

January 22, 2020

Dear Senate Colleagues,

In the Fall semester, Senate voted to approve me as one of the five faculty appointments to serve on the newly formed Strategic Enrollment Management committee led by EVP Ralston. Unfortunately, my experience did not reflect “shared decision-making that includes adequate time for deliberation and consideration by all constituency groups” as it is described on the committee description and charge (I included a copy of that document recently emailed by Patricia Stark to full-time faculty in the packet). Therefore, after the December 10<sup>th</sup> meeting, I decided I could no longer represent faculty voice on this committee and wrote a letter to SEM members explaining that decision.

Yesterday evening, I received a two-paragraph email response from the committee which does not address the specific concerns I raised in the letter: my absence from meeting minutes, the vote, the use of workgroups, and connections to what occurred last year with SEA and the Student Equity Plan. (I included a copy of the email I received from the committee in the packet). Therefore, I decided to make a public comment here today and read the letter I wrote to SEM members so that you know the specific reasons why I could no longer represent faculty on this committee. As we all know, from the “Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Survey” results, there are many folks who do not feel heard or respected on this campus for a variety of reasons. The response I received from the committee suggests to me that my concerns have yet to be heard in their entirety or maybe even understood.

Thus, my intent in sharing this letter with you, as faculty representatives, is to ask that Senate has a meaningful discussion regarding Senate’s role and leadership to manifest much needed change on this campus and to develop meaningful ways to hold folks accountable to help create such change. By change, I mean actual change in practice, and not just dialogue or promises of such or promises to do so in the future whenever that may be.

Thank You,  
Melissa

**Dear Colleagues Serving on the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee,**

After our December 10<sup>th</sup> meeting, I met with Academic Senate President, Patricia Stark, to inform her of why I could no longer represent faculty voice on this committee. During our meeting, Patricia recommended I write an open letter to explain to you my decision. The short explanation is I felt my integrity and dignity were being compromised, and therefore, my decision to leave this group is a conscious attempt to preserve both.

To explain further, my decision is analogous to an insight Dr. Marc Lamont Hill expressed during this year’s Dorantes Lecture. When he spoke of students of color on predominantly white campuses he called them “victims of liberalism”: they are now on these campuses as a result of good intentions, but many are “victims” of such good intentions because “they’re *in* the place but they’re never *of* the place.” That prepositional difference is why I chose to leave the committee because I realized I was “in” the committee, but I was not “of” the committee.

From my perspective, at our December 10<sup>th</sup> meeting we violated several of our own Committee Ground Rules and Principles that we created together during the first two meetings:

- Listen respectfully
- Debate with integrity
- When a vote comes up, provide time for communication outside the room with our groups
- Connect with groups outside
- Have an action item to take to groups for feedback- make room for all groups to participate

I expressed several concerns surrounding the idea of forming workgroups to fulfill the charge of the committee as it is described at the top of the meeting agendas. When I offered a possible suggestion to explore an alternative approach, it was received with indifference. I do not want to suggest that my concerns or ideas are the best way forward, but as the discussion continued, it seemed as though the workgroup idea presented by the committee lead was represented as the only option and there was no genuine dialogue encouraged to explore other approaches nor did the committee formulate a clear charge of what each workgroup is to produce. In fact, as the meeting

transitioned to the last agenda item, my suggestion to work collectively was highlighted and dismissed with the assumption that there was not enough time to do so within our meeting timeframe. It was at that moment, I realized my suggestion was not taken seriously. Moreover, the official meeting minutes [I included a copy of those minutes in the packet] that have been posted since the December 10<sup>th</sup> meeting do not contain any of my concerns or comments stated. The minutes only reflect the names and statements of those who agreed with the workgroup idea or from those who offered some suggestions of how to meet the targets suggested by Dr. Benjamin's exit report for the Board of Trustees. It is as though what I said was never said.

Furthermore, the vote regarding whether to accept the targets shared by Dr. Benjamin in her exit report also didn't seem to follow our Ground Rules and Principles. This is why I chose to vote "no" because I didn't have the opportunity to communicate that the committee was making this decision for the college to the constituents that I represented. This item was not placed on the agenda as an item that would be up for a vote. We did not discuss the rationale or the impacts these figures might potentially have. Moreover, such a decision fulfills a major aspect of the committee's charge, yet it was decided in eight minutes without meaningful input of Department Chairs which seemed to be an important group identified as needing inclusion as we work toward developing any targets. Since my previous concerns were not heard, I felt as though if I spoke in opposition, I would once again be dismissed, so I said nothing.

