

SEA Committee Meeting
April 23, 2020
4:30 - 6 PM, Room CG-223 [Zoom Meeting](#)

[SEA](#) is a college-wide committee that reports to the EVP
[Committee Website](#)

MINUTES

Members Present: Sabrina Barajas, Roxane Byrne, Jana Garnett, Liz Giles, Christy Grant, Pam Guenther, Andy Harper, Dolores Howard, Elizabeth Imhof, Priscilla Mora, Vanessa Pelton, Steve Reed, Kristy Renteria, Co-Chair Arturo Rodriguez, Co-Laurie Vasquez, Sara Volle, Virginia Estrella (for Jens-Uwe Kuhn)

Unable to Attend: Vandana Gavaskar, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Jose Martinez, Ashlynn Pyae

Resource: Cesar Perfecto

Guests: Robin Goodnough

A. Welcome (93 minute agenda) Facilitated by Co-Chair Rodriguez

At the beginning of the meeting, there were 12 voting members, which made quorum

1. Public Comment: Limited to 2 minutes per speaker unless modified by Co-Chair to ensure committee has sufficient time to address committee business. Committee will not respond to comments during public comment.
2. Approval of [minutes, 4/16/20](#)

Priscilla Mora made a motion to approve the 4/16/20 minutes. Jana Garnett seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as amended (Marit ter Mate-Martinsen's name was removed from the attendance portion of the minutes, as she is not an official member of SEA). The majority of members voted yes, there were zero no votes, and no abstentions.

B. Today's Goals: Develop the 2nd iteration of the SEA '20-'21 budget recommendation.

C. Co-Chair Report

D. Discussion Items

1. Annual Budget Process
 - a. Develop annual budget building process that includes presentations and data analysis
Co-Chair Rodriguez reiterated that funding requests far exceed our revenue. He suggested having an annual budget development process beginning early next year, reviewing projects from a disproportionately impacted student lens --
Some questions, concerns and comments:
 - *Laurie Vasquez suggested new members view the "program expenditure guidelines" on the bottom of the agenda for information from the Chancellor's Office regarding funding.*

- *Co-Chair Rodriguez said, the committee should know if the programs have other funding sources besides SEA.*
- *Regarding the sub-group, Elizabeth Imhof suggested that if that happens, there should also be an educational component built into it to help those who are applying to effectively produce an application, such as what's available in the curriculum committee. Perhaps having a sub-committee reviewing proposals for DI impact prior to submitting for allocation. From there, the committee can review outstanding questions so the committee can proceed with ranking.*
- *There was concern that even with an equity perspective embedded, there will be a need for additional training to address that concern. Co-Chair Vasquez said that the Accreditation Steering Committee met and discussed having possible orientations in the fall so that committee members understand what their role is in terms of managing expectations, especially for those committees that have funding mechanisms attached to them.*

2. ACC '19-'20 Proposal (CG&SB) [ACC Original Proposal](#), [Counseling Stats for DI students](#)
Christy Grant and Sabrina Barajas gave a presentation that supported their need for the ACC positions that were approved last year.

Here are the main points they brought up:

- *The majority of disproportionately impacted students are served through ACC.*
- *ACC serves 78% of the ethnically underrepresented students; 70% of 1st generation students and 84% of disproportionately impacted economically students.*
- *In 2016, a BPA was done for ACC, and some of the main recommendations were:*
 - *Utilize technology better to identify students that need support, which would lead to developing a holistic program of support and promote ongoing meaningful relationships and connections with students.*
 - *Have support staff that would help take some of the administrative duties off of counselors' plates, so that counselors' time could better be spent counseling students who need it.*
- *As a result, the counseling department voted to move to a case management model, where every student has a primary counselor assigned to them. But, because of limited support staff, ACC doesn't have the capacity to do more aggressive outreach to disproportionately impacted students.*
- *Class Planning is the first point of contact students have with a live person as they do their steps to enrollment. The counselor helps students identify their goals and how ACC can help them with those goals.*
- *Academic Counseling's average caseload for the spring semester is 508 students to one counselor. The state recommends that there be a caseload of 370 students to one counselor. In comparison, some other programs have caseloads that fall below the state recommended caseload average.*
- *A requirement of the Promise Program is that those students meet with an academic counselor every semester. In Fall 2019, there were 1,700 Promise students. 67.5% of the Promise students are eligible for the California College*

Promise Grant. In order to be eligible for the CCPG, the income level must be extremely low. ACC serves about 90% of the students who are in the Promise Program.

