

STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

[SEA WEBSITE](#)

September 25 2023

1:00 – 2:30 p.m.

MINUTES - DRAFT

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, Andre Gil, Liz Giles, Robin Goodnough, Jennifer Hamilton, Akil Hill, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Christina Llerena, Jennifer Loftus, Julio Martinez, Jennifer Maupin, Maureen McRae Goldberg, Vanessa Pelton, Krisy Pula, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez, Sara Volle

Members Unable to Attend: Jeanette Chian, Elizabeth Imhof, Chelsea Lancaster

Resources in Attendance: Cheryl Brown, Nicole Huber

Guests: Elizabeth Mares, Melissa Menendez, Josue Miranda, Nicole Oldendick, Corlei Prieto, Beth Taylor Schott

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 9/11/23 - Draft](#)

Christina Llerena made a motion to approve the minutes. Akil Hill seconded the motion.

4. Information

The budget report to the Chancellor's Office is due October 1st. As soon as it's completed, a pdf will be shared at the next meeting.

5. Discussion - SEA committee is a Participatory Governance Committee

a. What is a Participatory Governance Committee?

- i. [Resource Guide to Governance and Decision making \(pg. 10; 18\)](#)
- ii. (**"Cliff Notes"** from Resource Guide)

Co-Chair Arnold said we are proposing to discuss today what the structure of our committee should be.

Background information: In Spring 2022, the Student Equity Committee and the SEA committee were charged with consolidating to become one joint committee. The consolidation memo that we presented to CPC is attached to the bottom of the agenda. Through that discussion, we said our primary objective for the remainder of that spring semester, summer, and fall semester, was writing our Student Equity Plan. We intentionally chose at that time not to restructure the membership of our newly consolidated committee. We said in this fall semester [2023], we would take on the work of restructuring the membership of the committee.

This is our primary responsibility this fall semester. Now that the Student Equity Plan is done, we're also going to continue to do some reporting of activities throughout the year.

We started discussing it at the last meeting, and what the chairs said that we would do is go back and pull all of the historical information for everyone to see how we got to where we are now. We are not coming to you today with any recommendations or plans. This is about presenting information for the committee, and then hopefully we can work together as a committee to decide how we want the membership structured moving forward.

Some things they discovered:

** There were some references to SSSP and SEA, and the Student Equity Committee as being operational committees.*

** There were some references to SEA being a shared governance committee.*

** We read information in the Resource Guide to Governance and Decision Making, and did some research on other colleges on how their SEA committees were structured. We ultimately asked Dr. Endrijonas about it. She said it should be a shared governance committee because there is legislation that stipulates that there should be a SEA committee*

on college campuses, and that's one of the criteria for determining whether it should be a shared governance committee or not.

**What does it mean to be a shared governance committee? What does the membership of a shared governance committee look like? What are the membership roles on a shared governance committee?*

** It was determined that it would be helpful to review some of the information together, and then go into the discussion about what we want the structure to look like. Moving forward, we will need to develop our recommendation for what our membership should look like, and then because we report to CPC, take it to them for their input and review, and then potentially vote on it..*

Co-Chair Vasquez read aloud part of the "Cliff Notes" to the committee members and guests. The next section was going to go into the role of each type of person on the committee (e.g. constituency member, proxy etc.). Co-Chair Byrne suggested that we go to the current committee structure and the former structures, and then come back to this section when we're ready to figure out who we need on our committee. Co-Chair Arnold agreed that was a good idea.

b. Participatory Governance Committee Roles

- i. **Co-Chairs (pg. 13)**
- ii. **Voting Members (pg. 13)**
- iii. **Constituency**
 - 1. **Faculty (Academic Senate/Bylaws)**
 - 2. **CSEA**
 - 3. **ASG**
 - 4. **ALA**
 - Additional Members**
 - 5. **Proxy/ Ex-Officio/Notetaker/Guest**
 - 6. **Advisory**

There can be other non-voting members.

c. Historical Membership Structure

- i. **[Student Equity Committee](#) - collegewide**
- ii. **[SEA](#) - collegewide**

Both the SEA and Student Equity committees were college wide committees. They were set up as operational committees, but it was never clear historically if they were operational or shared governance. Some of the memberships were positional representation (e.g. certain directors or deans, or certain faculty members were specifically assigned to be part of the committees). And some of it was that CSEA reps, faculty reps... were needed.

*Co-Chair Arnold displayed and read aloud the **SEA committee membership pre-merger**. She explained that the original structure of this*

committee came from SSSP. We can see in some of this membership that this was a carryover from some SSSP days.

