



STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING
[SEA WEBSITE](#)

Thursday, November 19, 2020

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

MINUTES

Due to the COVID-19 crisis, and in compliance with the Governor's Executive Orders N-29-20 and N-33-20, Santa Barbara City College has temporarily moved meetings online.

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://sbcc.zoom.us/j/91610694377?pwd=OUx4VUIHUKFJVjRUR3V2TFZnOTdDQT09>

Meeting ID: 916 1069 4377

Passcode: 954209

Members in Attendance: Co-Chair Paloma Arnold, Roxane Byrne, Cosima Celmayster, Jana Garnett, Vandana Gavaskar, Liz Giles, Pam Guenther, Elizabeth Imhof, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Jose Martinez, Vanessa Pelton, Dylan Penglase (new ASG Liaison), Steve Reed, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez, Sara Volle

Members Unable to Attend: Lydia Aguirre-Fuentes, Dolores Howard, Suzanne Obando, Kristy Renteria

Resources in Attendance: Robin Goodnough, Z Reisz

Guests: Marit Ter Mate-Martinsen

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.1 Call to Order

The SEA meeting began at 3:03 p.m. Co-Chair Arnold shared the agenda link with everyone in the chat. ASG liaison, Dylan Penglase, introduced himself. He has been commissioned to be the ASG representative on this committee.

It was noted that Cesar Perfecto was unable to join the meeting today.

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.

Marit ter Mate-Martinsen commented that she is still the proxy for Dolores Howard. Co-Chair Arnold asked if she thought that this was a more permanent proxy position and if the membership should be updated. Robin Goodnough will check with Academic Senate President Raeanne Napoleon since it's a Senate appointment. She will check and see if it is okay to have Ms. ter Mate-Martinsen stay, or if Dr. Napoleon wants to appoint somebody new for the rest of the year.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 [Minutes, November 5, 2020](#)

Co-Chair Arnold asked if there were any comments or amendments needed to the 11/5/20 minutes. In the absence of any comments, she asked for a virtual sign of the approval for the minutes. The minutes were approved.

4. REPORTS

4.1 Co-Chairs report

Co-Chair Arnold noted that the \$20,000 (from [CCCCO AB 943 memo](#) which specified appropriate expenditures for SEA funding) that was set aside in the SEA budget for emergency grants was currently allocated under her org as Contingency/Undesignated." She made a request to the assistant controller to reallocate it to the Equity org (4094) as Other Student Aid (760000). That way, the Interim Equity coordinator can begin the process of distributing the funds as previously determined. This has been corrected.

Earlier this week, there was a discussion between Co-Chair Arnold and Cesar Perfecto about the \$20,000 set aside for SEA, based on the AB 943 memo from the Chancellor's Office to have that money available for contingency needs. Co-Chair Arnold recognized that it was in her budget and realized it should probably instead be in the Interim Equity Coordinator's budget, so Mr. Perfecto made that switch.

Roxane Byrne confirmed the switch has been made. It has been located in her budget, and the SEC is finalizing the process for writing an amendment into the SEP, which is required before they can distribute funds.

4.2 **Executive Director - Office of Equity and Inclusion.pdf** (63 KB)

Presented to the Board of Trustees on Nov. 12.

Expected contribution from SEA will be about 150,000 (the amount of a director). This will be an executive Director and will be an increase of about 49K. The difference between 150k and the person's salary will be paid out of the general fund. SEA is not making up the difference of an executive director position.

At the last Board meeting, the position for an Executive Director of the Office of Equity and Inclusion was approved by the Board of Trustees. This is a change from the current position. The position that was vacated previously was a Director position. As a reminder, Roxane Byrne is the Interim Coordinator.

The change from Director to Executive Director means the position will:

- *report directly to the President*
- *sit on President's Cabinet*
- *be able to have a lot of institutional and campus-wide impact and oversight and influence.*

It is Co-Chair Arnold's understanding that the SEA committee will not be expected to make up the difference for the salary from it moving from a Director to an Executive Director position. They're anticipating that the difference is going to be about \$50,000. SEA is expected to maintain the contribution that was previously for the Director position, which was about \$150,000, and included salary and benefits.

The difference will likely come from the general fund, although there still may be some discussion on that piece.

