

## STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

### [SEA WEBSITE](#)

October 23, 2023

1:00 – 2:30 p.m.

### MINUTES

---

#### 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, Andy Gil, Robin Goodnough, Jennifer Hamilton, Akil Hill, Elizabeth Imhof, Chelsea Lancaster, Christina Llerena, Jennifer Loftus, Julio Martinez, Jennifer Maupin, Maureen McRae Goldberg, Vanessa Pelton, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez, Sara Volle

**Members Unable to Attend:** Jeanette Chian, Liz Giles, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Kristy Pula

**Guests:** Monica Campbell, Christopher Johnson, Melissa Menendez

#### 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 10/9/23 Draft](#)

*Maureen McRae Goldberg moved to approve the minutes. No corrections were needed to the minutes.*

#### 4. Information

#### 5. Discussion

- a. SEA Committee (Participatory Governance) Membership Structure (cont)

- [Discussion notes](#) 10/9 meeting
- [Draft v1.0](#) (presented 10/9 based on 9/25 discussion)
- [Draft v2.0](#)

**Attached to the agenda are:**

- \* *the notes from the breakout sessions from the last meeting on October 9th, and some of the suggestions and comments that were made*
- \* *the draft that we presented on October 9th that we had based on the previous discussions from September 25th;*
- \* *Draft 2.0, which is incorporating some of the discussion that happened at the last meeting, October 9th.*

*Co-Chair Arnold apologized for not getting the agenda out to you earlier. She thought what made sense for us to do is review the proposal for Structure version 2.0, and highlight some of the changes we made, and have some discussion around it.*

*The charge essentially is staying the same. That is what we worked on last year when we consolidated our two committees. We updated the structure. Co-Chair Arnold reminded the committee about the conversation she planned on having with Dr. Endrijonas. The outcome of that meeting was that Dr. Endrijonas felt that the committee should report to the VPSA. It would still be a CPC reporting committee, and VPSA Arnold would have the official budget reporting oversight of the committee, but she would no longer serve as one of the Chairs of the committee.*

*We agreed at the last meeting that the Chair model would be a Tri-chair model, which would include an administrator from ALA (designated by the VPSA), one faculty (the Academic Senate President or designee), and one classified staff person (appointed by CSEA)*

*For the voting members, at the last meeting, we brought up whether there should be 3 or 4 voting members. It seemed to Co-Chair Arnold that there was consensus from the group that 4 would be better– that having broad representation on this committee was important. This draft proposes 4 members from CSEA, Faculty Senate, and from ALA.*

*There was also a lot of discussion last time about making sure that we had representation from our existing, historically represented Equity programs. One of the ways that we tried to incorporate that was when we reach out to these different constituency bodies, the request is that special consideration is made to classified staff and managers from our already existing Equity programs (e.g. Raices, TAP, Umoja, MESA...). The reason we're not calling out specific positions individually as voting*

*members is because if you see the list, we have quite a few programs. The question becomes, where would we draw the line? Does everybody become a voting member if we had CSEA, Faculty, and ALA, plus voting members from each of these groups? Or do we say, let's look at this constituency representation. And when we reach out to these constituency groups, we request that there's strong representation from these different groups, and that's kind of a way we were hoping to ensure both.*

*Continuing to read down the list, there would be one confidential representative and one representative from ASG. Then the area experts, one SEL noncredit designated by the VP of SEL, and the Director of Student Equity and Engagement programs would be an area expert. We would maintain the three Dean appointments – two instructional Deans and one Student Affairs Dean.*

*Regarding Advisory membership, continue with the idea that advisory members are folks who represent areas from the activities that we explicitly wrote in the Student Equity Plan in order to have more broad member participation. Hopefully we can work with Chris Phillips in the Career Center on the Learning Aligned Employment Program (LAEP), so that students can be paid to participate and hold paid internship roles on the SEA committee.*

*Adding the additional Advisory members: Institutional Research designee, Director of Financial Aid or designee, Director of DSPS and EOPS/NextUp or designee. "Designee" was due to a comment that was previously made that it doesn't necessarily have to be the Director. It can be a designee from one of these departments. Veterans Resource Center, Guided Pathways Coordinator or designee, and the Executive Director of Marketing and Communications designee.*

