

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES CHIEF INSTRUCTIONAL OFFICERS
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING**

MINUTES – approved

Wednesday, July 14, 2010

9:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Executive Conference Room, 3rd Floor, CCCCCO

1102 Q Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-6511

**Renee Kilmer, Claire Biancalana (Executive Secretary), Ray Maghroori, Marcy Drummond, Randy Lawson, Dave Fishbaugh, Sharon Lowry, Regina Stanback Stroud, Kerry Campbell-Price (ACCE Representative), Barry Russell and Erik Skinner (Chancellor’s Office), Jane Patton, Richard Mahan, (ASCCC)
By phone: Larry Buckley, Melinda Nish, Pam Deegan, Deborah Ikeda, Jim Mathews (CCL Representative)**

1. Call to Order – Renee Kilmer 9:30

R. Kilmer called the meeting to order on behalf of M. Nish who was attending by phone.

2. Agenda Modifications – Renee Kilmer

The Treasurer’s Report and Budget Proposal consent agenda item was moved to the beginning of the agenda.

3. Treasurer’s Report and 2010 – 2011 Budget Proposal (to follow) – Larry Buckley

- a. Treasurer’s Report: The final 2009-10 budget-to-actual report was presented and the final result of the year-end budget was a net loss of (12,194.29). This net loss was due to several mitigating factors as follows: (1) the timing of the posting of “other income” which was reported in 2009-10 but should have been reported in 2008-09 and this correction was made, (2) income that was budgeted and generated in 2009-10 from the CCAOE was not received until the beginning of 2010-11 fiscal year, and (3) \$3,000-5,000 budgeted for conference sponsorships was not obtained.
- b. 2010-2011 Budget Proposal – L. Buckley provided a recommendation for the 10/11 budget. Several key points included:
 - i. New 10/11 budget decreased by a net of \$2,000.
 - ii. There was discussion regarding the small amount of interest the accounts are generating. L. Buckley indicated he is investigating a certificate of deposit instrument and would bring a recommendation back to the board because this instrument would tie up the funds for 28 months.
 - iii. A \$100,000 certificate of deposit at Wells Fargo matured (June 10) and the funds have been moved to the checking account.
 - iv. Discussion of special board travel - Re-examine amount budgeted and assessment of past expense amounts and purpose, establish procedures for how funds will be used/distributed. Currently many members have multiple unreimbursed expenses. Last year there was \$4,000 budgeted but a minimal amount was spend. This year Larry recommended decreasing the amount budgeted to \$1,500. R. Kilmer and M. Nish recommended that we leave it as \$1,500 but consider moving money if necessary at a later time. This account was set up because as college travel budgets were decreased, there were increasing challenges for covering travel expenses. M/S/U
 - v. Approve the Treasurer’s Report and 2010 – 2011 Budget Proposal - m/s/u
D.Fishbaugh/R. Maghroori

4. Introductions of Regional Representatives

5. Consent Agenda 9:40

- a. Minutes of May 14, 2010 Meeting (attachment 1) – Linda Berry
 - i. m/s/u R.Maghroori/D.Fishbaugh – minutes approved with corrections as articulated.

6. Election of Secretary

There was a discussion of the election of the secretary. L. Berry, current secretary was not present. M. Nish would like to talk to L. Berry. There was a consensus to ask for nominations and do elections in September.

7. Annual Evaluation of Executive Secretary

C. Biancalana excused herself from the room. R. Kilmer indicated that she is preparing the evaluation and asked the group provide input into the evaluation. R. Kilmer reminded the group of the duties and salary of the position. Board members provided feedback that will be incorporated into the evaluation.

8. President's Report – *Renee Kilmer* – 9:55

- a. Consultation Council Report
 - i. Discussion of SB1143 Lieu bill, prerequisite, and ACCJC taskforce
 - ii. Tomorrow is the consultation council meeting. M. Nish is out and R. Kilmer will sit in for her. There is no budget/financial activity to discuss.
- b. Committee Members and Reporting Responsibilities (attachment 3)

The Board is interested in understanding how well people know their responsibilities and how they are supported in carrying them out. A “best practices for serving on committees” document was prepared. Input was solicited and provided by board members. R. Kilmer indicated that she would send out an email asking people to look at the appointment list and update it. Recommendations included:

