

**JOINT STUDENT EQUITY COMMITTEE (SEC)  
STUDENT EQUITY & ACHIEVEMENT (SEA) COMMITTEE MEETING**

[SEA WEBSITE](#)

**Thursday, May 12, 2022  
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/92888839255?pwd=T2xFeUpNeEdjMjNnK3hEN3dMWjZYz09>

**Meeting ID: 928 8883 9255 Passcode: 419332**

---

**Members in Attendance:** Co-Chair Paloma Arnold, Vandana Gavaskar, Andrew Gil, Liz Giles, Robin Goodnough, Pam Guenther, Jennifer Hamilton, Akil Hill, Elizabeth Imhof, Co-Chair Brittanye Muschamp, Vanessa Pelton, Kristy Renteria, Co-Chair Laurie Vasquez, Julio Martinez, Sara Volle

**Members Unable to Attend:** Aurore Bernard, Co-Chair Roxane Byrne, Jens-Uwe Kuhn, Aika Person, Carola Smith, Chelsea Lancaster

**Resources in Attendance:** Jennifer Baxton, Virginia Estrella, Z Reisz

**Guests:** Raquel Alvarado, Virginia Estrella, Tracy Reynolds, Beth Taylor-Schott

**Call to Order (Brittanye)**

**Public Comment (Brittanye)**

1. 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.

**Approval of Minutes (move to the end of the meeting)**

**Information**

1. Review [SEP Timeline and Plan](#)  
*The meetings are set up weekly starting May 18th, and everyone should have a calendar invite. For faculty who are off-contract and want to participate in the summer, SEA funding can be used to pay you for that time. Everyone is welcome to come whenever they can attend.*

*After our first couple of meetings, we will probably split into the five areas that we need to focus on in the Student Equity Plan. You may be able to participate in the area(s) that are more relevant for you.*

## **Discussion**

1. Review 2022-2023 SEA proposals (22)
  - 1.1. Math addendum to SEA proposal (red'd 5/11/22)
  - 1.2. Does this proposal have an equity focus?
  - 1.3. Please indicate yes or no under your column (committee ranking tab) for each proposal.

## **Action**

1. Approve 2022-2023 SEA Proposals  
Co-Chair Arnold added the link to the proposals to the chat.

### **Proposals that came in after the deadline:**

*A couple of proposals that are already on the list came in after our midnight deadline, and we also received a few proposals after that. We mentioned briefly last time that we were okay to accept those that came in right after the midnight deadline given the position we're in right now with the allocation that needs to be spent. Co-Chair Arnold asked if anybody had any concerns about accepting the proposals that we received late. There were no concerns.*

*Co-Chair Vasquez read an addendum to Nina Grimison's proposal, for weekend math lab faculty supervision. The rationale was submitted by Blake Barron. Mr. Barron requested additional funds to pay faculty at the non-teaching faculty hourly rate for nine hours per week for 15 weeks per semester (weekends), including benefits. Estimate: \$9,000 per semester/\$18,000 annually.*

**Question:** *Would we not be able to have weekend tutoring without faculty supervision?*

**Answer:** *There has to be supervision. It is Elizabeth Imhof's understanding that for apportionment collection reasons, it needs to be someone who meets the minimum qualifications in the area. But for supervision purposes, Co-Chair Arnold said it could be any full-time classified person who has the ability to supervise hourly staff as part of their job description.*

**Proposal over the \$ limit:**

Co-Chair Arnold said we have one proposal that is significantly over what we said the limit was.

Blake Barron has \$175,000 for PAL STEM Tutoring; Nina Grimison has \$55,000 for PAL Math Tutoring, and \$75,000 for Tutoring for AB705 impacted Math classes. Plus, the \$18,000 that Co-Chair Vasquez just mentioned (for weekend math lab supervision).

**Question:** How do those requests fit into the larger Tutoring budget?

**Answer:** Elizabeth Imhof said PAL was established under the Title III grant, which sunsets at the end of September. The number varies regarding how much comes from Title III, but it has been rapidly increasing. We're on target to spend \$250,000, the most we've ever spent this year on STEM Tutoring. We were in the \$900,000 range at the height of Tutorial funding between all of the funding sources.

The contributions from the general fund have decreased significantly – they'll probably be in the \$600,000 range, which is \$200,000 under where we would ideally like to see it.