*Some of the reasons why these specific programs were called out is because if you look back at the Chancellor's Office definition of what the Student Equity and Achievement program is, it includes DSPS, current or former Foster Youth, low-income, Veterans. That's why, on f, g, and h, you'll see "as per the Chancellor's Office, definition of SEA."*

**Questions, comments, and concerns:**

*\* Maureen McRae Goldberg commented that it was still going to be a huge committee,*

*\* There was a concern that Academic Counseling wasn't on the list. Suggestion: When Academic Senate decides who will be on the committee, it would be realistic to think that the ACC position would*

*represent one of the four faculty Senate reps on this committee.*

*\* Jennifer Hamilton noted that for the Advisory members, she didn't know if there was a designee from the Transfer Center. Co-Chair Arnold said it would be up to the Transfer Center.*

*\*Who will reach out to the people that are not attending the meeting regularly to let them know that the committee has voted on this, and now you need to come up with someone? Co-Chair Arnold said the Chairs would reach out to these people, in addition to the constituency groups. Then it would go to CPC.*

*\* Melissa Menendez' understanding was that we had leaned toward having 3 representatives so there could be more intentional representation on the actual committee that has voting ability, and not just advisory ability. Her thought was that:*

*- Area experts should have the power of voting.*

*- Some of those areas, according to the Chancellor's Office. [The Chancellor's Office defines equity populations as Guardian Scholars, DSPS students and Veterans], should also be [voting] members.*

*- Director of EOPS or designee is an area expert, and should also be a part of that list.*

*- ACC should definitely have a seat. The position is historical, from SSSP, but the majority of SEA budget goes to counseling.*

*- English and Math are area experts that need to be included [There was a question whether these were historical on there from SSSP, but Co-Chair Arnold said they were there because of the Student Equity Plan].*

*\* Dr. Menendez noted that we need to be mindful that we're not creating a committee structure based on just the Equity Plan we have now. We need to be thinking about building a structure for all the years to come. She said some of the other folks that are listed as advisory should be on the Equity committee because they are area experts.*

*\* We have flexibility in terms of how we design our program, according to Co-Chair Vasquez' recent conversation with the Chancellor's Office about the direction of SEA programs. It's okay to be flexible with a membership depending on what we're working on on campus.*

*\* Robin Goodnought also remembered that we talked about 3 rather than 4, and expanding some of the focused positions. Basic Skills was before all of this. When SEA became SEA, she thought that Math and English and ESL were on the committee specifically because of AB705 and its focus on equity for those students in those disciplines. Given that we're still working heavily on AB705, and still trying to figure out where equity does and doesn't happen through implementation of AB705, it makes sense for those departments to be voting members.*

*Co-Chair Arnold wondered if we could ask Academic Senate for 4 Senate*

reps, one from Math, and one from English. Because right now, as it is, the committee is almost 30 people.

Ms. Goodnough's experience on Senate, and the way appointments happen is that:

- the Senate President puts out a call to faculty, saying we have these positions available.

- If they get people from those disciplines that the Academic Senate President wants to appoint, they do.

- They have the prerogative to select who they choose to select, and they also have the limitation of selecting from who puts themselves forward.

- If the Senate President wanted or thought somebody would be excellent, and that person didn't step forward, they could contact them and ask them if they would be interested in doing this.

- That would be more a question for the Senate President as to, can a committee say, we'd really like or prefer a rep from this area if it's not codified in the document.

\* Co-Chair Arnold asked, what if we put something in that says every time we have a new Student Equity Plan we revisit this discussion? Co-Chair Vasquez asked the Chancellor's Office about that, and that's up to us. Jennifer Maupin said it is written there that we will update the advisory membership every time we update the Student Equity Plan.

\* Dr. Maupin thinks we should have a permanent member from counseling, as a voting member. She also wouldn't want the appointees for the faculty from the Academic Senate to be limited to say, 'Okay there's going to be one Math. There's going to be one English. There's going to be one Counseling. And then there's going to be one from all the other departments,' because we have people in many other divisions and departments that want to participate in this committee. She sees Math and English in more of an Advisory role.

\* Dr. Menendez said we want to have some equity around the area experts, and for this to be a very inclusive committee. We can have two faculty, two CSEA, two ALA folks that we list as area experts. So we have not only the cross representation, but it's also intentional. And then we have some of those other constituency seats that are open. It's really good to have folks who are across the table working together, because that's when Equity work becomes a campus culture.