Questions, comments, and concerns:

* For the Faculty co-chair, Melissa Menendez said that it was actually the Academic Senate President or designee. Co-Chair Vasquez was noted as being the Academic Senate President designee.

* Co-Chair Vasquez wanted to make sure that everyone understood that when the Legislature created the Student Equity and Achievement language, the three previous separate funding categories (SSSP, Student Equity and Basic Skills), were morphed into SEA.

* The Chancellor's Office doesn't give us any guidance on how to structure the SEA committee. That was totally up to SBCC. It was the previous EVP who developed the structure of the SEA committee.

* Sara Volle recalled that we had four CSEA appointments at one time. Co-Chair Byrne said that on the website, it shows the Director of EOPS underneath the CSEA designees, but the Director of EOPS is not a CSEA representative. Co-Chair Arnold said it may not be as significant whether we had 3 or 4, but rather, how many do we want to have now that we're joined as one committee?

* There was a discussion as to whether the EOPS Director was or was not on the SEA committee. Co-Chair Arnold said that when she was the Director of EOPs she fought hard to have that position on the SEA committee, and was told "no." The position was, however, on the Student Equity Committee. Co-Chair Vasquez referred to the Resource Guide, and it has the Director of EOPS under Advisory members.

Co-Chair Byrne displayed and read aloud the **Student Equity Committee membership pre-merger**. Some of these positions are either no longer here, or have been reclassified and changed. That's something else for us to consider as we're putting together the new list of people.

Questions, comments, and concerns:

* Robin Goodnough's recollection is that on SEA, the Administrative Co-Chair was the EVP or designee, but Z [Reisz] didn't codify that in the committee structure. She believes the norm for shared governance committees is usually the head of that area of governance. Ex: A CSEA rep would be designated by the CSEA president. Co-Chair Arnold said that in the Resource Guide to Governance and Decision Making, it doesn't appear that it's stipulated that they're designated. Ms. Goodnough pointed out that the Resource Guide says that co-chairs are elected, but she believes the SEA co-chairs were appointed, not elected. And also, the part about the faculty and co-chairs rotation on an annual basis. The practice has been that each year the appointee is confirmed again by the

Senate President if the Senate President wants the appointee to continue in the role, and also if the appointee themselves want to continue in the role.

Co-Chair Vasquez noted that she listened to many CPC meetings where Dr. Reisz tried to update the 'Resource Guide' on what they saw as current practice. For many reasons, it was not easy for him to continue updating the document. She recommends not spending a lot of time on this piece yet as it will change again.

d. What is the current structure of consolidated [SEA membership](#)?

*Co-Chair Arnold displayed the **current structure of the consolidated SEA membership**. It also shows where each person came from (SEA/SEC).*

Questions, comments, and concerns:

** Dr. Menendez said that since Co-Chair Vasquez is the Academic Senate President designee, it should be changed to reflect that.*

** Co-Chair Byne explained that "BOTH" refers to the two committees combined. For example, certain things like ALA is Student Equity Committee only, because there was no ALA membership on SEA.*

** It was noted that there are several positions that have different titles now, so when we adjust and put our new committee forward, we'll use the correct titles.*

** There was a question as to why Elizabeth Imhof was listed as both a voting and non-voting member. Co-Chair Byne explained she was a voting member on SEA, and a non-voting member on SEC.*

** Co-Chair Arnold reminded everyone that this is not a recommendation, but just how the two committees merged and where each person on the committee is from and where they fall under. This just shows what the current membership looks like. If a position became vacant, we were leaving it that way for attrition, so we could get to a point where we weren't 36 members deep.*

** JH said when we look at membership for this year and beyond, the expectation should be that people are regularly attending and participating.*

** Are we going to look at this committee to meet in person? Alternating meetings? As the college is moving to have more and more in-person, Ms. Hamilton would like to have some committee meetings in person. Chair Arnold proposes that we first discuss the membership structure, not even necessarily the people in each position, but just the structure of the committee. And then we leave it up to CSEA or ALA to determine who is going to actually be the person. Once we have the membership structure, then we go back to deciding how often we're going to meet, length of meetings, and what modality (in-person, Zoom).*

** Jennifer Maupin volunteered to step off the committee, but Co-Chair Byne said she didn't think she should do that yet, and that we need to figure out what that model [for the committee structure] will look like, and then from there start to*

make some of those difficult decisions about who is deciding to stay on or leave.

