SB CC

STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

[SEA WEBSITE](#)

Thursday, April 1, 2021

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=OUx4VUlHUkFJVjRUR3V2TFZnOTdDQT09

Meeting ID: 916 1069 4377

Passcode: 954209

_____

Members in Attendance: Lydia Aguirre-Fuentes, Co-Chair Paloma Arnold, Roxane Byrne, Cosima Celmayster, Jana Garnett, Vandana Gavaskar, Liz Giles, Pam Guenther, Marit ter Mate-Martinsen, Elizabeth Imhof, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Steve Reed, Kristy Renteria, Luz Reyes-Martin, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez, Sara Volle

Members Unable to Attend: Dylan Penglase, Vanessa Pelton

Resources in Attendance: Cesar Perfecto

Guests: Raquel Hernandez (for Robin Goodnough)

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.1 Call to Order

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

2.1 Public Comment Guidelines - Limited to 2 minutes per speaker to ensure committee has sufficient time to address committee business. Committee will not respond to comments during public comment.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 SEA Minutes 3-18-21 - DRAFT

The minutes for the 3-18-21 SEA meeting were approved.

4. REPORTS

4.1 Co-Chairs report

1. **FREE - The Future of Student Basic Needs: A Conversation with Higher Education State Leaders** . Recording on Youtube

This is the kick-off event of the 2021 California Higher Education Basic Needs Alliance (CHEBNA) Learning Series. The three segments of public higher education in California remain committed to addressing and supporting students in a number of ways, including their access to financial aid, healthy food, safe housing, and wellbeing and mental health support.

Speakers: Senior Advisor on Higher Education to Governor Gavin Newsom, Dr. Lande Ajose; California Community Colleges Chancellor, Eloy Ortiz Oakley; California State University Chancellor, Joseph I. Castro; and University of California President, Michael V. Drake.

To REGISTER for future dates coming up

- Wed. April 14th, from 10:30AM-12PM
- Wednesday, April 28th, from 10:30AM-12PM PST
- Monday, May 24th, from 10-11:30AM

Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez encouraged committee members to listen to as many of the webinars put out by the Chancellor's Office because many of them are bringing in our CSU and UC partners, as well as Governor Newsom's Office. The more foundational knowledge there is about the

direction around meeting student needs, the better conversations the committee will have.

2. **FREE -Vision for Success Virtual Summit 2021 (5 webinars, every Thursday on April 1, 8, 15, 22 from 2:00 - 4:00)**
   will help you take action to lead our commitments to diversity, equity and inclusion, anti-racism, and centering students to move the California Community Colleges into the future and realize our Vision for Success. Join the conversation and learn with your peers from colleges and partner organizations through five weekly webinars every Thursday in April from 2pm - 4pm

   To [Register](#)

   Explore [Agenda](#)

   When Co-Chair Vasquez gets the recordings, she will put them on the next agenda.

3. **Chancellor Eloy Ortiz Oakley** [podcast (35:33)](#) with Lande Ajose, Senior Policy Advisor for Higher Education for the Office of Governor Gavin Newsom, for a discussion about a groundbreaking report, "[Recovery with Equity: A Roadmap for Higher Education After the Pandemic](#)." The report was published by the Governor's Council for Postsecondary Education and the discussion centers around how it validates and builds upon the goals and objectives that are set forth in the [Vision for Success](#).

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

       5.1 Reviewing the [Rubric](#).

Pam Guenther and Co-Chair Arnold met during Spring break to discuss potential changes to the rubric. One of the most significant concerns with making adjustments to the rubric after the applications had been put out was, would it negatively impact the applications that were submitted? The adjustments they came up with didn't negatively impact the applicants, and may actually benefit them.

The few people who had done their scoring before may have to re-number them a little bit.

The two changes that were made:

- *Students/DI groups impacted: applicants either did identify a student population or they didn't. It's either a "0" or "3."*

- *For funding sources: it didn't seem appropriate to rate people on whether or not they had tried to secure or had additional resources. There's no score on that question.*

The total maximum score is 39.

Liz Giles mentioned that she put a formula on her Excel sheet that will total the sum, if anyone wants to borrow it. Per Co-Chair Arnold's request, Ms.Giles copied the formula onto everyone's sheet.

5.2 Results of responses from Equity Now training series being hosted by USC.

Student Equity and Achievement (SEA) Program funds. As outlined in Education Code 78222, SEA funding projects and activities must:

1. implement activities and practices pursuant to the college's implementation of Guided Pathways
2. ensure that students complete their educational goals and courses of study, and
3. provide curriculum, instruction, and support services to ensure that students deficient in English and mathematics complete a course of study in a timely manner

All requests must be for reasonable and justifiable amounts as they relate to the type of activity proposed.