\* Co-Chair Arnold noted that if we were to approach it from that perspective, these were some of the programs that we listed as Equity programs. That would be 13 additional members on the committee. Co-Chair Byrne added that many of them are from specific departments or areas that are represented.

### **Questions/Comments about Area Experts**

- Director of Student Equity and Engagement. That person is basically working with Umoja, Dream Center, Rising Scholars, and BNC.

- That then leaves Raices, ESL, TAP, MESA, EOPS, DSPS.

Right now they are listed [as advisory members].

- Who should we move into the area expert piece so that they also have a voice in terms of vote?

Co-Chair Arnold moved them up on the draft.

- Financial Aid and Veterans

- Co-Chair Byrne asked if TAP would be under the Transfer Center?

Co-Chair Arnold said, technically, yes.

- Co-Chair Arnold asked if the discussion is making these [e, f, g, h] all voting members? And then potentially the Transfer Center Director, too?

- Co-Chair Byrne cautioned moving a lot of people into voting membership, because then to get to quorum, and to be able to do what we need to do in the meeting, we'd have to make sure that everybody is attending each week.

\*There was a discussion about how huge the committee was getting. From the perspective of a chair position, Co-Chair Arnold noted, this is a very large committee, and that can be really hard. Co-Chair Byrne said CPC is doing the opposite, paring the committee down to a more manageable and effective committee.

\* Co-Chair Arnold said there are two sides. How do you find the balance between making this a broad and inclusive committee, and not a committee that's so large that it's difficult to get work done?

\* Dr. Maupin didn't think the discussion was moving all of those into voting positions. She thought it was more like, are there people that we need in permanent, reliable voting positions that are not in the structure right now? And Academic Counseling was raised as potentially one of those.

\* Co-Chair Arnold wanted to make sure we captured everybody who should be on the voting member side. Once we see what that looks like, do we reduce the constituency membership in some way to reflect the increases that we made to the voting membership in other areas?

\* Dr. Maupin asked, if you're thinking we have a certain number of voting positions, is that number capturing all of those people in some way? There's one vote that's coming from this area expert that is representing all of these programs. Co-Chair Arnold said it makes sense, but we don't have a perfect structure that can support that because there are some areas where that wouldn't work, For example, there isn't one person who can necessarily represent ESL, and Raices, because those are different [programs].

*\* Ms. Goodnough's recollection was that people weren't on the Equity committee to represent an entity, but were there to represent equity interests on campus. Equity committee members were assigned to particular areas to do outreach on particular programs, and invite them to come to the committee and talk about their needs... She's not on the committee to represent ESL so much as she's on the committee to help think about equity on campus.*

*\* Co-Chair Arnold said this is now our third meeting discussing committee structure, and she thinks we need to try to get some resolution of what our new structure is going to be so we can decide when and how to implement it, and when we're going to meet.*

*\* There was a concern that we're choosing committee members, but we haven't clearly defined how our role is changing. How are we redefining what we do and our new role? We have to decide how many reps from each constituency group, and what essential voting members we need to have along with experts. The numbers are a little big right now.*

*\* Akil Hill said in listening to Co-Chair Vasquez, it sounds like she was saying nothing is set in stone. If we're going to be bigger or smaller this time, we can reassess at the next Equity Plan. It's really more about doing the work. At the last Equity Plan, we had a big committee, but it was only the same six people every single week showing up to write it. His concern is, whatever it is we're going to decide upon, we've got to have commitment from people to be here twice a month and engage in the work in that way.*

*\* Co-Chair Vasquez said sometime soon, the Chancellor's Office will be sending out feedback they want to give us about our last Equity Plan.*

*\* Co-Chair Vasquez feels like all of us are experts based on the work we have all participated in the last few years.*

*\* Co-Chair Byrne would like to propose that we add Academic Counseling as an area expert, voting membership.*

*\* Dr. Menendez asked about having a CSEA representative whose position is also an area expert that we could put on this intentional list for the area experts. She wants the list to be equitable so that there's an intentional representation there so we don't have to rely on the appointments to get those folks.*

*\* Dr. Menendez also thinks it is important to have an instructional faculty as part of the experts— somebody like the Faculty Professional Development Coordinator, since a lot of the professional development work that's done for teaching faculty needs to be in this conversation around equity, too.*

*\* Co-Chair Bryne said if we were able to do that, she feels like one of the only places it really makes sense is with Veterans programs, particularly because that's one of our Equity populations that historically has always served as an advisory role, but hasn't had that real seat at the table in*

terms of voting.

