STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING

[SEA WEBSITE](#)

April 24, 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, Liz Giles, Robin Goodnough, Akil Hill, Elizabeth Imhof, Amanda Jacobs, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Christina Llerena, Jennifer Loftus, Jennifer Maupin, Maureen McRae Goldberg, Co-Chair Brittanye Muschamp, Vanessa Pelton, Kristy Renteria, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez, Sara Volle

Members Unable to Attend: Mark Bobro, Jeanette Chian, Andy Gil, Jennifer Hamilton, Chelsea Lancaster, Julio Martinez

Resources in Attendance: Cheryl Brown, Nicole Hubert, Z Reisz

Guests: Margaret Prothero

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**

   [4-10-23 Minutes - Draft](#)
   Maureen McRae Goldberg made a motion to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved.

4.   Information

4.2 Discussion

a.   2022-2023 update on [one- time SEA proposals (unspent funds)](#) (C. Brown)
*There is still uncertainty on how much money will be available for the 2023-24
one-time proposals.*

Some of the challenges:
** Not all of the information has been received on unspent funds from last year's
proposals.*
** Some of the payroll and accruals won't occur until July or August. Stipends should be
submitted to the VPAA for Board approval by the beginning of May at the latest,
followed by a payroll memo to Payroll. We still have until June 30th to finalize these
expenses and budgets.*
* Some of the proposals from last year were underspent, some were overspent.
** We still have not received our SEA allocation for next year, and we won't get an initial
number until the May Revise.*
** In attempting to clean up a lot of the previous SEA budgets, Cheryl Brown found that
there were some things that were not expensed to SEA that should have been, but
which have now been appropriately expensed.*
** Some of the proposals were for more than the $10,000 limit. Co-Chair Arnold said it
wouldn't necessarily be equitable for us to take proposals right now that said they
needed more than $10,000 if that message wasn't clearly conveyed to everyone
equally.*

*The co-chairs feel that right now, they need to stick to the $10,000 limit, especially
since there were 23 applications submitted for one-time funding. It looks like there's
going to be about $75,000 to $100,000 of unspent money from last year's proposals.*

b.   2023-2024 One-time proposals for SEA funding ([applications](#))
*During the SEA meeting, Becky Saffold sent committee members an email with each
of the 23 individual proposals attached to it.*

*The total amount of one-time proposals added up to about $530,000. If we were just
going with the $10,000 limit, it would total $230,000. Co-Chair Muschamp noted that
just because we received 23 applications, doesn't mean they will all be approved.
Some of the proposals seem like they need to be institutionalized, and there might be
other funding sources we can look into for some of these applications.*

*One-time funding is meant to spark and get the program/project going. Once it is
shown to be working, how do we have the college further support it? Co-Chair Arnold
suggested that SEA reach out and let folks know that the award amounts will not*

exceed $10,000, and if they'd like to withdraw them, they can. For some proposals, they can perhaps braid with another funding source and still use the $10,000.

Regarding the larger proposals:
* Are there some proposals that can be tied to the work in online instruction? What other grant opportunities or funding on campus could be used?
* Some of these might involve having conversations with the managers who submitted them to see if they could be modified to use other funding sources the campus already has that can be tapped into.
* Over the summer, the co-chairs may look at the SEA budget and have a discussion about possibly categorically funding some of these larger projects. We should be able to have a larger conversation with perhaps Maria Villagomez and Dr. Murillo and some other people on campus to discuss: What can we do to support all of them even if we don't have all the money? Are there other funding sources right now that we can pull as we work through the other stuff on campus?