Co-Chair Arnold said she will need to get some clarification from Dr. Ralston and Mr. Perfecto regarding the potential increase of the contribution coming from SEA, which was previously two positions, then went to one position, then will be going back to two positions. The fact that the position has been unfilled is part of what is giving SEA money for some one-time proposals. There would potentially be an impact in terms of what money there is for one-time proposals moving forward.

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Update from workgroup.

The members met last Friday and this Monday to review the process for training applicants for SEA funding.

- [Notes from workgroup](#) training discussion on Nov. 13
- Discussion continued Monday Nov. 16
- Paloma, Z and Laurie met to create a [google document](#) for the committee to review and respond to.

Some of the updates from the workgroup:

- *Developed a timeline for when the trainings and office hours will take place.*
- *Worked on the application some more, and Z Reisz helped update it. Co-Chairs Vasquez and Arnold and Dr. Reisz met again to review it.*

Would like to go through the proposed application with the SEA members and get feedback.

Questions, comments, and concerns regarding the Application:

- *Application was put in Google docs so SEA committee members can provide comments or suggestions before it gets put into either a pdf or Google form.*
- *Not a lot of changes were done in section one, but Dr. Reisz would like help with making this introduction nice and easy to read through. Aiming to keep it short, succinct, to the point, and accessible.*
- *The highlighted areas need hyperlinks. It was determined that hyperlinks can be added to Google forms.*
- *When the call goes out, it's thought that they will include links to core documents. The documents will also be on the SEA website so people can access them there.*
- *Still working on figuring out what the maximum dollar amount will be.*
- *Section 2 has contact information, who will be doing the work etc.*
- *Section 3 gets into the details of the whole proposal: Trying to have people say what they're going to do, why they're going to do it, and how they are going to know whether it was successful or not.*
- *Question 8: Depending on the technology used (i.e. check boxes), this is where people show which equity gap(s) their project will focus on, pulling from the VSS or SEP.*
- *Question 9: This is the part where the committee is really going to need to work with people to help them understand how to support the ideas that they're proposing.*
- *Question 10: This is one of the bigger steps for applicants, really thinking about how they're going to measure this and how they will know it is successful.*
 - *Some projects are going to have an indirect relationship to removing the equity gap.*
 - *It was suggested to have direct and indirect examples.*
 - *The last part of the question refers to their benchmark where they'll be able to either say they were successful, or it didn't quite play off as well as they thought it was going to.*
 - *There was a concern that the examples did not directly address the equity gaps. Some of the points in that discussion were:*
 - *Are the number of students who do whatever the outcome is, additional students? There was a discussion about taking the word "additional" out, since programs wouldn't necessarily know if they're serving additional students or not.*
 - *Not everything is going to be measurable in a way of saying it reduces gaps.*
 - *A conversation may need to happen about shifting the focus to percentages as opposed to numbers, since enrollment is declining so significantly.*
 - *Since question 9 is about the direct correlation to the equity gap, and question 10 is more about internal data collection, there was a thought that perhaps question 10 could be a sub-question of number 9.*
- *The work group had discussed having templates, one that is directly related to an outcome, and one that is indirectly related to an outcome.*

- *It was suggested to not only help people in the beginning, so they can write their proposal, but six months later, when it's time to evaluate it, too. Dr. Reisz thought that the training itself would help with reducing the distance between measurement and activity. He noted that this is probably going to be a first time for a lot of people where they're trying to propose a project as well as think of the specific way they're going to track progress on that project.*
- *Section 4 updates that Cesar Perfecto had asked to be included*
 - *Who will be the budget manager?*
 - *What org is associated with this project?*
- *There was a discussion about question # 14 (What other funds will be used to support this proposal, if any?). Although it doesn't need to be solved today, Co-Chair Vasquez noted that it's definitely something that needs to be addressed.*
 - *Would that question impact the committee's decision in any way? (i.e. successful activities that are going to sunset, or, for ESL peer advisors, for example, the lead peer advisor was paid for by one grant and the peer advisors were paid for by SEA). It was noted that prior to SEA, the ESL peer advisors were "institutionalized" from matriculation funding, but when that fund merged into SEA, they no longer had the security and funding.*
 - *One thought was that it was important to find out and disclose that kind of information in order to get a better understanding.*
 - *One way to look at it is, there's a network of funding, so it wouldn't just be SEA. On the flip side, the proposal may not have any other way to get funded.*
 - *One thought was that if the committee doesn't want this question to impact their decision, the question should probably be taken out.*
 - *Another thought was that in some cases, having that external funding to get it started was a plus in why it's successful and should continued to receive funding. And in some cases, it would be in a project's favor that it doesn't have any other source of funding.*
 - *Dr. Reisz's thought was that a project that is well established by some other funding, is really different than something that's new and coming into being. In some ways, there is a higher bar for them to indicate the success of a grant-funded project that is sun setting. He would want more information about how it had been assessed previously that really shows it was successful. With the newer projects coming in, there isn't an expectation other than having a really strong rationale about why they think it would be helpful. He thinks they need really different treatments and assessments about whether the committee should go forward with them or not.*
 - *If a project should be institutionalized, it should truly be institutionalized and general fund funded, not categorically funded. It was noted that our college doesn't have a history of institutionalizing things.*
- *It was noted that projects that had been funded in the past versus entirely new projects had different processes. Co-Chair Arnold asked if that was something*