*\*Chelsea Lancaster said she is one of those people that would fit into the multiple categories, and she would love to uplift some other voices from CSEA, especially some of our colleagues working in these areas, with both learned and lived experience in terms of a lot of our students that are the most marginalized and are presenting as such in our data. Her intention is from the CSEA perspective, to encourage and uplift some of our newer colleagues for some fresh voices and perspectives.*

*\* Co-Chair Arnold doesn't know that we should totally take this off the table. It doesn't necessarily have to be the only way that we get representation from these different areas on SEA. She is still wondering if it could be part of our ask when we reach out to our different constituency groups.*

4. VOTING MEMBERS 4 voting members from each primary constituency group (CSEA, Faculty, ALA)

3. There should be special consideration made when constituency leadership are making these appointments to include faculty, staff and managers from programs that primarily or have historically served marginalized students (Ratcos, ESL, TAP, WESA, EDPS, DAPS, Financial Aid, Veterans, Uniq, Dream Center, Rising Scholars, NextUp/Summer Scholars, SHG)

*\* Dr. Menendez agreed with Ms. Lancaster about uplifting certain voices because they deserve to be at the table, not because we're asking for permission. She thinks it's important that we're intentional about who's at the table, and then, even if we have to lessen the constituencies to two per group or something like that... she thinks this is the conversation we need to have before we determine the number of the larger call.*

*\* Co-Chair Arnold said that one thing we need to be a little bit careful about as we go down that path is that we're thinking about positions and not people. Dr. Menendez agreed, it is positions.*

*\* Co-Chair Arnold said, going back to that thought, we put down here designee as a way to incorporate more than just a Director voice.*

1. Learning-Aligned Employment Program (ALAP) (As per Council Approval)
- c. Institutional Research Designee
- d. Fiscal Services Designee
- e. Director Financial Aid/Designee
- f. Director DSPS/Designee (As per CO Definition of SEA)
- g. Director EDPS/NextUp Designee (As per CO Definition of SEA)
- h. Veterans Resource Center (As per CO Definition of SEA)
- i. Council Partnerships Coordinator/Designee
- j. Executive Director Marketing and Communications or Designee

*What she's hearing is that we also want to add an area expert that's specifically a classified staff person. How would we frame what that position looks like?*

*\* Co-Chair Byrne asked, isn't that a slippery slope? Then, who is that one representative area expert voice? And if you choose one program, how do you then not choose all of the other programs or positions?*



*\* Dr. Menendez thought that the Director of EOPS or designee should be bumped up to a voting member from an advisory member because of the various populations that department serves.*

*Co-Chair Arnold bolded the proposals to be moved up to voting memberships.*

- c. Institutional Research Designee
- d. Fiscal Services Designee
- e. j Director Financial Aid Designee
- f. Director D&P/Designee (As per CO Definition of SEA)
- g. Director EOPS/NextUp Designee (As per CO Definition of SEA)
- h. Mexican Resource Center (As per CO Definition of SEA)
- i. Global Partnerships Coordination Designee

### **Discussion about Dean appointments:**

*\* Co-Chair Byrne brought up Dean appointments, which she said were a legacy from the prior SEA committee. She wanted to see if anyone had any insight about the necessity of having three Deans. Co-Chair Arnold said they were a historical carryover. Christina Llerena volunteered to step down, but Co-Chair Byrne said that was not the Dean appointment she was thinking about.*

*\* Dr. Maupin wanted to hear from the Deans on the committee, but it was noted that Dr. Imhof had [temporarily] stepped out of the meeting, and Jens Kuhn wasn't here today. She observed that their involvement in this committee was largely an advisory role.*

*\* One of the reasons Co-Chair Arnold thought it would be okay to have two instructional Deans is because this position reports to the VP of Student Affairs, and that might be a way to sort of balance it a little bit more institutionally between Instructional and Student Affairs.*

*\* Co-Chair Byrne asked if those roles could be advisory. On the Student Equity Committee, those Deans were advisory as opposed to voting.*

*\* Co-Chair Arnold asked, do we leave it at one instructional? Or now, if they're advisory, do we make it two?*

