

STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

SEA WEBSITE

Thursday, January 21, 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=OUx4VUIHUKFJVjRUR3V2TFZnOTdDQT09>

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, Jose Martinez, Dylan Penglase, Vanessa Pelton, Steve Reed, Kristy Renteria, Laurie Vasquez, Sara Volle [*All members were in attendance*].

Resources: Robin Goodnough, Z Reisz

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.1 Call to Order

The meeting started at 3:03 p.m.

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 Minutes, December 3, 2020

The 12/3/20 minutes were approved.

4. REPORTS

4.1 Co-Chairs report

- a. The 2019-20 SEA annual report was submitted and certified by the Chancellor's Office on December 23. Due date was January 1, 2021.

The report was signed by Dr. Goswami and Business Services Vice President, Lyndsay Maas, and was quickly certified by the Chancellor's Office. This report was year two of the model. A lot of what was reported were activities that may have impacted the populations that were identified in year one. Year two was an update on spending. The report did not require any narrative.

If anyone would like to see it, Co-Chair Arnold can send screen shots.

4.2 The Joint analysis of the Governor's 2021-22 January Budget

- b. For the SEA budget the Chancellor's Office proposes the same funding level as 20-21@ \$475 million. The final budget approved in May

See (Table 6, page 13).

The January budget is introduced early in the year and the final budget is approved in May. Based on the January budget, there doesn't seem to be any change with the SEA program.

Cesar Perfecto is putting together a report of how the Governor's proposed budget will possibly impact SBCC. He may have some information regarding SEA based on the budget at the next meeting. This is a very preliminary budget that goes through rounds of updates and changes, and we don't get the actual budget until August. Co-Chair Arnold is cautiously optimistic.

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

5.1 Chancellor's Office **1/13 Webinar: Equity Plans for the California Community College System**

- Log into the Vision Resource Center

Panelists: Dr. Bensimon, Dr. Felix and Dr. Chase from CUE.

System leaders Dolores Davison, President of the ASCCC and Katherine Esquire, Vice President of the SSSCC.

Order of speakers and timestamps:

- Welcome – **2:50** Deputy Chancellor Dr. Daisy Gonzales, Chancellor Eloy Ortiz Oakley
 - COVID-19 Update – **7:10** Vice Chancellor Paul Feist
 - 2021-22 Proposed Budget and Federal Relief – **11:00** Vice Chancellor Lizette Navarette, Vice Chancellor David O'Brien
 - Statewide Analysis of Student Equity Planning – **20:30** Center for Urban Education: Dr. Megan M. Chase, Dr. Eric R. Felix, Dr. Estela Bensimon
 - Grounding Equity Plans in Real Student Experiences – **38:40** Dolores Davison, President, ASCCC, Katherine Squire, Vice President, SSSCC
 - Leveraging Research and Data to Drive Equity Work – **48:30** Assistant Vice Chancellor Valerie Lundy-Wagner
-
- CUE Final Student Equity Report
 - Six Characteristics of an Equity-Minded Student Equity Plan

Takeaway - The Chancellor's Office, based on this information is looking into a structural redesign of the Student Equity Plan in 2022, with a more thoughtful approach on the DI data sets.

At the last meeting, it was mentioned that the Chancellor's Office was working on the Equity Plan. Now the Chancellor's Office has all the data from the Center for Urban Education (CUE). A report was created to go to the Legislature. The Legislature wants to know how the money is being spent.

Click on the link or get into it through the Vision Resource Center. Co-Chair Vasquez pulled out the three links that she thought were most important for reading now, and those are the three bullets at the bottom of item 5.1.

Elizabeth Imhof said that one of the most important takeaways was a common critique that the college wasn't explicit about its equity groups. DI or under-served students were talked about, but not specifically, such as Black

or African American students, for example. They want the college to be very explicit in that work and the intentionality in who the DI students are.

Roxane Byrne explained that one of the goals of the Student Equity Committee (SEC) this semester is going to be developing a process for writing the next Student Equity Plan, as well as looking at the assessment for the current plan, which is broader and vaguer. SEC is going to be talking about what that process looks like and they're hoping to do that in more of a partnership with SEA, and help ensure that others at the college are on board.

5.2 [Funding application](#) (up to \$50,000)

A. Sent campuswide 1/20/2021

Z Reisz and Co-Chairs Arnold and Vasquez met and incorporated the feedback into the application, which was sent out last night. Some of the questions at the last meeting were, would the Equity program need to reapply for funding? Would the bigger non-permanent groups need to reapply for funding? If so, then the limit on the funding would be much higher than \$50,000. That might set an expectation for the others, so decisions were made to:

B. Exempt Equity from having to reapply (with understanding that there's oversight) *For ongoing Equity initiatives, they don't need to reapply. If they're new initiatives, they would need to apply.*

C. For ACC and Tutorial hourly (request/develop abbreviated application to ensure continued focus on DI populations)

The co-chairs will work on an abbreviated process for tutorial and ACC adjunct hourlies, to make sure they're still meeting the equity intent of funding.