** Ms. Maupin suggested maybe reducing the number of votes within each category to make it more equal among the constituency groups. Ex: If one group has six members, and another has 3 members, make it so they both have an equal number of votes.*

** Co-Chair Arnold said as we're having this discussion, think of the role of advisory members and see if there's a way we can use that to our advantage to ensure that people who are really invested in the committee can stay on the committee.*

** Co-Chair Vasquez also talked about the work before us. We have a Student Equity Plan that should be completed by 2025. We should also be thinking about the number of people with the knowledge to help complete that equity plan and doing the work that's required.*

** Kristy Pula would like to see an increase in student members and participation. Even if we only have one student vote. Perhaps we have 3 student members, because it's difficult for students and their schedules, but their voices are very important.*

Co-Chair Arnold agreed. For one year, we had a regular student committee member, but it tends to be challenging because there's a fair amount of work that's associated with this committee, and there's a fair amount of work that we ask this committee to do outside of the regular committee meetings.

Co-Chair Byrne added that the Student Equity Committee historically also involved students in other areas/programs they're affiliated with (e.g. EOPS. Enrollment Services etc.), but they weren't necessarily an ASG appointment. That might be something we want to consider as well, as some advisory members who are from some different areas on campus.

e. What should the new structure be?

- i. Chair/Co-Chair model?**
- ii. How many reps from each constituency?**
- iii. Advisory members?**

Chair Model: When we put forward the consolidation a year and a half ago, we proposed that the chair model would be a tri-chair model of 1 faculty (either the Academic Senate President or designee) , 1 administrator, and 1 classified staff member.

Questions, comments, and concerns:

** Ms. Goodnough likes this idea, noting that a lot of times, CSEA is not given a co-chair option. We also have to deal with which administrator now is the prevailing administrator to make the appointment since we don't have an EVP anymore? Is it one of the VPs? Is it the President/Superintendent? The Administration has to figure out that part of it.*

** Dr. Menendez also likes the idea, given that this is the Equity committee and should be practicing inclusive practices. It's a place for us as a college to really start modeling what that work and leadership looks like.*

** Co-Chair Vasquez reminded everyone that the Student Equity Committee was established to focus on groups of students, current or former foster youth students with disabilities, low income students, and veterans. And then the breakout of ethnic and racial categories, such as American Indian or Alaskan native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, some other race, homeless students, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender students.*

** Co-Chair Arnold said that once we have an idea of our proposed membership, we'll need to take it back to the constituency groups (e.g. CSEA, Senate, ALA) saying, this is what we're proposing. Any concerns or thoughts or do you agree?*

** Right now our proposed chair model would be the Tri-Chair: one administrator, one faculty, one CSEA. The faculty would be the Senate President or designee. The question around the Administrator is which Administrator designates the Administrative Chair portion of the position? Co-Chair Arnold is more than happy to start that conversation at the Executive Committee and see if Dr. Endrijonas has a preference on that.*

** Co-Chair Arnold started a document that she shared with the committee*
[Proposed SEA Membership Structure](#)

Question: *How is the CSEA membership determined?*

Historically, the CSEA President accepts recommendations. If the Chairs reached out to the CSEA President and said, "We're looking for a new CSEA representative on the SEA committee. These are some recommendations that we have." Then the CSEA President usually reaches out to those people herself or says, "That sounds great. Go ahead and reachout to those people on my behalf." Co-Chair Arnold said she believes the Chair position would be a similar process, but we'd need to check in with Liz Auchincloss.

Question: *When you say you're going to take it to the Executive Committee, hasn't the Dean of Student Affairs or the Student Affairs Executive been one of the tri-chairs of this committee?*

Chair Arnold said historically, the EVP designated someone [for SSSP and SEA]. When we split the VP position, Dr. Murillo had Co-Chair Arnold stay in the position until the full membership conversation happens.

Co-Chair Byrne said that the Student Equity Committee was a little bit different. First, the Chair was the Director of Equity, Diversity, and Cultural Competency, then the Executive Director of DEI, and then Dr. Byrne as the Coordinator of Equity, Diversity, and Cultural Competency.

Maureen McRae Goldberg was concerned because it is her understanding that if we leave this to whomever is in Dr. Endrijonas' position, she could actually appoint two faculty members, or if she gives it to Maria Villagomez, it would be two people from the faculty side, and we'd have

less of a Student Affairs voice. She would hate to see a senior Student Affairs official not being one of the tri-chairs.

Co-Chair Arnold said, the question on the table is, which Administrator should appoint an Administrator for the chair position? Another possible way this could end up is that the VP of Student Affairs position is not actually one of the chairs. But the three chairs and the committee reports to the VP of Student Affairs, who then reports it to CPC, because that's where it was before.

This is ultimately a recommendation that we'll take back to CPC. Co-Chair Arnold will bring the information back to the committee to discuss and see how we want to move forward with it. She thinks we can definitely come forward with a suggestion or recommendation.