Bottom line from Dr. Imhof: We've got some really successful tutoring. It's been independently evaluated, and it's really working towards student success. This is funded through a Title V grant, which is an HSI grant. The design is for Latinx students, and in fact, our math lab recently won the Seal of Excelencia (one of the top honors for serving Latinx students). It's essential for student success and it's absolutely equity focused and equity designed.

It is Dr. Imhoff's understanding that the Tutorial Center is also requesting the normal \$200,000 that SEA has allocated. They decided to have the specific groups apply for the funding independently so that instead of just having overall numbers, they could be very specific about equity achievements, and serve our students more specifically.

**Question:** Do we know what the numbers are of Latinx students actually participating in the programs? Do we have that data?

**Answer:** Dr. Imhof said that is all on Tableau. Co-Chair Arnold added that in all fairness, we didn't ask anyone to provide that level of data in the SEP proposals. Vandana Gavaskar said there was a link on the application in which they identified African American and Latinx students, but it is not showing up in this format.

Co-Chair Arnold asked how the committee felt about receiving a proposal that is significantly over what we said the budget was (\$283,000).

Sara Volle said she would be in favor of funding the full amount requested even though it was more than the limit. Her concern was, what's the long-term plan for funding this?

Dr. Imhof said it is the credit and noncredit tutorial apportionment. They are working hard on that, and they're hoping to make this income-generating within the next year. They're working on some technological barriers to claiming the funds from the state, but there are schools bringing in many hundreds of thousands of dollars in this and are fully or almost fully supporting their tutorial programs. Dr. Imhof hopes that within the next year, it will become mostly self-supporting.

**Short term and unallocated funding:**

For short term funding through the end of June, we need to spend \$1.4 million. For next year, we probably have closer to \$2 million unallocated right now. That is an estimate because we haven't hit the year end, and expenses are still coming in. What we have to spend next year will also be determined by how much of that we are able to spend and whether or not we have more or less to roll over next year.

**Funds to be spent by June 30, 2022**

Robin Goodnough wanted to make sure she understood correctly that at the last meeting, the committee approved the co-chairs to authorize the expenditures that need to be spent by the end of the year.

Co-Chair Arnold said that was correct. The co-chairs are going to request a meeting with Dr. Murillo and Dr. Scott. They have received a few requests, but nothing to the magnitude that's going to get us to that dollar amount. They will probably end up having to transfer expenses from things that we have already paid for out of the general fund this year to the SEA budget (i.e. equity focused positions). The co-chairs really want to look at positions that fall in line with what our goals are and what our goals have been. Otherwise, if the money is not spent, it would have to be given back. The co-chairs are going to have to sit down with Cheryl Brown in probably a month for a whole day just to see what can be done.

Here are the proposals that were discussed after Co-Chair Vasquez read the contents to the committee.

**Kate Brody-Adams - Maintain funding for Academic Counseling Center's Hourly Counseling Assistants**

**Amount: \$75,000**

*Jennifer Hamilton spoke about the proposal. She said 90% of the student population comes through Academic Counseling. Hourly employees service our front desk, answer emails, do our chat, help run class planning. We have about 75 students four times a week signing up for class planning. Without the counseling assistants, we would not be able to do it. They are a critical part of our counseling department.*

*Co-Chair Arnold added, this is one of the proposals from last year that we recognized as probably best not SEA funded, and we were trying to move this over to the unrestricted general fund. We were successful in switching the permanent position for the Counseling Technician Assistant from SEA funding to the unrestricted general fund (as a reminder, we switched the Financial Aid and this position, as the Financial Aid position was more in alignment with our goals). The long term goal is to move these positions as well.*

*It was determined that we're saying are we okay with this being spent one time, but we're not necessarily saying we agree that this fits the equity goal.*

*Chair Arnold asked the committee if they were in agreement that this fits the one-time funding model that we're working on.*

**Outcome of vote:** *The majority voted "yes."*

**Shawna Sweeney - Funding for Disproportionately Impacted Students**

**Amount: \$5,000**

**Outcome of vote:** *The majority voted "yes."*

**Alyson Bostwick - Mental Health Clinician Part Time: BiCultural BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, Persons of Color)**

**\$50,000**

**Outcome of vote:** *The majority voted "yes."*

**Vanessa Pelton - Enrollment Coaches**

**Amount: \$60,000**

*This would fund approximately nine Student Worker Enrollment Coaches.*

*Vanessa Pelton said they are looking to separate the Welcome Center functions*

*and the Enrollment Coaching to have two separate pools. They're finding that the Welcome Center needs to be staffed full time, doing phones, emails, chats, and being the first point of contact for the college.*