 - i. Keep Executive Board informed.
 - ii. Create a form to complete with meeting attendance (C. Biancalana will create a form)
 - iii. Remind members to send minutes or link to minutes and C. Biancalana can upload them
- c. The membership list was reviewed with several suggestions for updating
 - i. Katie Townsend-Marino replaced by Mitjl Capet – prerequisites task force
 - ii. Need a representative for Ed Policies and EEOC
 - iii. Check to see if part-time faculty meeting is ongoing – M. Bernard – will add to list as part-time advisory committee. Renee will clarify with chancellor's office
 - iv. M. Nish will attend budget meeting tomorrow
 - v. R. Stanback Stroud expressed an interest in serving on the prerequisite task force and asked that M. Nish work with existing reps to consider appointments on the taskforce and other committees. M. Nish indicated she would take the request under consideration.
 - vi. R. Stanback Stroud will be assigned to the Matriculation assessment work group (need to look at taskforce for assessment as well)
 - vii. Recommended that charge of committee be included on the form
 - viii. Include items of concerns to CIO's on the form
 - ix. Regarding committees with multiple members – will identify a lead person and have them work together with other representatives (if applicable) to distribute notes.
- d. Synthesizing issues for CIOs
 - i. There are so many federal and state regulations and laws that are being proposed, changes, etc. there was discussion as to whether we should consider having a position that would be occupied by someone who would pull together all of the policy and legislative activities going on and provide a synthesis. R. Kilmer reported that much discussion has been centered on whether it should be a person or multiple people. Should we consider hiring someone to scan issues, synthesize and report back to the Board/CIO's.
 1. R. Maghroori indicated that he thought this was a great idea but there is a role for a person to think and conceive what needs to be compiled, solicit reports and then edit. This would be a difficult task for one person
 2. P. Deegan sees it like the league of women voters because they tend to publish pros and cons – sees it as a huge task. Suggest start with state focus or have a combination of people that divide up
 3. D. Fishbaugh – recommends a recent CIO – interested in more pragmatic issues related to regulations

4. R. Stanback Stroud – two different foci – one toward board and another toward CIOs in field.
 5. P. Deegan – thinks it is a good use of resources to make it easier for people in the field.
 6. R. Maghoori – the money should be spent to serve the needs of the constituency. Would be important to have information about emerging issues and the other ongoing issues that are accessible from the League and similar organizations. There are two functional needs (editor at large and technical expert). Recommend contacting California Community College Collaborative, at UC Riverside, whose mission is to become a depository for issues related to community colleges. Caution is that they may be looking for money to do it. It could be part of PhD student work, and could have a small contract.
 7. D. Fishbaugh also recommended looking in to the California Collegiate Brain Trust as another way to work with existing organizations in which we could have the “on-call” services.
 8. R. Maghroori will approach UC Riverside Community College. – might be able to access grant and we co-submit.
 9. M. Drummond – also reinforces the notion of a recent CIO in this role.
 10. Next meeting – R. Maghoori and P. Deegan and others can bring info back to the group. M. Nish will follow up with R. Maghroori and P. Deegan and “agendize” this topic for the September meeting
- e. **Update on AACJC Meeting** - will be subsumed under the conference planning report
- f. **CIO/ALO Training**- will be subsumed under the conference planning report
- g. **Academic Deans’ Retreat**
- i. M. Nish thinks it was through College of the Canyons that a regular deans retreat has been organized and conducted
 - ii. Will wait for B. Russell to arrive to discuss further – mentioned the possibility of CIO’s sponsoring a retreat in the north
 - iii. Opportunity for deans to get together and discuss common issues and leadership issues. Panel on how to work with CIO. The deans were really eager and anxious to have regular opportunities to get together.
 - iv. Will put on future agenda and look at how we can co-sponsor.
- h. Prerequisites – see update on policy proposal below – move agenda item to when B. Russell arrives
- i. SB 1143
- i. C. Liu – concerning proposal for the funding model for community colleges to change from first census to midway point. The bill has gotten through committee. Chancellor’s office has worked with C. Liu (e.g. this has been sent in previous consultation council notes). B. Russell and E. Skinner may have more information to provide when they arrive.
 - ii. The funding formula would change to an average number of students retained at second census. Initially the bill did not pass but has subsequently been changed. It has now passed with new language which had a broader view of student success. Required C. Liu to work with Chancellor’s Office to establish parameters and the Chancellors Office has begun to work with senator. A taskforce will be formed from a representative group. Part of the bill indicates that funding would be set aside for student success. The partial funding and application for funds – was removed. Fundamental distinction is in converting community colleges from business model to educational model. CIOs need to start articulating perspectives on retention and on SB 1143.
 - iii. Many issues – extra dollars – accountability models. Patrick Perry distributed an analysis of what would happen if community colleges are funded under this new model. Higher retention rates are in disciplines such as theater, PE, drama versus many of the transferable courses – so is counter-productive to recent efforts.
 - iv. Concerns regarding the perpetuating inequities. Recommend CIOs articulate an educational perspective. In many ways “student success” funding is a slogan great for public consumption but the proposed language is counterproductive.

- v. Like the idea of connecting to real life stories and recommend looking at the USC TRUCCS (Transfer Readiness of Urban Community College Students) study that showed many of the reason for stop outs and drop outs which in most cases had nothing to do with colleges.
- vi. Perhaps there would be person on board who is interested in working on taskforce with the Chancellors' Office on this issue. R. Maghoori recommended that legislative sub committee has that mission. R. Kilmer indicated that a group is being formed to work specifically with this bill and will work with consultation members to get additional members.
- vii. D. Fishbaugh recommended Rob Johnstone.