Dr. Hill argued that in order to help those students who are "never of the place" we need to "de-center our world views." It seems to work toward this goal requires a change in practice because as those of us who attended Crossroads training will remember, it is very easy to go with what's familiar and to fall back into our normalized practices. And often those practices impede "de-centering."

During Howard Deutch's presentation of the results from the "Inclusion and Equity Survey" we took in May 2019, he emphasized the need for our campus community to make different choices about how to work together. He underscored that the biggest failure our leadership can do is do nothing. In light of our situation, it seems this committee could lead that change. I said it several times that I was truly excited to see such a diverse group of representatives working together to possibly do just that. Yes, it takes time, it takes a different set of skills, it takes patience. And to be successful, it requires a deep commitment and a leadership that is truly committed to "decentering" our normal practices.

However, these two decisions that occurred during the December 10<sup>th</sup> meeting do not represent this change that our campus community needs, and therefore, they signify to me that I cannot be in this committee any longer. I explained during the meeting that the workgroup idea will silo the work of the committee charge to a few. This decision dilutes diversity. This decision also contributes to what many stated in the "Inclusion and Equity Survey" results that they felt unheard or that a select few make the decisions. I do understand that the workgroups will report back to the larger committee but having a few people share ideas to then present products to the committee for approval is very different from having a collaborative brainstorm and plan developed by the entire group. Using workgroups does not seem like an honest effort at collaboration and inclusion.

Moreover, what I witnessed at this last meeting seems to reflect a larger pattern occurring on this campus. This last academic year it became quite clear to many governance groups that there was a problem with the process of how decisions were made by the Student Equity and Achievement Committee workgroup. And more recently, there were many concerns raised about the Student Equity Plan: the process by which it was developed, the inclusion of individuals' names who did not participate in the process or those who participated very minimally, and the need to create a separate volume II so that the meaningful work could be done. Similarities to these two examples seem to be emerging in this committee which is troubling, considering the ramifications and impact the plan will have across this campus.

Moving forward, I hope the committee will consider the following recommendations:

1. Begin each meeting reiterating the Committee Ground Rules and Principles
2. Honor the Committee Ground Rules and Principles
3. Have a meaningful conversation about the "Take 5 CRT Toolkit" I shared after the October 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting as a way to be more mindful about all groups who are impacted by the decisions being made. (Here's a link to the initial email sent that explains the context for doing so) [I included a copy of the email I sent to the committee on November 7<sup>th</sup> in this packet].

4. Consider implementing **Consensus Decision Making** to ensure all groups are heard. (**Here's a link to a website** that describes this process but there are other explanations and examples).
5. Continue to develop new methods to work collectively - go beyond our normalized practices of workgroups and retreats.

In closing, I want to make it clear that I write this letter not to shame nor blame nor judge, and if this is the perception please believe this is not my intent. I write this letter to be transparent about why I can no longer be "*in*" this committee. I write this letter in hopes that it inspires dialogue to manifest necessary structural changes and new ways to collaborate within our institution. I write this letter because it is possible others in the group might share similar views but are unable to express them for a variety of reasons. As a tenured full-time faculty member who can be replaced on this committee, I have the privilege to do so. Therefore, I hope my letter is received as it was intended.

Sincerely,  
Melissa

Pamela Ralston <pgralston@pipeline.sbcc.edu>

Tue, Jan 21, 2020 at 6:48 PM

To: Melissa Menendez <menendez@sbcc.edu>

Cc: Tina <cikistler@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Michael Medel <medel@sbcc.edu>, Elizabeth Stein <eastein@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Ellen O'Connor <oconnore@sbcc.edu>, Vanessa Pelton <vepelton@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Carola Smith <csmith@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Alan Price <aprice3@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, James Zavvas <jdzavvas@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Lyndsay Maas <lmmaas@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Andy Harper <agharper@sbcc.edu>, Christopher Johnson <ckjohnson2@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Georgie Armstrong <bgarmstrong@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Sara Volle <srvolle@sbcc.edu>, Luz Reyes-Martin <lereyesmartin@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Sara Hartley <smhartley@sbcc.edu>, Stephanie Dotson <sedotson@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Claudia Johnson Madrigal <johnsoncl@sbcc.edu>, Priscilla Mora <mora@sbcc.edu>, Cornelia Alsheimer-Barthel <cmalsheimerb@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Jens-Uwe Kuhn <jkuhn2@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Patricia Stark <starkp@sbcc.edu>, Bea Dones <bmdones@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Margaret Prothero <mhprothero@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Z Reisz <zreisz@pipeline.sbcc.edu>

The following is a letter sent on behalf of the SEM committee, drafted and reviewed by members.