*Co-Chair Byrne suggested we leave it at two. There's no requirement they attend every meeting. They're there when it's important.*

*Dr. Imhof rejoined the meeting and said she was supportive of that.*

*\* Co-Chair Arnold explained what had happened while Dr. Imhof was away, and that they had moved the Dean appointments from voting members to advisory members because historically [in the Student Equity Committee], they were advisory members. Dean Llerena was good with that.*

*\* Dr. Imhof explained that historically, we have been making arguments to keep Deans as participating members of important committees because we collectively oversee almost every employee on campus, and are oftentimes left out of conversations where it is critical that we participate and where we could really contribute a lot. Her concern is if the position*

*becomes advisory, it is likely that people might not show up regularly. She would argue to have at least one Dean as a voting member.*

*\* Co-Chair Byrne explained how the conversation got started. She had asked the question, other than the historical move over from SEA, did we know why we had two instructional Deans and one Student Affairs Dean, and could we potentially move to one instructional Dean and one Student Affairs Dean?*

*\* Co-Chair Arnold said, in thinking about how we balance Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, what if we have one instructional Dean as a voting member? And then one Instructional Dean and one Student Affairs Dean as advisory members?*

*\* Dr. Imhof's recommendation would be to have one instructional and one Student Affairs Dean as voting members, because she thinks the committee will benefit from the active participation or input from the Deans.*

*\* Chair Arnold asked, what about if we do that and reduce ALA to two members.? Dr. Imhof can't speak for ALA, but she imagines, because we made a similar decision in another area that ALA probably would be okay with it.*

*\* This all has to be run by all the constituents and CPC.*

*\* Co-Chair Byrne said it's also not a reduction, because currently ALA on SEA is two. She wants to respect that Ms. McRae Goldberg is our ALA rep on this group.*

*\* Co-Chair Arnold noted that the Dean appointments were actually their own category.*

*\* In summary, Co-Chair Arnold said, we have one Instructional Dean, one Student Affairs Dean. But then, as a result, we're proposing to maintain it at two.*

### **Discussion about Constituency groups:**

*\* Co-Chair Arnold asked, are we proposing to keep CSEA at four, and Senate at four faculty? Or are we doing four and three?*

*\* Dr. Menendez asked, do they all have to be the same number that we ask for? When we're looking at the list of experts, ALA is heavily represented, and Faculty has one. Co-Chair Arnold said we don't know that ALA is heavily represented because we put in the designee.*

*\* If they don't, Dr. Menendez wondered, is that where we ask for more CSEA? Can we do that? Co-Chair Arnold said that we can. It's going to be up to the constituency because that's actually a conversation that the Chairs had— should all of these be the same number? If we were to recommend something different, we would need to bring this to the constituencies and explain our justification. This is why we're suggesting it.*

*\* Co-Chair Byrne noted that historically on SEA, ALA had less*

*constituency representation. She thinks ALA was at two, whereas the others were at three. She believes it can be uneven.*

*\* There was more discussion, and Co-Chair Arnold asked, if she was hearing that we're saying 4 CSEA, 3 faculty, and 2 ALA?*

*\* Dr. Maupin agreed that we're all representing what's best for the whole college. But people bring different knowledge and experience.*

*\* Ms. McRae Goldberg noted that at the moment, we have a lot of ALA crossover— Dr. Byrne, Ms. Llerena and herself, all serve on the ALA. But if this is going to be something that's permanent, you can't assume that the Director of Financial Aid, the Director of Equity, and the Dean of Students are also on ALA and active in ALA. Co-Chair Arnold thinks that the important distinction is not that they are ALA Exec.. it's just that they represent the constituency group of ALA managers. (same for Faculty and CSEA, they represent their constituency groups). It's not somebody who has to be in a leadership position in one of those constituencies, it's just people within those groups. It can be somebody who's not on Senate. It's just the Senate appoints that faculty person, the ALA appoints that manager, and the CSEA appoints that classified person.*

*\* Ms. McRae Goldberg said that makes sense except the way ALA operates, which is the point some others were making. We're supposed to, as ALA reps, bring the information back to the Executive. But if you're not in ALA, you very seldom come to ALA. You're not really representing in the same way. But if that's not an issue for her other ALA colleagues, she is happy to step down.*