- *When you tie in the support staff for the other programs in comparison to ACC, ACC's caseload numbers are still extremely high. They're above the recommendation of the 308. They have 489 with support staff. When you look at other programs, their caseload numbers are about 102 to 1. Currently, there is only one support staff for ACC.*

Some things ACC wanted to do with more support staff:

- *Utilize the technology within Starfish to have staff making phone calls, trying to get students to come in.*
- *Work with faculty to help with students that needed extra support in entry level classes.*
- *Provide more outreach to disproportionately impacted students who have an "endanger of failing" flag in Starfish.*
- *Develop interventions for disproportionately impacted students who are on probation or dismissal.*
- *Collaborate with staff in the other special programs, such as Umoja, MESA, STEM, ESL, Veterans.*
- *When Degree Planner gets implemented, reach out to students who are close to completion and give them the support so they can complete and finish.*
- *Address excess unit issue: If students meet with a counselor before they register for the first semester, they can be registering for classes they actually need.*
- *Reach out to DI students who've not completed a comprehensive Ed plan.*

Some questions, comments, and concerns regarding the presentation:

- *Would there be a guarantee that the position be specifically assigned to disproportionately impacted students? Ms. Grant explained that there are times that ACC is very busy, with lines out the door. But, there will be times in the semester when it's not as busy, where all of the support staff will be working on outreach.*
- *As far as measuring outcomes, IT will be able to help determine the DI students, giving ACC the ability to know what has been done with those students.*
- *ACC is open to training and providing professional development for staff and faculty regarding DI populations.*

E. Action Items

1. [Emergency Student Funding Assistance](#)

Resources:

- a. [AB 943](#)
- b. [Promising Practices](#)
- c. Chancellor's Office [memo](#)
- d. Ed Code [78220 \(2\)](#) In order for emergency student financial assistance to be an allowable use of Student Equity and Achievement Program funds, emergency student financial assistance shall be included in the institution's plan for interventions to students.

RB: Roxane Byrne met with Elizabeth Imhof, Pam Guenther, and Sara Volle, to work out details for the Emergency Student Funding Assistance request. Here are some points that were brought up:

- *Ms. Byrne did some research with The Foundation, and the subgroup looked at other institutions to see how they're using SEA funding to support student emergency needs.*
- *The money set aside would be overseen by Equity and distributed in partnership with the Equity Office and a representative from SEA.*
- *The request is for \$20,000 annually into the Student Equity budget (which is comparable to what The Foundation disperses each year), specifically earmarked as student aid. In addition, \$180,000 that could be resourced from departments that are receiving SEA funding, who find in emergency crisis situations, that they may have money that won't be spent, and would like to shift the funding to student aid.*
- *The \$20,000 would be earmarked and the \$180,000 would be something used at the discretion of departments as well as the SEA committee.*
- *The Financial Aid and the Cashier's offices will help with distribution and monitoring of funds to make sure the money is not negatively impacting the student's financial situation.*
- *Maximum requested amount would be \$2500 per year, and this would be for anything that could impact the student's success. Ex: ESL department who have students who have challenges of being able to pay their registration fees.*
- *The Equity Office and a representative from SEA would respond to requests within 48 hours and the turn-around would be rapid with the Cashiers and Financial Aid to get it into the hands of the student.*
- *A report would be given to SEA once a month, sharing what monies have gone out and keeping tabs on how those funds are being distributed.*

Co-Chair Rodriguez made a suggestion on #2. Since it would be considered one-time funding, the amount requested would have the ability to be adjusted on an annual basis, depending on a variety of factors.

Ms. Byrne said that because they have to write this into the Equity Plan with an amount set aside specifically for student aid, she thought it would be challenging to potentially amend the equity plan each year.

Co-Chair Vasquez said that the Chancellor's Office has not put a lot of parameters because they're trying to allow the campuses to be flexible depending on what the needs are.

It was decided not to make a motion yet, but to take this request into account with all of the other proposals.