the committee wanted to do. Dr. Reisz said not for this round, but it may be something to keep in mind for next round.

- What happens if there are proposals for projects that are currently being funded this year? Dr. Imhof said that one of the things the committee is charged with doing is revising the process so that the work is truly equity based. If they make considering a previous commitment a factor in the decision making process, there's a real danger of an obligation to the institution and to the structures, versus an obligation to the equity commitment.
- For this round, Dr. Reisz suggests taking out question 14 and possibly 17. Co-Chair Vasquez would like to keep the questions in, but would also like to hear Mr. Perfecto's perspective. Co-Chair Arnold doesn't necessarily think by removing these questions, they're automatically saying that existing proposals wouldn't qualify or wouldn't be funded. The point is really ensuring that they are going through the process of the equity training and making sure their project is focusing on reducing the [equity gap]. And if they can and are able to do that and show that they are, then they may continue to get funded.
- It was thought that since SEA's funding is based on numbers, and the college is down [45%] as of today, there will be a cut in the current amount. 85% of the SEA budget is in salaries and benefits.
- The reason why this is just one-year funding for the next couple of years is because if the committee gets told in May or June that the budget is being cut again, then all of these proposals probably won't get any money.
- Co-Chair Vasquez saw a draft of next year's budget, so she will go back and see what they said about SEA.
- From what Co-Chair Arnold understands, the funding for SEA is not directly based on this year's enrollment. There's usually a gap. It would potentially be the year after that that might be impacted.
- There is a SEA meeting on December 3rd. The release date for the application is Monday, December 7th. That would give the committee one more meeting to finalize, but input is needed before the December 3rd meeting. That way, adjustments can be made and a final application can be brought forward to the meeting for approval. An email will be sent to the committee, with a deadline of Monday, November 30th for any input and feedback. There was a request for a reminder email before then, too.
- How to release it to the campus:
 - Campus-wide email with some information: application, training dates and times...
 - Send it to different groups for it to be announced (Academic Senate, Managers, CSEA, Noncredit)
- What does DI mean to noncredit? There is a noncredit SPA, who serves primarily the AHS [and GED]. Co-Chair Arnold's understanding is that the position serves the DI populations that the college should be focused on. There are also two noncredit hourlies that are funded by SEA.

6.2 Reviewed [tentative dates](#) for the training

- The two initial trainings will be recorded.
- It is Co-Chair Arnold's hope and expectation that committee members can be at one of the initial trainings.

- *The work group will host a series of drop-in office hours throughout February and the very beginning of March to answer questions for people as they're trying to fill out the application, after they've attended or watched the initial training.*
- *Becky Saffold sent out one-hour increment calendar invites to the work group for the office hours. If others are interested in participating, they are welcome to do so.*

6.3 [Rubric for Proposals](#)

- Language (equity, diversity, deficit language)
- Google form

It was decided to have the committee also review the most recent rubric and give input and feedback by November 30th.

Last year's proposals are in the SEA folder.

6.4 [Calendar for SEA activities](#) (call for proposals, due date, review (advising those applying for funding, ranking, contacting awardees, evaluation outcomes))

7. ACTION ITEMS

7.1 Summary/Follow-up items

Homework due by Monday, November 30th. Provide feedback on:

- *SEA Application*
- *Rubric*

An example application and rubric from Citrus College will also be included. In addition, other links will be provided to help with the homework.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting ended at 4:18 p.m.