*\* Co-Chair Arnold said it's a both/and. She thinks it is to bring the ALA and/or the faculty and/or the Senate voice to this committee, as represented by the different people on the committee. It would also be up to those members to decide, how are you going to take that information back to your different constituency group? It may mean that somebody has to go make a presentation at Senate, who's not on the Senate etc. Co-Chair Byrne noted that they are really working on that in Exec right now, where we have that report-out structure that happens once a month. Also, because we have the "and designee," we can't assume that we're going to have a lot of ALA representation on the committee, either. What we're looking at now, seems like a much more intentional as well as a more manageable number of people.*

*\*Co-Chair Arnold continued to make some adjustments to the document.*

*\* Dr. Menendez wanted to include TAP as an area expert because that is a program that works primarily with these populations we're talking about. It is in the current Equity Plan, and she imagines that's going to always be something in the Equity Plan of completion and transfer. Also, in doing so, it would add another Student Services faculty member in the area expert, so there's a little bit more faculty representation there, too.*

|

## 5. Advisory membership (non-voting members)

Align with activities written in the Student Equity Plan (updated every time we update the S

1. Math Department Chair or designee (2022-2025)
2. English Department Chair or designee (2022-2025)
- I 3. **Transfer Center Director or designee (2022-2025)**
  - a. **TAP**
4. Umoja Representative (2022-2025)

*\* Dr. Menendez thinks CSEA needs more. Looking at the area experts, have two non-instructional faculty listed. Thinking of the equity, should we have an area expert be an instructional faculty person as well? Co-Chair Byrne said that can come from Senate.*

*\* Dr. Menendez said she is thinking of the intentionality. That's why it seems like the Faculty Professional Development Coordinator would be an appropriate person to be on this committee. We have two versions of that, the face-to-face, and online version of that, because they are responsible for the professional development that goes into instruction. Co-Chair Arnold asked if it was possible that that position could ever become a non-instructional faculty. Dr. Menendez doesn't think so because the person's role is to head professional development for instructional faculty. And then it could be a designee, just like we're doing with the others in case they don't have capacity and maybe want to appoint someone from our new TLC committee...*

*\* Dr. Maupin doesn't see that we would need to put that in the area experts given that we have the three faculty representatives that are appointed by the Senate. Maybe we would want to make a note that at least one of those needs to be instructional faculty. She feels it might be a little bit too prescribed at that point to say it's going to be the Faculty Professional Development. She would lean towards having appointees from the Senate. Would we note that one of them should be instructional, since we have some other representation? Dr. Imhof said that the Faculty Professional Development Coordinator is not necessarily also a forever position.*

*\* Co-Chair Vasquez wondered, because the T and L committee is just starting, about capacity in terms of what their objective is. Her feeling is they're going to be so busy with certification of faculty, that we'd be pulling their energies. Not that we couldn't reach out and have them as advisory. Co-Chair Arnold asked what about if we start with that role as an advisory, and given that it's a new committee and/or the development of that position, that over the next two years until 2025, it's open for discussion whether or not that position should become a voting member.*

*\* Dr. Menendez thinks it's about what do we want? And why do we want it? As opposed to thinking about whether people have capacity or not. It is*

a position we have now, currently, and we said earlier in the meeting that we're developing a structure with that intention also of being nimble. If it becomes a non-position in a year or two, then obviously, it's taken away... We're going back to, we'll make a note that they should be instructional, but Dr. Menendez thought where we were going as a group was, let's put [them on] the intentional list, get them there for sure, so we don't have to ask Senate or another group to please send us people that meet this criteria.

\* Dr. Menendez said that even though CTL is a new committee, that position has been around for a very long time. It's just changed a little bit of its direction and its name. It might be appropriate to name the Chair of the Committee on Teaching and Learning, who happens to also be the Professional Development Coordinator. And there's always been a historical connection... It might be very appropriate for the Chair of CTL to be a voting member.

\* Dr. Imhof added that it might be a good idea to have the Chair of PDAC on the committee, because the Chair of PDAC is responsible for all campus professional development. In that case, that's her. But maybe they could double as both the Dean and Chair of PDAC. Co-Chair Vasquez asked if she meant T and L, not CTL.

\* Ms. Goodnough thought it was probably a good idea. Because this position is so focused on equity and teaching, and it's a teaching-based faculty position, she thinks it is really appropriate to have someone who's in that arena as a named expert on the committee. Even the online teaching is going to be highly focused on equity in online learning environments.