2. Relationship Between SEA and SEC

a. [Membership and Liaison to SEC](#), non-voting

Resources: First meeting for the Equity committee is 5/6/2020 from 3:00 - 4:30.

- Liaison from the Student Equity and Achievement Committee (voting)

- Twice a month schedule and the same time on Wednesday ([SEC Charge](#))
- Nominations

It was pointed out that the committee needs to vote somebody from the SEA committee to serve as a liaison to the Student Equity Committee (SEC). The committee meets twice a month. Co-Chair Rodriguez asked for volunteers. Elizabeth Imhof said that she serves on the SEC in an advisory capacity, and she would be willing to be the liaison if there were no other volunteers.

Outcome: *Roxane Byrne made a motion to approve Elizabeth Imhof as the SEA representative to the SEC. Priscilla Mora seconded the motion. There were 13 yes votes, zero no votes, and no abstentions. The motion passed.*

3. [2020-2021 budget](#),

a. Determine one time allocation categories

Co-Chair Rodriguez asked if anyone wanted to make a motion that everything would be considered a one-time fund with the exception of permanent labor.

Priscilla Mora made a motion to support that budgets need to be examined every year and any allocations that are made are one-time. Andy Harper seconded the motion.

Some questions, concerns, and comments:

- *There was a request to hear from departments that would be impacted by this.*
 - *Christy Grant said that if ACC's adjunct faculty were reduced significantly, they couldn't sustain their caseload management system.*
 - *Roxane Byrne said the impact on Equity would be dramatic, as it would devastate some of their most essential programming, particularly the Food Pantry and the two centers. If her hourly budget was reduced, she would put in a request for a second full-time person.*
 - *Robin Goodnough said that ESL relies completely on hourly workers. The disruption is that it's really difficult to keep good people in the position when they don't know what's going to happen year to year, in addition to the timing of when things happen. The other issue with ESL is they do not have access to any other funding sources.*
- *It was pointed out that there is a difference between the actual programs that have been identified as critically important, versus the amount that is allocated each year.*
- *There was a question about the SEA money that comes in, and if the amount is tied to enrollment. Co-Chair Rodriguez explained that that is in the process of being developed by the Chancellor's Office. They've been told it's going to be somewhat reflective of the student success factors as well as enrollment. Since enrollment has dropped, the committee is budgeting for 97% of funds.*
- *It was noted that one reason it's important to reconsider the budget each year is that some programs (for example noncredit), have been actively growing.*
- *Co-Chair Rodriguez referred back to Discussion item 1A to explain that if the SEA Budget process begins in December and concludes in March. By march, every SEA funded department (activity) would know their allocations for the*

following fiscal year. They would have between March and the end of June to plan accordingly.

- *There'll be a rubric that the committee would approve and then they would go through the process.*
- *A question was asked if there will be a review at some point of the permanent positions that are currently funded through SEA and their fit with SEA funding. Co-Chair Rodriguez said that ultimately, the committee will make recommendations on allocations and resources. Typically the committee will make the recommendation to the EVP, and then the EVP, if they agree with the recommendation, will then work with HR, the union...*
- *Committee member, Dr. Mora clarified that her motion was limited to non permanent labor expenses.*
- *There was a question as to whether the same rubric would be used for permanent staff and employees vs. programming or hourly labor. Co-Chair Rodriguez said that would be something that the committee would have to figure out.*

Outcome: *The committee was reminded of the motion Priscilla Mora made and Andy Harper seconded. Once again, her motion was that all non-permanent employee funding be reviewed every year and that any allocations recommended for 2020-21 would be considered one-time funds, contingent upon the future year's review. For the vote, there were 8 yes votes, 3 no votes, and no abstentions. The motion passed.*

- b. *Determine new permanent employees position(s) to SEA budget*
There are proposals to increase permanent staff in the SEA budget. That's something committee members will have to weigh as to how that's going to impact everything else, the hourly positions and programming.
- c. *Determine carry over allocation*
Cesar Perfecto explained that there is \$1 million projected for the carryover that was based on savings for this year from the regular operating fund, plus \$438,000 that is still available in the operating fund that has not been allocated.