D. All permanent positions - No action required

The majority of Equity dollars right now do not need to go through any process. Implementing Equity training for positions that are permanently funded by SEA will be continued to work on, but most likely not this year.

E. Information available on [SEA website](#)

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 [SEA Application Training](#)

The link in the agenda, goes directly to the application resources page: SEP, VfSS, metrics sheet, rubric, pdf of application, and link to the application form. Scrolling down, it shows the dates and times for the application training and drop-in dates and zoom links.

Co-Chair Arnold thought it was important for all of the SEA members to attend one of the two trainings. Ideally, all committee members should be resources for people who might have questions or need some assistance completing the application.

Questions, comments and concerns:

- People do not have to bring anything with them to the training. If they have a rough idea of what they want to do, that could be helpful. The drop-in help is where people can bring their questions and ask for input on their proposals. It was suggested to mention ahead of the training that people don't need to bring anything.
- A reminder email will be sent out two days before the first training. It will ask people to have looked at the application prior to the training.
- Data only needs to be provided for proposals that are selected.
- The trainings will be recorded.
- Co-Chair Arnold requested that calendar invites be sent to all of the SEA members, and for members to accept the dates/times they can attend. At least one co-chair will attend each of the drop-in hours.
- Committee members were encouraged to inform their constituency groups and committees about the application. Robin Goodnough will ask Raeanne Napoleon to make sure an announcement about the application is put on the Senate agenda. CSEA will send an email to their group, too.
- Co-Chair Vasquez asked that Jose Martinez make the new SEL Vice President, Joyce Coleman, aware. Mr. Martinez informed the committee that Vice President Coleman will be joining the committee as a voting member. She will replace Mr. Martinez.

6.2 [Rubric](#)

The committee worked on the rubric in an effort to get it finalized so it can be posted in time for the training.

Questions, comments and concerns:

- Make sure the activity has clearly measurable outcomes.
- The rankings will be Basic (0-1 points), Moderate (2 points), and Excellent (3 points). In addition, the top category is weighted X 2, the middle is weighted X 1.5, and the bottom is weighted X 1.
- What happens if there is a tie between two proposals?

- *Asking people how effective would your plan be if it was awarded at 75%? 50%? Those questions are on the application.*
- *Looking at priority matrices (something that IT does in prioritizing projects).*
- *Maybe having an internal rubric in addition to the output one.*
- *Maybe the grading factors can be tied specifically to the DI population and/or specific goals.*
- *Where it gets tricky is if other projects below \$450K are amazing projects, then that's where other discussions would happen about possibly lowering the amount that each project gets so those additional projects can be included.*
- *Do we want to have some kind of process that if we are in a situation where things are equal or we're having a hard time making decisions, that we ask them to come present?*
- *Saying something along the lines of, 'in the event of a tie, we will use the category 1 information to help us identify, and something about the ability to still provide a program at 75% or 50% of the proposed budget.'*
- *Mr. Reisz suggested as people get ranked, the top 10, get 100%. And as the list moves farther down, they get 75%, 50%. This might be one way to spread out the money a little bit more.*
- *At a certain point, figuring out the math of how to allocate certain points based on the expense of the project, is something we're not going to be able to do in a transparent rubric. Those kinds of decisions need to be made collectively.*
- *Co-Chair Arnold added the sentence, "Final recommendations for funding will be made collectively by the SEA Committee."*
- *Budget plan*
 - *We need to know what they intend to spend the money on, like a high-level budget line.*
 - *Are we trying to just show that the person has thought this through, at which point then we want to see a detailed list? Or is the intent more that they are thinking about funds that will be spent appropriately? The general feeling of the*

committee was the first option, that people have thought about the intent of the resources.

- *It was noted that the budget plan doesn't really show how they're going to impact DI students. It's not a measurable thing that affects DI students, whereas if you have no implementation plan, you're not likely to affect the students that you're trying to get at.*
- *The reporting part is one important piece, and the other side is that these are thoughtful requests of the money needed.*

It was agreed by the committee that Co-Chairs Arnold and Vasquez will meet to make the adjustments to the application [and rubric], and report out to the committee so they can look at it.

7. ACTION ITEMS

7.1 SARS Funding/Translation for Enrollment Services

Due to the meeting running over, this item will be discussed at the next meeting.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting ended at 4:38.