*She said they need the Enrollment Coach pool to help with doing actual intentional enrollment work (outreach campaigns, workshops etc.).*

*There was a concern about the turnover of hourly student workers maybe being higher than hourly workers because the pay level may be lower. Ms. Pelton said that they incentivize Reps who stay for longer periods of time.*

**Question:** *Is this a continuation of Guided Pathways?*

**Answer:** *The Guided Pathways that Margaret Prothero is involved in is for the first year, and is more faculty-based. It is still in the developmental stages. Maybe eventually they will collaborate or there will be a hand-off.*

**Question:** *Is there anything in the description about prioritizing hiring bilingual staff at all?*

**Answer:** *Yes, we know that is critical. We would write in "preferred" or highlight it.*

**Outcome of vote:** *The majority voted "yes."*

### **Carola Smith - Noncredit Student Support and Outreach Initiatives**

**Amount: \$40,000**

*It was Robin Goodnough's understanding that they had hourly staff that were approved last year and they didn't have to reapply. Her understanding was that this would be additional support. Co-Chair Arnold thought the same thing, and she initially told Carola Smith that. But when she went back and looked, that's not what had been decided.*

**Outcome of vote:** *The majority voted "yes."*

### **Sarah Boggs - Faculty Mentor Program**

**Amount: \$50,784**

*\$50,784 for 22 mentors for one year;*

*\$500 for printed materials from the locations where they are trying to recruit students;*

*\$7,386 for the director stipend previously paid for from Title III grant.*

*This program was also recognized by AHSIE (Association of Hispanic Serving Institution Educators). The grant evaluator chose this program as the most effective one she saw of all the grants she evaluated, and chose to present it to AHSIE.*

**Outcome of vote:** *The majority voted “yes.”*

**Jeanette Chian - Bridging the hardware gap for Noncredit CDCP (Career Development College Preparation) Students**

**Amount: \$68,400**

*Pam Guenther asked which disproportionately impacted groups this is targeting. She knows it is targeting socio-economic concerns of our students, but that is not one of the groups. She wanted to know if there would be a way to make this align with our criteria.*

*There was also a question about whether these would be checked out to students or if they would be given to them.*

*Co-Chair Arnold said there are different places where students can check them out.*

*As a SEA committee, Co-Chair Arnold said, one of the pieces that we may need to add to our application in the future is if you are requesting something that impacts another department or is in the realm of another department, have you already connected with that department to make sure that your request is okay? She believes that IT has asked for no more purchases of Chromebooks right now, because they don't have the staff to support them. She doesn't necessarily think as a SEA committee it's our responsibility to say “no” to the funding request because IT can't support it, however, we need to say, “Just because we are approving the funding, this request also has to be approved through IT.”*

*Z Reisz recalled that Jim Clark and Jason Walker had requested at one of the Program Review meetings, that if there is an IT related request, it should go through the project request form or something similar. He assumes this would apply in this case, too.*

*It was suggested, because the Library gets 70% return from the Chromebooks that students check out, that maybe adding more Chromebooks to our already established system of Chromebook check-out in the Library might be a better way to go. But that's not a decision we can make, that's a discussion with IT.*

*Ms. Goodnough elaborated that noncredit is asking this because it's a hardship for their student to travel if they're attending at Wake Center to have to come to the main campus to check out the Chromebook. Speaking specifically to ESL students, it's trying to prevent students from having to make four different trips to different places to get prepared to attend their classes. She agreed that disproportionate impact might not have been addressed as well as it should be in this proposal, but it clearly does affect students who are disproportionately impacted in various areas.*

*She was also concerned that for as long as she can remember, they have been told by IT that they don't have the bandwidth to support things like this. Now we're faced with the pandemic where everybody has greater technology needs and students are using technology to a greater degree. We have some pretty big equity gaps of students who don't have access to technology, and we're still being told that we can't ask for it because IT can't support it. As a campus, we're really going to have to address this in some way, because otherwise we're falling behind in terms of students having access to technology, based on our shortfall in one area. She doesn't think as a college we can afford to tell students they can't have access to technology on our campus because we haven't addressed this shortage.*

*Co-Chair Arnold asked if we need to somehow make the opportunity to check out Chromebooks more accessible for the students at noncredit.*