Session 1: April 8th

Session 2: April 15th

Session 3: April 22nd

Session 4: April 29th

All sessions 10 am – 12 pm Pacific Time

There were six SEA members who responded that they could attend. There were a handful of Student Equity Committee members who also could attend. Ms. Guenther asked if the recordings could be watched later, as she had a conflict during some of the times they were being offered. Roxane Byrne was going to look into that.

For committee members who can attend, Co-Chair Arnold said to expect a follow up email from Becky Saffold, Ms. Byrne or Co-Chair Arnold for the dates listed on the agenda. Ms. Byrne asked Ms. Guenther to put on the survey form which days she can attend, so when she finds out whether people can attend some days, she can let her know

Co-Chair Vasquez reminded the committee members to be mindful that when we're requesting SEA funds other than for proposals, those funds are auditable by the Chancellor's Office.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Developing a 5 year plan to address proposals that are not meeting equity focus yet. Getting to equity in a meaningful way!

Some of the things that SEA has been paying for that don't necessarily have a clear equity focus are carried over from SSSP and Basic Skills funding. Although it would be ideal for some of these to move over to the unrestricted general fund, that fund is not in the position now to take on any additional positions, projects, or proposals currently funded by SEA due to the college's structural deficit.

There is a difficult position of wanting to make sure what is being funded by SEA is equity focused, and having historical things funded through SEA that may have a less obvious equity impact, and trying to decide how to manage and bring those two pieces together.

Co-Chair Arnold wanted to make it clear that in no way is she suggesting or proposing that positions permanently funded by SEA be eliminated. They want to make sure that if SEA funding is cut in the next couple of years, that those permanently funded positions are not impacted.

The other issue is making sure that what is being approved is equity focused, and recognizing that it will be difficult to move things to the unrestricted general fund anytime soon.

Co-Chairs Vasquez and Arnold came up with developing a five year plan with four different options. This was a way to reconcile the desire to be equity focused, but recognizing that we're not going to be able to do this right away in one year.

Questions, comments, and concerns:

- *Pam Guenther was not sure that the money currently spent out of this fund would meet the requirements for SEA funding, and if we would pass an audit. As we move forward, she wants us to be mindful of meeting the requirements. Co-Chair Arnold said that she believes everything we are doing would absolutely pass the audit. She said that we as a college are being much more strict on the equity focus aspect than the Chancellor's Office is asking us to be.*
- *Co-Chair Vasquez said that in her conversations with the Chancellor's Office, they are well aware that when they changed from the three*

funding streams to the SEA funding, there would be difficult legacy pieces that each campus would have to work through. She said as long as the committee feels confident and comfortable with funding proposals that will eventually meet that equity mark, then in their write-up for the state, the Co-Chairs would create the language that supports meeting the eventual goal.

- *There was a discrepancy about what is audited. It was stated that audits aren't done according to the parameters of the specific program, and that the audit is according to general principles of a financial stewardship. However, Cesar Perfecto challenged that and said there <u>are </u>basic things they look for, but at the same time, it depends on what the Chancellor's Office wants to audit. They can audit a program for specific or general things. Ex: Last year the college got dinged because of the CARES Act. The college was supposed to put a lot of different things on the website, such as notifying the public of what the program is available for. That wasn't done in time.*
- *Mr.Perfecto explained the different types of audits: Student enrollment audits, financial audits. In random audits, they pull a list of random transactions. Some are categorical and some are part of the unrestricted general fund. The college needs to provide all of the backup for this transaction. Every year, they give us different programs that they audit -- federal and state. For example, one year it could be for Title III, and the next year it might be a foster grant program. In addition, they're auditing categorical programs. It changes every year, and we never know what programs are going to be audited ahead of time. Every program is eventually audited.*
- *Mr. Perfecto is glad that we're taking the direction to be strategic about equity, because even though at the moment there aren't clear guidelines, that's the direction they're steering towards.*
- *On the main spreadsheet, Co-Chair Arnold added a column that she would like the committee to consider for each proposal that says "Five Year Plan."*

Would the five year plan for the proposal be:

- *To move to the unrestricted general fund?*
- *For them to start developing their own kind of equity focused plan?*
- *To potentially move them to an operational piece of the SEA budget?*
- *To reapply if things are going well?*
- *Co-Chair Arnold added a column for follow-up questions for each proposal. Because some people were representatives of the committee who submitted proposals and some people were not, it*

wouldn't be fair for committee members to be able to speak on behalf of their proposal as the committee was reviewing them. If we had questions for proposals, we would take down those questions and she could either email the applicant with those questions and follow up with them or ask them to come back to a later meeting to answer the questions that we have.