\* Co-Chair Arnold asked Dr. Imhof what she would think about putting PDAC down as advisory. Dr. Imhof said, thinking about who might be chairing that committee, and what that committee means moving forward... PDAC has really been focusing on equity for the last few years. She hopes that PDAC, responsible for professional development, continues to have a major focus on equity, and does control a little bit of money. She thinks it would be very appropriate for PDAC to have representation with a vote. But if you want to just do advisory... Co-Chair Vasquez liked the idea of PDAC, as opposed to PD, because the Chair of T and L sits on PDAC. That way it's all encompassing.

- I. AREA EXPERTS
- i. 1-SEL/Non-Credit Mentor- Designer of SPSEL
  - ii. 1- Director of Student Equity and Engagement Programs
    - 1. Ursula Trevino-Castro, Rector, Scholar, RMC, LICETD
  - iii. 1-Academic Counseling Department Chair or Designee
  - iv. Director Financial Aid/Designee
  - v. Director DSPS/Designee (As per CO Definition of SEA)
  - vi. Director EOPS/Needily Designee (As per CO Definition of SEA)
  - vii. Veterans Resource Center (As per CO Definition of SEA)
  - viii. Transfer Center Director or designee (2022-2025)
    - 1. TAP
  - ix. -Committee on Teaching and Learning Chair

*Co-chair Vasquez added, having sat on PDAC in the past, you not only have instruction, but you have more voices.*

*\* Co-Chair Arnold asked Co-Chair Vasquez if she was suggesting making the area expert the PDAC Chair, and then the Committee in Teaching and Learning Chair, an advisory chair? Co-Chair Vasquez said it was just a comment, and that she is not even sure about moving them yet. She's thinking in terms of PDAC, as a larger college wide committee for professional development...*

*\* Co-Chair Arnold asked if she was proposing it to be an area expert. Co-Chair Vasquez said possibly.*

*\* Dr. Menendez thinks that the intention about having the Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee, is because it's the instructional faculty voice and body. She doesn't think we want to blur that with professional development, which is a larger issue that PDAC has. Either both, or at least that instructional faculty piece, needs a definite seat at the table.*

*Co-Chair Arnold read from the document.*

*\*Dr. Menendez asked if we should do the [or] designee for the Teaching and Learning Chair and PDAC in case the Chair cant' come? Dr. Imhof said that the PDAC Chair is always going to be a Dean, so if you decide you wanted to leave the PDAC Chair as a voting member, you could just switch the Deans to whatever type of Dean is not the PDAC Chair.*

*\* Co-Chair Arnold said we could say Dean Appointments. And then it is the Chair. And then Instructional Dean and/or Student Affairs Dean, whichever is not serving as PDAC Chair. Dr. Imhof said then you don't have another Dean.*

*\* The only one where Co-Chair Arnold is not feeling 100% is the Transfer Center Director Designee. She could go either way with that being here, or putting it back as an Advisory member based on the Student Equity Plan, given that we do have strong counseling representation with the Counseling Department Chair.*

*\* Dr. Menendez said the only reason why she's advocating for TAP is because of the list above, and it does seem that— and thinking of the students that TAP serves.*

*\* Chair Arnold feels that there is a lot of crossover with the students that TAP serves, with EOPS, Financial Aid, and DSPS. She thinks there is representation for TAP students, but she is somewhat neutral on that one. Dr. Menendez was just wondering if we need somebody whose expertise is transfer at this table with a vote. Co-Chair Arnold would argue that Academic Counselors bring that expertise to the table, too.*

*Co-Chair Arnold is hoping that we feel good with this draft, and that we can potentially vote on it at our next meeting. Then, start discussing some of the other things that we had on the agenda about the SEA committee*

*at our next meeting. If there are any thoughts between now and then, please reach out to the Chairs so we can bring some of that to this new version at our next meeting.*

*b. Additional Structural Discussions*

- *What is the function of SEA given limited funding?*
- *When would the new structure become effective?*
- *Should meeting dates/times/frequency/modality be revisited*

**6. Action**

**a. Approve SEA Committee Structure**

**7. Resource**

- Final [Student Equity Plan 2022-2025](#)
- SEA [Consolidation](#) Memo to CPC (3/2022)
- [Resource Guide to Governance and Decision Making](#)
- Current structure of consolidated [SEA membership?](#)