In Co-Chair Rodriguez' email, he recommended that \$400,000 be allocated this year, \$300,000 the following year, \$200,000 the year after that, and in the fourth year, \$100,000. In looking at what's being requested, the sheet includes the call for proposals. There is nearly \$1 million that's being requested, and that doesn't include the potential new staff for Equity, or the Admissions & Records increase for a full-time employee. Even if the new permanent staff were removed, there would still be \$722,000 in requests.

Some questions, comments, and concerns:

- *A question was asked regarding whether the funds go up and down from year-to-year. Mr. Perfecto explained the money received for the SEA fund is out of apportionment, which is based on the student-centered funding formula: 70% enrollment, 20% equity-based, and 10% success-based. He added that*

PERS is going from about 20% to about 26% over the next 6 years. In addition, the state has a cap of 10% on apportionment.

- *Liz Giles noted that she didn't see the two hourly positions that are now being overseen by Admissions & Records on the chart. Mr. Perfecto said that one of the positions was not funded by SEA, but rather the Strong Work Force grant. He would look into the other position once Ms. Giles provided him some information.*
- *There was a request for information on each of these proposals for how the programs would be impacted if funding was reduced to 50% or 43%.*
- *Co-Chair Rodriguez asked if anyone wanted to make a motion to allocate funds out of next year's expected carryover, noting it was different from the \$200,000 that was already approved for one-time proposals.*

Outcome: *Dolores Howard made a motion to allocate \$500,000 to this year's carryover. Sara Volle seconded the motion. There were 12 yes votes, zero no votes, and no abstentions. The motion passed.*

d. [Hold harmless for "operational" expenses](#) and confirm [Rubric](#) tool for "ongoing" allocations

*Co-Chair Rodriguez explained that **hold harmless** is from the Chancellor's Office, this is a means to fund past activities/department with the lower amount between this year's and next year's request. Hold harmless will allow a transition period for departments that are not explicitly working towards addressing DI goals.*

Co-Chair Rodriguez showed the spreadsheet which shows that there is about \$1million in requested proposals. He said to keep in mind, though, there are some permanent positions in there, so that will make the number bigger. He asked the members how they want to rank these requests.

Some questions, comments and concerns:

- *Andy Harper said that since there is funding for the noncredit hourlies through the end of this fiscal year, Co-Chair Rodriguez could take \$5,000 off of his proposal.*
- *Dolores Howard thought that the committee is most familiar with the rubric used to rank proposals last time, and that it made the most sense to use that same rubric.*
- *There was a request to hold harmless positions for funding that were previously funded last year (assuming that they have not increased). Those would be separate from new requests.*
- *There was a request to give positions that had "dropped off the map for one reason or another" first consideration*
- *Kristy Renteria pointed out the Enrollment Services hourly for \$35,000 was either listed twice or listed incorrectly. Co-Chair Rodriguez realized it was listed twice, so he deleted the extra one.*
- *There was a request to have proposals show how many students they serve. Roxane Byrne noted that some disproportionately impacted populations may be relatively small, but are vastly important to serve. Column "M" was added to include how many students are served and how many DI students are served. Previously ranked proposals would not be re-ranked. Only ones that haven't been ranked will be ranked.*

- *Roxane Byrne will work with Co-Chair Rodriguez and Cesar Perfecto to make Ms. Byrne's funding requests clear.*

Follow-up: *Co-Chair Rodriguez said he will work on fixing the spreadsheet, and create the different tabs for everyone, including new members Kristy Renteria and Steve Reed. He would like to give everyone a week to rank them before the May 7th meeting.*

F. Next Meeting Agenda 5/7, 3-4:30pm, Topics/homework,

G. Adjourn

The meeting ended at 6:46 p.m.

References

1. [AP 5050 \(draft\)](#) pending BPAP approval
 2. [Norms and Membership Expectations](#)
 3. [SEA Robert's Rule of Order](#)
 4. [Program expenditure guidelines](#)
- a. SEA in Support of Vision for Student Success [presentation](#) (pg 9-10)
 1. [SEA Purpose](#)
 1. Approved [2019-2020 SEA budget](#)
 1. [SEA education code](#)
 1. [Vision for success reference](#)
 1. [SEA Membership](#)
 1. [SEA Labor Expenses](#)
 1. Proposals made in response to committee queries.
 - a. Counseling Proposal: ACC [Coordinator Position](#), ACC [Technician Position](#)
 - b. Tutorial [Proposal](#)