\*\*\*\*\*

Dear Melissa,

Thank you for taking the time to explain what was undoubtedly a difficult decision to leave the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee. At our meeting this week we took time to process this news and your detailed and thoughtful letter as a group. We had some meaningful and productive conversations. We are all processing this in different ways. Many of us were saddened by your decision and the circumstances surrounding it. We will miss your contributions to the committee. We understand that individual members may have or intend to reach out directly to you in addition to this collective response on behalf of our committee.

We appreciate your thoughtful recommendations for moving forward. These suggestions will no doubt lead to further dialogue as we continue our work this semester. Several members of the committee expressed an interest in further education on CRT and incorporating the "Take 5" principles to our consensus-building efforts. Your letter is an important reminder of the work we have ahead of us. We will continue to have these difficult conversations as we work toward greater collaboration and inclusion.

With appreciation,

The Strategic Enrollment Management Committee



**Pamela Ralston Ph.D.**

**Executive Vice President, Educational Programs**

721 Cliff Drive, Santa Barbara, CA 93109

(805) 730-4379 • pralston@sbcc.edu



## Strategic Enrollment Management Committee Agenda

December 10, 2019

12:45 pm - 2:00 pm

Room: CC 223

**Committee Charge:** As an open-entry institution, Santa Barbara City College serves a diverse student body with wide-ranging educational goals. SBCC's Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) encompasses recruitment, enrollment, retention, and goal completion from an institution-wide perspective. At its core, SEM decision-making is student-centered and fiscally responsible. This committee reports to the EVP and will provide reports and plans to CPC.

SEM Lead - Pamela Ralston\*

\*\*Arturo Rodriguez  
\*\*Alan Price  
\*\*Priscilla Mora  
\*\*Jens-Uwe Kuhn  
Christopher Johnson\*  
\*\*Carola Smith\*  
Andy Harper  
Lyndsay Maas\*  
\*\*James Zavas

\*\*Z Reisz\*  
\*\*Vanessa Pelton  
\*\*Michael Medel  
\*\*Luz Reyes-Martin  
\*\*Patricia Stark  
\*\*Stephanie Dotson  
\*\*Sara Hartley  
Tina Kistler\*\* (Rae)  
\*\*Melissa Menendez

\*\*Ellen O'Connor  
\*\*Sara Volle  
\*\*Elizabeth Stein  
Geordie Armstrong  
\*\*Claudia Johnson (ALA)  
\*\*Margaret Prothero  
\*\*Cornelia

\* Non-voting resource members

---

### Previous notes from 11/12/2019

Items from the Cancelled meeting on 11/26/2019:

#### I. Pending Items from the last meeting:

- A. SBCC's Vision for Success Goals in an Equity-Informed SEM Context Z Reisz
- B. Strategic Enrollment Management and Student Centered Funding Formula Integration
- C. Assessing the ASEMP targets
- D. Developing Workgroups for the Revised Strategic Enrollment Management Plan

#### II. An update on progress to Board of Trustees, December 12

- A. Committee development and charge
- B. Information and learning process
- C. Target review and planning
- D. SEM Plan timeline
- E. Dr. Benjamin's exit report and message

Background for discussion

Context: See resource folder for above items(and others introduced) and consider PCC's Critical Race Theory (CRT) Decision Making Toolkit

Resources:

A Roadmap for Strategic Enrollment Management Planning  
Vision for Student Success Goals, BOT Report  
How to Calculate FTES  
FTES Calculator

SBCC White Paper on Student Centered Funding Formula

IEPI Report on SCFF and SEM

SBUSD Enrollment Projections

Background for discussion

Context: See resource folder for above items (and others introduced) and consider PCC's Critical Race Theory (CRT) Decision Making Toolkit

NOTES:

Review from Dr. Benjamin.

Workgroups

I. Pending Items from the last meeting:

E. SBCC's Vision for Success Goals in an Equity-Informed SEM Context

Z Reisz

Vision for student success was done in Spring, the goals are very straight forward. Increase by 35% the number of CCC, Decrease the average number of units, Reduce equity gap, and we have equity goals as well.

All information is shown in the document above, where a breakdown is given regarding all the goals. The Chancellor's office has asked for the College to integrate these goals into the framework. The groups are identified - the Chancellor's office provided the data and provided the report for us. All the Locally Aligned Goals marked in bold in the document are the selected goals for SBCC.

F. Strategic Enrollment Management and Student Centered Funding Formula Integration

Funding Formula Integration - 70% allocation for the District - During the Webinar, they mentioned that new information is coming soon.

The document shows how District allocation works aligning student enrollment.

