

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES  
CHANCELLORS OFFICE**

1102 Q STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95811  
(916) 445-8752  
<http://www.cccco.edu>

**AGENDA & NOTES  
Consultation Council  
Thursday, October 20, 2011  
Chancellor's Office, Rm 3A and B  
9:30 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.  
1102 Q Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811**

(These are Melinda Nish's notes and do not represent official minutes.)

1. **August 18, 2011 meeting [summary](#) (Revised) approved.**
2. **September 15, 2011 meeting [summary](#) approved.**
3. **Community College Association Commercials** -- Ron Norton Peel demonstrates four commercials. They have already been aired in both Northern and Southern CA. The theme is "did you know?"
4. **Student Success Task Force Update** -- Two SSTF members are present -- Melinda Nish and Rich Hansen. Exec VC Erik Skinner and Chancellor Jack Scott are not in attendance at today's meeting. This is a standing agenda item. The recommendations are out and are in review now.

Dan Troy reports on the hearing of the Ed subcommittee yesterday. There were quite a few CalWORKS and CARE supporters that opposed the category block grant recommendation.

A general concern is expressed about the cost of the recommendations, they are not cost neutral. Additionally, a general concern is that there is not enough time to vet the recommendations. Melinda Nish states that the cover letter may have been misleading as it seemed to state all feedback needed to be received by November 9th. Steve Bruckner states that feedback will continue past November 9th when the SSTF next reconvenes. Melinda Nish states that this is her understanding too.

The BOG will hold a special meeting in San Diego just on the topic of the SSTF recommendations and may hold another prior to the BOG January meeting. The San Diego meeting will take place at the Holiday Inn on the Bay from 1 to 5 pm December 1st. A question is raised concerning budget priorities-- will these be revisited in terms of the final SSTF recommendations coming out of the BOG? Dan says we will have to see. He adds that we need to discuss when it is a good time to implement any of the final recommendations.

Rich Hansen for CCCCI states that the new PPT is better and more neutral...not so critical. He hands out a resolution (see CCCCI response to SSTF attached). This lists concerns, including: the process is

too fast; the recommendations do not emphasize the need to increase funding; the recommendations do not recognize the need to hire more counselors and this should not shift to paraprofessionals.

CCA has prepared a detailed response to the recommendations. There is considerable discussion about needing to hire more full-time counselors. This brings us back to the 50% rule with the addition of counseling expense not falling on the right side of the 50%.

There is considerable discussion about the need for SEPs. There is discussion about how many self-directed students there really are. Not everyone needs intensive services. Therefore, we need to divert those that don't need these services away so counselors are available for those that really need it. The point is made from the AS that even things such as SB 1440 have added complexity, not taken it away. CSSOs feel that it's so complicated for students now that we need much more service to support those attempting transfer. Pathways are extremely complex.

FACCC states that the recommendations do not address the need to hire full-time faculty. They want to point out that there is a full-time faculty need. There is comment that "legitimate" or "valid" SEPs will only come with full-time counselors. Paraprofessionals will not be an effective substitute.

AS rep sees two things merged -- student success and system reform. Therefore, not sure that all 22 recommendation address student success. For example, how to close the achievement gap was not addressed.

A comment that the BOG fee waiver recommendation does not promote student success comes from the CCC/CFT rep who feels that this is rationing access. There is continued comment about ignoring the cost. Marlene Garcia states that the BOG waiver recommendation was not intended as a rationing mechanism. It's due to the fact the waiver allows students to have less than a 2.0 GPA. The recommendation was to help them move toward success. It's not a cost saving measure.

EOPS spokesperson speaks against the consolidation block grant. Agree with AS that this is not cost neutral. Do not support the BOG recommendation.

CCSF rep speaks about participation rates (see Access CCSF Oct 2011 attached) and notes that their ARCC data demonstrates a significant decrease in access for most populations. Speaker states that the recommendations amount to a plan to ration education. There is a comment from CCLC rep that a planned ration might be better than an unplanned ration, the latter being what the CCSF data demonstrates.

There is a concern expressed from CCA that Prop 98 funds will be shifted. Dan Troy states that this is not the intent. This is countered by FACC rep with the example that Prop 98 funds are cited within the recommendations to be used to strengthen the Chancellor's Office.

It is remarked that these recommendations are still in draft form and discussion will continue. The discussion is concluded

5. **Faculty Obligation Number** (See the FON Oct 2011 attached.) By November of each year the BOG must determine if there is sufficient revenue in the system to support the FON. The 2011-12 year has not had a COLA and has had a \$300 M workload cut. The categorical funds have not been restored, there are deferrals, and there are trigger cuts which are likely to occur. Therefore, the

recommendation from the Chancellor's Office is that we do not have adequate funding to support the FON. Discussion continues about when we will come back to funding the FON. Since 2008 we have been frozen. In the year when we unfreeze there may be significant challenges to hiring back the number of full-time faculty we need.

Conversation turns to the auditing of hours arranged in terms of AAM. There is a question of whether or not more materials should be distributed to Consultation Council members. Should we have a consultation council portal? Should we have a FON training each year in October or September? These suggestions will be considered.

6. **State Budget Update** -- Dan Troy presents but states there is not much to update. We will have the LAOs economic forecast in November and should know whether the trigger will be pulled. Latest revenue report indicated we are below by \$650 M. However, the level of the monthly shortfalls is decreasing. Therefore, the forecast will be very important.
7. **Government Relations Update** -- Marlene Garcia reports. (See the State Update Oct 2011 attached and Matrix Oct 2011 attached.) There are a large number of bills that have been approved. These include AB 743 common assessment, AB 1056 electronic transcripts, AB 194 granting priority registration for foster youth. There is a question about concurrently enrolled foster youth and whether or not they are covered. This is not yet resolved. The Dream Act bills were signed, AB 130 and 131. There is a question from AB 130 as to whether private financial aid is compelled to participate or not. This could affect the Osher Foundation aid. There are a series of veterans related bills that have been signed: AB 636 no date issue for a withdrawal refund if called into active service; AB 882, brings CA law into compliance with federal law and grants members of armed forces and their dependents resident status as long as they are continuously registered; and SB 813, extends priority enrollment from two to four years for vets. SB 650 was signed. This is the college promise partnership act for LBCC to allow higher priority to high school students via their "promise" program.  
On the federal side, things are still in session. (See the Federal Update Oct 2011 attached.) The House has proposed the elimination of Pell grants for part time students. President Obama has taken the Jobs Act on the road. Community colleges could receive \$5 B for renovations. Not time yet for letters of support but we will be kept informed by the Chancellor's Office.
8. **Student Senate Report.** They will be discussing the role of advisors and seeking to provide clarification. They will be meeting on November 3 in San Jose and discussing the SSTF recommendations at that time. They welcome Consultation Council and SSTF members to attend.
9. **Other --**
  - Will the SSTF discussion from today's meeting be in the notes? Since Melinda Nish took notes as she is a member of the SSTF, she is asked to share those with the committee.
  - The next Consultation Council meeting will be in San Jose November 17th from 10 am to 1 pm.
  - On November 16th, there will be a student debate of the SSTF recommendation led by CCSF's forensic team and it will be webcast.