baseline information. Now, really start to think how you're going to impact these numbers and how you're going to measure this." He thinks as we build this foundation and understanding and this informed data across our campus over the next year or so, then we can start to move more into these inferential statistics*

*Co-Chair Arnold said she sees it more as how are we changing our activities to meet these specific populations? To meet the needs of these specific populations, not necessarily how are activities benefitting these populations but how are we changing what we're doing to meet their needs?*

- *Dr. Riesz's hope is that over the next few years we really start to become integrated in our planning in a way that most people understand what our plans are, or at least which plans directly relate to the work that they do day-to-day, and how those all kind of tangentially or directly link to our mission.*

## 6.2 [Rubric for Proposals](#)

*Originally we had said we wanted to develop the rubric before we looked at the application.*

*Based on all the feedback and notes that Co-Chair Arnold had written and the committee had provided, she did a highlight overview of some of the changes that were made. She asked if the committee members could take a few minutes to look at it and give feedback on it.*

*Co-Chair Vasquez said they should probably add numbers on the far left. There can be a cross reference in terms of which part of the rubric matches the application.*

## 6.3 [Working Draft Application](#)

*Co-Chair Vasquez went over the working Draft Application. For the application, they took everything out and started fresh with an idea of what is it we really want people to know up front. They started with, do people know what the committee is asking for in these applications? They provided a basic definition. None of this is written in stone, so if anyone has suggestions for changing language, please make the suggestion.*

*Questions, comments, or concerns:*

- *# 3, is to make sure people understand the alignment and synergy between the two committees.*
- *Regarding the question addressing the metrics, Co-Chair Arnold said this is the area we would probably need to work on based on what we decide to be asking.*
- *On the previous page, Pam Guenther asked, do we want to provide any guidance on the description of the proposal? Do we want a word limit?*

Do we want certain things in the proposal? Co-Chair Arnold said that would make sense.

- Co-Chair Arnold said that some of the questions they had about the questions is what's the intent in asking the questions? Are we asking the questions because the answers will help us determine who has priority? Are we looking for programs or proposals that say they are going to collaborate? Will those proposals be more heavily weighted? Is that a priority for us?
- In Section 8, they weren't sure if they wanted to keep those questions or not.
- For # 18, Ms. Guenther said that since there isn't a lot of money to give, the committee had wanted to have people think about what are the 'have to haves' in their proposals? She wanted that question left in. Co-Chair Arnold was in agreement, but she was having some difficulty dragging that question into the right area.
- It was noted that in some cases, a group might need to ask support or dollars for marketing, since marketing has been something the college cut back on quite some time ago.
- Dr. Reisz said that we probably don't want to require people to use Tableau at this point. The only dashboard that they have that is mature in a DI kind of way is Course Success, so people would be pretty limited if they were trying to identify activities they want to do. He suggested leaning back on the VSS and the SEP.
- Co-Chair Vasquez asked if there were too many questions. Does it look like we're getting at what we want to know?
- Are the questions going to be rated equally, or are some more critical than others? And how would the people who are writing these proposals really know which are the more important ones? Or is that part of the training?

Co-Chair Arnold thought that that would be part of the development of the rubric, in determining which questions are the most important. Which ones should be most heavily weighted? If the SEC is saying this is our number one equity achievement gap that we're trying to close right now, then the proposals that are in alignment with the SEC's priorities are ones we give more points to. She hopes we can vet that through the rubric discussion. Some questions are just informational (i.e. what is the org number etc.?).

- All of the questions right now seem to be long-answered text. Will there be a shift as we move forward to perhaps drop-down menus? Co-Chair Arnold would like to develop the form in a way that if people pick the metric, then it will automatically lead them to the next section that says, 'These are the DI populations that have been identified for that metric. Which one are you hoping to impact the most?'
- Will we stay focused on the Chancellor's Office DI student groups? Will we also offer an additional question for other groups on campus that people are concerned about (i.e. Chelsea Lancaster, who advocates for single parent students...)? Co-Chair Arnold said that if our goal is to try to really address what has been identified in the SEP and VSS, then she thinks we would need to stick with what has already been identified. This could be Phase 1, and then perhaps in Phase 2, they could follow the Student Equity Committee's Phase 2.

- *Roxane Byrne thinks this is another area where we have to reiterate the parameters of the SEP, and she thinks that has been a source of frustration and contention in a lot of ways for people because they often think we are identifying those groups and the metrics, when those are things that have been defined for us. It's sort of the constraints in which we have to work. She would like information made very clear to the campus when this is sent out, so they understand we're not trying to exclude any groups.*

*Co-Chair Vasquez asked Ms. Byrne to go back to the application, and if she sees a spot where that might be emphasized, can she just make a note for her and Co-Chair Arnold?*

- *Co-Chair Arnold asked the members to take a little bit of time to either add comments, add notes, or send Co-Chair Vasquez and her an email with thoughts about it.*
- *The little stars mean that's where the Co-Chairs have questions or areas that need to be changed.*
- *If people could look at this within the next week, then the Co-Chairs could take the suggestions, and bring back a somewhat finalized version of the application to the next meeting.*
- *Co-Chair Arnold will create a new application and share it with the committee. She'll put it in a Google Doc, so people can add comments. Co-Chair Arnold will send a link to the application and rubric.*

*It was agreed that the presentations from people who had received funding this year, will be postponed until Spring 2021.*

#### 6.4 [Calendar for SEA activities](#) - review plan for next meeting

### 7. ACTION ITEMS

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

#### 7.2. Summary/Follow-up items

*To Do:*

- *For those of you in the work group, please finish filling out the Doodle poll.*
- *The Co-Chairs will switch out the link for the rubric so it reflects what's on this agenda.*
- *Co-Chair Arnold will send out an email with the rubric and application links for items that need your feedback.*
- *The Co-Chairs will meet with Dr. Reisz to make sure that they're clear about what they're asking on the application, in terms of data and what's realistic there.*

### 8. ADJOURNMENT

*The meeting ended at 4:34 p.m.*