- *Co-Chair Arnold suggested looking at and discussing each proposal probably with the assumption that we can fund it, but if we fund it, what type of five year plan would we put it in? Co-Chair Vasquez said this is very similar to what some of Senate committees have just completed.*
- *Ms. Byrne asked if our review of the proposals would be framed more around thinking about how this would move forward, especially for those legacy proposals. She asked if this could be done more as a group or in work groups, reviewing and talking through the different proposals, creating some sort of plan versus doing this individualized rubric ranking. If we know that we're potentially going to be able to fund all, if not most of them, how do we plan on moving forward?*
- *Chair Arnold said they may find a parallel between the applications with lower scores, and those may be the ones they'll suggest be moved to the unrestricted general fund. Applications with the highest scores may be ones they consider being operational over the next five years. The exercise of having evaluated each one independently is going to be valuable.*
- *What will be the impact next year if there are certain proposals on the radar this year? Are other plans disadvantaged since people weren't informed about this beforehand? It's an unusual year because of COVID. For example, for ESL, Marit ter Mate-Martinsen said they didn't put anything forth for AB705. Now that we're having this discussion, she wishes she had known. The Co-Chairs explained this wouldn't limit anybody's ability to put a proposal in for future years. It's not an either or situation.*
- *To incorporate better planning as well as reviewing each individual proposal would give us a little more flexibility.*
- *Some five year plans might be that you're transitioning out of SEA funding.*
- *Dr. Imhof would like the committee to create comprehensive plans that support long term equitable goals. We've been doing a lot of piece-mealing. She likes that innovative equity minded people have somewhere to go for funding.*

7. ACTION ITEMS

7.1 Start the review and scoring of proposals, lines 2 through 19, with equity focus.

Co-Chair Arnold asked how proposals were reviewed last year. It was noted that each proposal was discussed point by point after people and reviewed and scored them. It was determined that Co-Chair Arnold would ask each person for their score, so it could be put on the first sheet.

The first proposal on the list was submitted by Kate Brody-Adams, and it was to maintain funding for the ACC front desk counseling assistants.

Discussion about the proposal:
- *There was a large range in numbers, but overall, the numbers are still relatively low.*
- *Chair Arnold asked what would be the reason this one got a lower score. Some reasons that were given:*
  - *It has a looser correlation to the equity work being done on campus.*
  - *The proposal was not as specific as one would have hoped it to be.*
  - *There was a reminder that in the proposals, if a specific population is targeted, it will automatically help all students.*
- *Co-Chair Arnold noted that in the proposal Ms. Brody stated that there are things that the front desk could be doing differently to be more focused on the DI populations.*
- *The struggle with student services now is that there isn't a baseline for data. We don't necessarily know where our gaps are right now.*
- *Cosima Celmayster recently set up a meeting with Steve Reed, Z Reisz, and Co-Chair Arnold to discuss obtaining disaggregated data.*
- *It was suggested that this would be a good proposal to put on the five year plan to transition to the unrestricted general fund.*
- *How do you capture the students that threw in the towel because they couldn't get to an academic counselor? Jana Garnett thinks we have a lot of DI students that we can't even consider because they gave up.*
- *Co-Chair Arnold said that one of the things they would like to start tracking within ACC or counseling in general is which students are getting access? Which students are making an appointment? Compare that to our student population, and that would tell us if there are more of one type of student versus another type of student who's seeing an academic counselor.*
- *It was suggested that this position should not be the work on an hourly employee doing this long term. Co-Chair Arnold is going to add onto the spreadsheet that this should be a full time classified position.*
- *Steve Reed noted that the hourlies really support class planning. Even though class planning captures all students, it really benefits*

those in the DI population as they are usually the ones that are likely to never meet with a counselor.

- *Dr. Imhof noted that even though we know that DI students are less likely to see a counselor, and seeing a counselor will benefit them, the design has to be specifically about how do we design so the DI students see their counselors?*
- *What we're doing right now with class planning is a huge improvement. How can we be changing or improving class planning to make sure that our DI students have access to it? Is this how it really works best for our DI students? And make those changes and that will benefit everybody else.*
- *Maybe the follow up that we have with each one of these proposals is (and this can be something that we do with work groups) is potential. This is what we're asking you to do and here are some examples, here are some opportunities. Use this as a way to give some feedback, not just 'You're approved." It's "You're approved and here are some layers to be considering." There are still a lot of opportunities to have these positions be potentially more equity focused even if we're suggesting moving them to unrestricted general funds.*
- *What happens if as we're analyzing this, we say we've got to come up with a way to collect data? Co-Chair Arnold said she needs to think about that. She said there are ways to identify gaps, but not in the format we have access to.*

7.2 Potential Additional SEA Meeting on 4/29/2021 to complete ranking
The committee members agreed to have an additional meeting on April 29th.

Homework:
Please have all of the proposals rated for the next meeting.

Helpful Links

Ranking Folder (including pdf Applications)

Spreadsheet of ALL Proposals

Spreadsheet for Committee Ranking

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting ended at 4:35 p.m.