Measurable results, minimum academic standards, close attention to retention, and economically.

Budget Principles - research the information and add it as a resource

G. Assessing the ASEMP targets

H. Developing Workgroups for the Revised Strategic Enrollment Management Plan

FTES and Efficiency Target Recommendations

FTES Budget Allocation Recommendations Workgroups.

Efficiency Target for the College - We have been working on this since 2017. In order to have a global number, each department still needs to have its own numbers.

525 is the goal, the number SBCC have is 451. The plan has to include all our strategies as a component part. Looking into the efficiency per department, we can learn how to balance the information.

FTES Allocations will be the budget portion per department.

Alan - Ideas about workgroups - The small groups are able to breakdown the information and bring that to the larger group for discussion.

Ellen is in favor of the workgroups, to discuss the information in detail and helping guide us into efficiency.

Patricia agrees with the workgroups to bring a list in detail about each item.

The idea of the workgroup is to talk about structures and analysis for each department.

Arturo agrees with the small group, Deans will not know how their department is doing.

Efficiency is based on the program and we understand the challenges to get to 525.

FTES - Do adjuncts count towards the FTES? Yes, all part-time faculty are added into consideration as well.

Can some of these conversations happen at the Department level? Rae is suggesting that the Deans have a conversation with the departments regarding cancel classes, students added, etc.

Program review - some strategies that we discuss here might help for future program reviews and testing new things. Carola and Patricia are working on seeing the relation of this committee with PEC. PEC reviewed several programs' responses to the diversity question, and for those that needed guidance on going deeper, the committee returned them with suggestions for improving equity outcomes

Sara on Department needs: some of the problems of mapping are that we might not have the requirements for the students and classes get canceled due to that. The new tools that we are using to build students' plans. If a class is a requirement for a degree then we should use that as a tool to offer the class that is needed for graduation.

Canceling classes - Patricia proposes that we need a coherent vision - it is disrupted when a faculty member has a class canceled and it affects them on a personal and financial level.

Annual assessments and opportunities to improve and revise it.

## II. An update on progress to Board of Trustees, December 12

- A. Committee development and charge
- B. Information and learning process
- C. Target review and planning
- D. SEM Plan timeline
- E. Dr. Benjamin's exit report and message

In order to maintain the strategic enrollment, plans are to keep retention, recruitment, and work on our budgets.

Motion to approve the FTEF numbers for the next 3 yrs.

13 votes

1 no (Melissa)

1 abstain (Rae)

Students need to be involved in this meeting - We may recommend a student for the committee.



## **Strategic Enrollment Management Committee**

### **Type: Educational Programs Committee**

**Background:** In 2017, the Abbreviated Strategic Enrollment Management Plan established that: A Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (SEMP) will be developed by the Office of Educational Programs. A SEM Committee will be established to guide this process. Members from all constituent groups will be represented.

**Charge:** As an open-entry institution, Santa Barbara City College serves a diverse student body with wide-ranging educational goals. SBCC's Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) committee encompasses recruitment, enrollment, retention, and goal completion from an institution-wide perspective. At its core, SEM decision-making is student-centered and fiscally responsible.

In order to ensure long-term viability, SBCC regularly adapts programs and services to meet the changing needs of its communities and students. SEM addresses current realities, adapts to the changing environment, and includes proactive planning. At Santa Barbara City College, SEM is a shared responsibility that ensures fiscal stability and viability by optimizing enrollments and integrating SEM into financial planning, budgeting, and allocation processes.

**Decision-Making Process:** The committee will discuss and decide the process for shared decision-making that includes adequate time for deliberation and consideration by all constituency groups. Membership includes both resource (non-voting) and constituent (Academic Senate, Associated Student Government, Classified Consultation Group, and District administrator) representation. Formal recommendations will receive first- and second-readings by all groups. Voting on formal recommendations, when necessary, will function with a simple majority vote format.

**Products:**

- Strategic Enrollment Management Plan and Assessment
- Academic Calendar Review and Recommendations
- FTES and Efficiency Target Recommendations
- FTEF Budget Allocation Recommendations
- Waitlist practices and class cancelation guidelines

### **Membership:**

Executive Vice President, non-voting  
Educational Programs Deans

- Dean of Students, voting
- Three instructional deans, voting
- Associate Dean of Students, non-voting
- Two instructional deans, non-voting

School of Extended Learning Dean (1), non-voting  
CBO and Controller, one voting, one non-voting  
Director of Institutional Research and Planning, non voting  
Director of Enrollment and Retention Services, voting  
Director of Admissions and Records, voting  
Executive Director of Public Affairs and Communications, voting  
Academic Senate President or designee, voting