Some questions, comments, and concerns:
* Elizabeth Imhof noted that if we only support the smaller projects, we're robbing ourselves of the ability to implement a wide-ranging bigger impact. At the same time, the idea of SEA as seed money to really support new innovations is important. The missing piece is that connection between what we find to be really successful and want to continue to support at a bigger scale, and an institution that doesn't have any space to really transition that in. Co-Chair Arnold said that brings up the question of the whole budget resource allocation process, and how this would fit into the entire process on campus.
* What happens to programs that don't have access to the broader budget budgeting process to budget new initiatives (e.g. ESL)?
* Co-Chair Vasquez recalled that in our revised institutional planning document with Gensler consultants, there is mention of planning for innovation. What do we need to put in place to support innovation and to ensure appropriate allocations?   Co-Chair Muschamp recalled that English asked for three $10,000 grants for restructuring English… She said that if we're looking at actually institutionalizing the equity work, we would consider giving the money to Umoja as the program overseeing the Umoja work with English in order to facilitate and coordinate for intended outcomes.

c.   Update rubric for reviewing proposals
Co-Chair Arnold pulled the rubric up. She noted some changes that needed to be made (e.g. link the current Student Equity Plan and make sure the questions on the proposal coincide with what is on the rubric…).

There was a suggestion that we take some of our ongoing obligations and run them through the same rubric. Co-Chair Arnold noted that over 85% of our SEA budget is permanent staff and faculty. Because of increases to benefits and raises, and that our college is in a structural deficit, we're not in a position to move these positions over to

the unrestricted general fund.

Co-Chair Muschamp made it 100% clear that we're not getting rid of any of the positions, and that we want to preserve the people here on campus. Our main goal is to look through these proposals and see if they align with the Equity plan? Did they put measurable outcomes for the populations that they targeted? And if we can't fund it, it doesn't mean the conversation stops there. As the SEA Committee, we will try to go to other funding sources and have those conversations.

There was a discussion of the ranking system itself. Jennifer Maupin noted that at some point the "moderate" and "excellent" is going to have to be basically our interpretation of how valuable it is. Co-Chair Muschamp suggested that as you read through the proposals, if the metric they chose was "Black and African American" students, for example, it is one thing to work directly with and target that population, and another to be more general. We're not looking for generalized things.

In describing the number system, Jennifer Maupin suggested having "3" be yes, absolutely; "2" would be a good use of these funds, but not a top priority. Or, are there other resources to braid funding with another existing finite stream?; "1" would be that it is not really hitting the mark for what we want.

Other options were discussed, but in the end the committee agreed to use the rubric and rank items 1, 2, 3, (good, better, best).

Homework before the next meeting: *review and score all of the applications using the rubric. At our next meeting we'll review everyone's scores to determine which proposals we may be able to fund.*

We have one more meeting on May 8th to get everything done. If we can't get everything done by then, we may have to hold a special meeting.

d.   Proposed ranking spreadsheet (will need to be modified based on rubric)

e.   2022-2025 Student Equity Plan Year 1 Action Plan (55 minutes, **Brittanye**)
   i.   Breakout Rooms to start writing step by step instructions to accomplish Year 1 SEP Goals
      1. Metric: Successful Enrollment
         a. Jeanette Chian Brooks
         b. Vanessa Pelton
         c. Sara Volle
         d. Martha Swanson
         e. Cheryl Brown
         f. Kristy Renteria
         g. Chantille Marquez (dual enrollment)

2. Metric: Completion of Transfer Level Math and English
   a. Elizabeth Imhof
   b. Jens-Uwe Kuhn
   c. Robin Goodnough (Access?)
   d. Raquel Hernandez (Access?)
   e. Jennifer Maupin
   f. Elizabeth Mares
3. Metric: Retention from Fall to Fall
   a. Andy Gil
   b. Nicole Hubert
   c. Maureen McRae Goldberg
   d. Akil Hill
   e. Lelia Richardson
4. Metric: Completion & Transfer
   a. Z Reisz
   b. Elizabeth Giles
   c. Julio Martinez
   d. Kyle Rasmussen
   e. Christina Llerena
   f. Jennifer Hamilton
   g. Chelsea Lancaster
   h. Marc Bobro

5. **Action**

6. **Future Agenda Items**
   a. Spring semester SEA meetings
      ● April 24
      ● May 8

Resources

● Final [Student Equity Plan 2022-2025](#)