Question: If the recommendation is to report to the VP, then is it the same VP who would determine the Administrative role?

Co-Chair Arnold said that seems like a logical connection.

Ultimately, the SEA committee reports to CPC, which is the advisory to the Superintendent/President.

There was a discussion about voting and/or advisory members.

Thoughts and comments:

* With four people from various groups, you end up with a lot of people like we have now, and it can take a while to get through topics and come to a consensus. However, with this particular group and the tasks that we have, more representation can be advantageous to our goals, because we will have potentially more diversity represented in this group.

* Advisory members historically have been those non-voting members, a wide constituency base. A lot of people have input into the work. One thing about advisory members is some of them are present at every meeting. Some of them look at the upcoming agenda and see whether or not it's appropriate, or if they feel it's necessary for them to be a part of the conversation. Having a broader advisory group is beneficial.

* It's important that we have a lot more voting members that represent the various groups, so that the vote has diversity within it.

* Co-Chair Arnold said as we're thinking about, if we go with four from each constituency group, does it make sense to say we would really like a faculty from "X" department because of what's written in the Student Equity Plan? Or would we like a CSEA member from X, Y, and Z program? Is it appropriate to suggest areas that would be relevant areas to have on the committee, or is that where we work in the advisory membership?

* Once we see who those representatives are and then we see where we might need some voice. That's maybe when we go out to get some of these advisory roles. It may not be this super large committee, because it's possible that some of the faculty or CSEA reps who are getting chosen, are already representing various programs and departments that are doing

some equity work on campus.

** Something to consider for the advisory membership is to have it align with the activities in the Student Equity Plan, and to suggest that advisory membership is updated every time we write a new Student Equity Plan (every three years).*

** Increasing ASG members as voting members, and then having a robust advisory group of students.*

** There was a suggestion to have student representatives on the committee compensated. Some suggestions to have that be done:*

- ASG is now compensated for their time. They receive stipends, depending on their role.

- Seek out student workers who are already working on campus for different equity-based programs, or just different programs on campus, and see if those departments would be willing to have the student worker participate for an hour meeting, on the clock.

- Another way would be to designate some SEA funds to pay student workers. Where that gets challenging is that could potentially create an inequity with other committees that don't necessarily have funds attached to them.

- Work with Chris Phillips to see if we can develop an LAEP internship for students to be able to participate on this committee as a working paid internship.

- Have interested students apply, and go through an interview process. That way the student will understand going into this role, that it's part of their job to attend meetings. Co-Chair Arnold said that would occur if the LAEP funding was used. It is a formal process, and students would basically be paid interns.

- There were some discussions around trying to develop a leadership work experience class so that students could get credit. But Co-Chair Arnold is not sure where that discussion is right now. It might be a good question for Anita [Cruse].

** Are there other roles that we think would be important to have as non-voting advisory members, regardless of the activities written in the Student Equity Plan?*

** How do we ensure that noncredit has a voice here, too? Should noncredit be a voting member? Would that be a designation from the VP or SEL? Corlei Prieto is here as a designee by Carola Smith.*

** Ms. Goodnough pointed out that on campus we tend to say smaller is more efficient, and efficiency is a concept that is put out there a lot. She thinks it's really important to remember that a voice at the table is really important, even when we have "representatives of different areas." We need to make sure that equity is represented for all groups.*

** Co-Chair Vasquez said we don't have IR and Fiscal on this list.*

** Ms. Maupin said on the list of the advisory positions that we have currently, there aren't many of those that she would like to see go away. She thinks it doesn't really matter what that year's Student Equity Plan looks like, because we're always developing future Student Equity Plans, and we always want to have everybody's voice in the conversation.*

Co-Chair Arnold explained that one of the reasons that she made the suggestion was more because, if you look at our Student Equity Plan, a huge portion of it is transfer, and we don't necessarily have anyone from the Transfer Center on the Equity Committee. So, making sure that we have people who are representing some of that work to really participate in the

committee.

Ms. Maupin agreed with that, and that we should keep a core group of advisors. And that every year we will make a list as part of the Student Equity Plan that includes other groups that need to be specifically brought in.

*Co-Chair Arnold asked that everyone **please review the document that she shared with all of you. Add your thoughts and suggestions.** She thinks we need to bring this conversation back to our next meeting. In the meantime, she'll bring the discussion up with Dr. Endrijonas.*

[Amendment to the minutes: It should be noted that CSEA reps Akil Hill and Liz Giles were supportive of the tri-chair model].

6. Action

7. Resource

- Final [Student Equity Plan 2022-2025](#)
- SEA [Consolidation](#) Memo to CPC (3/2022)