Faculty representation--requested to senate--5 divisional reps including at least one from student support (transfer and/or EOPS preferred) and no more than one from each division  
Classified Consultation Group--requested to be staff from highly relevant departments--scheduling, Admission and Records, and categorical programs  
Advancing Leadership Association (is represented by roles defined above)  
Faculty Association (1)  
Associated Student Government (2)

**Proposed Meeting Date/Time:** 2nd and 4th Tuesdays, 12:30 to 2PM



Melissa Menendez <mamenendez@pipeline.sbcc.edu>

## Strategic Enrollment Management Committee - Toolkit to Consider?

4 messages

Melissa Menendez <menendez@sbcc.edu>

Thu, Nov 7, 2019 at 4:32 PM

To: Tina <cikistler@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Michael Medel <medel@sbcc.edu>, Elizabeth Stein <eastain@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Ellen O'Connor <oconnore@sbcc.edu>, Vanessa Pelton <vepelton@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Carola Smith <csmith@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, aprice3@pipeline.sbcc.edu, James Zavas <jdzavas@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Lyndsay Maas <Immaas@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Andy Harper <agharper@sbcc.edu>, Christopher Johnson <ckjohnson2@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Geordie Armstrong <bgarmstrong@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Sara Volle <srvolle@sbcc.edu>, Luz Reyes-Martin <lereyesmartin@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Sara Hartley <smhartley@sbcc.edu>, sedotson@pipeline.sbcc.edu, Claudia Johnson Madrigal <johnsoncl@sbcc.edu>, Priscilla Mora <mora@sbcc.edu>, Cornelia Alsheimer-Barthel <cmaalshaimerb@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, jkuhn2@pipeline.sbcc.edu, Patricia Stark <starkp@sbcc.edu>, Pamela Ralston <pgralston@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Bea Dones <bmdones@pipeline.sbcc.edu>  
Cc: Helen Benjamin <hbenjamin@pipeline.sbcc.edu>, Z Reisz <zreisz@pipeline.sbcc.edu>

Dear Fellow Strategic Enrollment Management Committee Members,

I'm writing this email in the spirit of collaboration as we defined in our committee agreements.

At this year's NCORE conference, I participated in a workshop given by faculty and administrators from Portland Community College. Their talk was to share what they called the "Take 5 Took Kit" developed by their District Leaders of Diversity Council. As the college website explains and from what I learned at the workshop, this toolkit was created in 2014 as part of "a strategic plan that encourages the use of Critical Race Theory (CRT) as part of our business practice and policy-making. CRT is both a paradigm and a practice that challenges dominant systems on race, racism, and inequality. CRT asks us to examine how and why practices and policies were created—and whom they ultimately serve—as a means of challenging institutionalized forms of oppression."

Since many of us had the opportunity to participate in the Crossroads workshops, within our cohorts, we started the awareness to challenge such systems because the ways an institution like ours functions can unintentionally exclude even though we as individuals do not mean to do so.

What inspires me to share this information now is this week's visit by Chancellor Oakley. Towards the end of the Town Hall, in answer to a question regarding support for anti-racism work at SBCC, Oakley responded "there may be some of my colleagues in the system who feel that it is not important enough, we are going to continue to try and convince them that it is important. We are going to certainly give cover and support to the students and the faculty and the staff that want to raise this."

He then reiterated that "the Board of Governor's is going to continue to press. So, I am confident that it is becoming part of the expectation of our system. I am going to do everything possible to make it part of our system's conversation."

He concluded with "But you can only begin to change if you start taking steps forward and acknowledge that there is a problem. Clearly, you all have seen that there is a problem. Whichever way you come to this, there is a problem that has been underground for a while in this community that now is being surfaced. It is for, you know, the betterment of our student's future and this community's future that we begin to have a serious conversation about it. We will take steps to improve the hiring process to do things that we can do through regulation or law, but ultimately this is a people issue. Ultimately, you all have to wrestle with this in your own way. I can't tell Santa Barbara City College how to wrestle with this. All I can tell you, is that it is important that you wrestle with this. You will find over time that it was a worthwhile difficult conversation."

Considering the importance and impact of the decisions that we will make over the next two years on this committee, I'm sharing this resource as a potential framework because it might help us to examine our decision-making processes so that as we move forward in the development of our Strategic Enrollment Plan, we, like Portland Community College, can try to be more mindful of "institutionalized forms of oppression." I, therefore, would like to request that this Toolkit be placed on our next agenda as a discussion item to explore that possibility. I also put a copy of this document in the shared google folder under "Resources."

In Community,

Melissa