*Ms. Gavaskar supports what Ms. Goodnough said, and added that it's a real hardship because not only is there a digital and literacy divide, there's also a campus divide. She thinks we need to make it more intrusive. The few times she's been there, she's noticed that the technology is really outdated. It presents a sort of have and have nots sort of thing. She is advocating for the students.*

*Co-Chair Vasquez echoed that this is clearly an institutional barrier.*

**Outcome:** *After further discussion it was determined that the committee would circle back to this. Maybe the co-chairs can reach out to Ms. Chian for more information, and ask Kathy Scott for her opinion.*

***Patty Saito - Human Anatomy Week 0  
\$8,300***

*This had been done before, and it took a hiatus, but is back again.*

*Jennifer Hamilton noted that from a counselor's perspective, it had been very successful for students to have that extra week.*

**Outcome of vote:** *The majority voted "yes."*

***Julio Martinez - Kanopy, a Video Streaming Service for Students, Faculty, and Staff  
\$50,000***

*Co-Chair Arnold noted that their intention with this is not necessarily to just support Ethnic Studies classes, but a lot of times, students have to, in order to watch the movies on their own time when it might be more convenient for them,*



*subscribe to a streaming service or have to pay for the movie. This would just make it free and accessible to all students in the classes.*

*Elizabeth Imhof noted that this service is not sustainable. She has mixed feelings about it because it is a really fantastic service, but it is really expensive. And there's no way the department could afford to pay for it. This will get us through a relatively short period of time. Because we have the money now, and we still have so many students studying remotely, it's useful to have this. But Dr. Imhof has been working with Film Studies faculty and other faculty, to move us away from either checking out video or independent viewing video so that students have access to resources that are available on the web.*

*The way this works is you buy the movie rights. You can do multiple views, but it's about \$600 to watch a movie (one request was for \$5000, but it was turned down). You can watch the movie the whole year. But then if only two students are using it, that's kind of where the problem is. It's free in the Santa Barbara libraries, so they've been wondering if there's a way to use that.*

*This specific request is really a partnership with Ethnic Studies. They're still having a lot of their classes online, and they don't have the resources to access film in a way that Film Studies faculty have.*

**Outcome of vote:** *The majority voted "yes."*

*Since there was not much time left, some questions were asked about some of the proposals.*

**Questions:**

*\* Ms. Gavaskar wanted more information about the ESL Consultation Proposal.*

*Ms. Goodnough explained that the Latino/Latino/Latinx population has been disproportionately impacted by COVID, and the immigrant population has been really affected in Santa Barbara on multiple fronts: economically, a lot of them lost jobs for a while, and they weren't eligible for the same aid packages that a lot of residents and citizens were eligible for. What we don't know right now is how many non-English speakers still live in our area. What are their needs? Have they left the area? We know anecdotally some of our students that were here before are now taking classes from Ventura or Oxnard, doubling up on housing etc. We also know anecdotally that the local workforce is very depleted, especially in service industries. We suspect that could be a sign that a lot of our immigrant population has relocated or is not entering the workforce at this time, for whatever reasons.*

*Ventura and some other colleges have already undertaken this type of consulting to identify who their market is now, what their needs are, what their ability to take classes is, what areas they work in, and what their workplace goals are.*

*Ms. Goodnough and others met with noncredit ESL and put together a similar proposal to what has been done in Ventura. They are doing it jointly for noncredit, because they overlap in the populations they serve: focus groups, outreach to current students, outreach to students who were here and aren't taking classes currently, outreach to the community and employers in the area.*

*\* Co-Chair Vasquez wanted to be clear about what the amount was for Raquel Hernandez' proposal, ESL Online Orientation. The spreadsheet shows \$5,000. Ms. Hernandez said it involves various departments, so it is more for staffing than anything else.*

### **Ranking Spreadsheet**

*It was determined that the committee would complete the ranking spreadsheet by Monday, May 16.*

## 2. Approve Minutes

[11-18-21 SEA Minutes - DRAFT](#) (former SEA-only voting members)

[2-24-22 SEA Minutes - DRAFT](#)

[3-10-22 SEA Minutes - DRAFT](#)

[04-14-22 SEA Minutes - DRAFT](#)

[04-28-22 SEA Minutes - DRAFT](#)

*All of the minutes were approved. They will be posted on the website.*

### **Additional Resources**

- [Student Journey Framework](#)

### **Conclusion:**

*As this is the final SEA meeting for the 2022-23 year, the co-chairs thanked the committee for all of their hard work, participation, feedback, and flexibility.*