

SEAP BUDGET AND STATE WORKGROUPS – CABINET REPORT 03.03.20

Mt. SAC Budget Workgroup Update

- Review of previous SEAP budget allocations and expenditures in progress with deep discussions on nature of the work as it relates to student achievement, equity, and decreasing the achievement gap for underrepresented students
- Budget structures and “projects” built include Academic Support Labs and Noncredit, with more following (Instruction, pathways)
- Activities such as counseling, professional development, and research will be considered “services” and maintaining department manager budget approvals
- SEAP Professional Development plan and Research Plan will be developed and contain PD and research services from projects in Student Services and Instruction (Academic Support)
- Some positions and expenditures that do not align with SEAP objectives have been reclassified to unrestricted funds (or other restricted funds) if appropriate
- Process will be developed to manage carryover funds for salary increases, over expenditures of SEAP projects, and one-time allocations (See handout)

State Workgroup Update

Quarterly meeting March 6 to provide updates on policy, educational planning, funding formula, and Annual Report. Funding formula subgroup update:

- Subgroup is active with weekly meetings and work will finish in early April
- Consensus on three factors: headcount (75%), equity (15%), and low income (10%)
- Equity factor proposed elements: First gen, AB540, vets, LGBTQ, foster youth, disabled, multiple ethnicities, ethnicity
- Low income factor proposed elements: Pell eligible, Promise eligible, college participation rate, poverty rate
- Weight of 75% for NC headcount will be proposed if CR headcount is lowered
- Chancellor Oakley communicated to subgroup that a proposed SEAP formula should not include performance metrics
- Base amount proposed for colleges

A deep discussion by the funding formula workgroup was held regarding the 17-18 hold harmless amount. There is not a consensus among this subgroup on whether this provision should be removed from SEAP legislation EDC 78222(a). Some believe there is huge funding inequity if it remains and that there will be decrease in the achievement gap or increased student success. Others contend that this legislative change would be too risky at a time when the SCFF is so inconsistent and with no COLA being applied. All were concerned about the colleges’ current staffing commitments if a new formula was implemented. A cap on changes in allocation is also recommended if a new formula was applied to the SEAP fund. The CO is planning advocacy with state legislators to remove the provision. But if no changes occur in the legislation, the formula would not be applied unless there is an augmentation in the SEAP fund.