9. **Regional Updates – (Regional Chairs) 10:45**

- a. West Central Region 6 – Sharon Lowry. Met in June. Discussed various topics including:
 - i. Avocational retention in all courses, prerequisites, and accreditation
 - ii. AB 1440 (think it will have a significant impact on scheduling of courses),
 - iii. Accreditation – there were at least 4 who were in the middle of self study reports
 - iv. Substantive changes
 - v. Scheduling cuts and how the colleges implemented it. There was consensus that all of the easy eliminations had been done and all remaining decisions were the toughest
 - vi. College reorganizations and layoffs
 - vii. Many doing more with less – discussion regarding what message that sends.
- b. Southwest Bay Region 4 – Dave Fishbaugh - Sub regional meeting (by Eloise Orrell) was held at Foothill. Low turnout. Many of the same topics as above.
 - i. Initial reason for hosting was to see if colleges could agree to certain level of cooperation on a regional perspective in the area of foreign languages for foreign language outside of usual cannon. Agreed to build a data base of offerings.
- c. North Central Region 2- K. Campbell-Price reported for Mary-Kay Rudolph – has meet with people individually but not collectively, will meet at fall conference. M.K Rudolph was re-elected as the region's representative.
- d. Los Angeles Region 7 - Marcy Drummond , no report from LA
- e. San Diego Region 10- Pam Deegan
 - i. Legislation
 - ii. Accreditation
 - iii. Transient role of presidents and impact
 - iv. Two new CIOs so sent flowers
 - v. Suggestion to take PE hours and move to other areas now such as math and other GE areas before the money is gone
- f. East Central Region 5 – Deborah Ikeda – State Center North Centers
 - i. Met in June
 - ii. Reminder to colleges who had not paid dues
 - iii. Reviewed 2010 conference agenda
 - iv. CIO academy was discussed
 - v. Discussion on prerequisite issue and the change in graduation requirements
 - vi. Discussion as to whether academic senate has encouraged colleges to develop alternate classes. Recommended that we do a survey of colleges to find out.
 - vii. Discussion of lay-off s, found that West Hills is doing furlough days for professional development days for faculty and spring break for classified.
- g. South Coast – Region 8 - M. Nish reporting for Francisco Arce
 - i. Last meeting at end of April (CIO Joint / CSSO meeting)
 - ii. Re-elected F. Arce
 - iii. Had several retirements and movements – so have a lot of interims
 - iv. Anticipate a meeting in September/October
 - v. Identifying core curriculum programs given budget cuts
 - vi. Discussion with CSSOS regarding categorical programs
 - vii. Santa Ana Rancho Santiago doing layoffs.
 - viii. Attrition – Vacancies not being replaced

10. **2010 Spring Joint Conference** Income, Hilton Inn , Financial District, San Francisco Income – *Melinda Nish*
- a. Brought in over \$6,000 from conference
 - b. Was a very expensive conference but the conference rate was higher
 - c. Was well funded and got a lot of positive feedback. Was a successful conference
 - d. Income earned in 2009-10 was collected and will be reported in 2010-11
 - e. 2010 CCLC Fall Conference, Pasadena Convention Center November 18-20, 2010,- *Melinda Nish Curriculum Hot Topics* – Randy Lawson, Sharon Lowry, Beth Smith
Honing the Core College Mission During Difficult Financial Times - Pamela Deegan, Barry Russell and *Sibling Rivalry* – Melinda Nish, Dennis Gervin, Karen Walters Dunlap, Cheryl Babler
11. **2010 Fall Conference**, October 27-29, 2010, Dana on Mission Bay, San Diego (attachment4)
- a. Normally the president, president elect and past president meet to determine the outline and bring to board
 - b. There is interest in working with the ACCJC deeply on accreditation topics because CIOs are typically the Accreditation Liaison Officers at colleges. There have been conversations with the ACCJC on joint presentations that can be made at the conference. As such, there have been some session times set aside for these joint accreditation sessions.
 - c. Melinda Nish, Jane Patton, Barbara Beno, John Nixon, Renee Kilmer – agreed to do some sessions at fall conference to do joint accreditation presentations. Do advance work on what the presentation will be on.
 - d. Agreed to set aside some time of conference. Start on wed afternoon and end on Friday afternoon
 - i. Randy Lawson , Dona Boatright, and Pam Deegan will do 411 academy – designed for new and aspiring deans. Often CIOs encourage deans to attend.
 - ii. 411 Academy is the day before and the morning the conference begins.
 - iii. Theme of section of accreditation – Beyond Accreditation: Quality Practices
 - iv. Keynote –CIO as a visionary
 - v. Two non accreditation days - Wednesday/Friday
 - vi. Thurs – accreditation would allow a one day registration for ALO’s who are not CIO’s – recommend the three of them continue the discussions with ACCJC. R. Lawson reported that Barbara Beno is excited.
 1. Institutionalizing self study
 - a. Panel members
 2. Good integrative planning
 - a. Recommending Dianne Van Hook’s presentation
 3. Data measurement, practices
 4. Substantive change
 - vii. Recommending that we discuss some of the political issues that affect accreditation
 - viii. Consider having a general discussion on Friday about a “debriefing” or accreditation.
 - e. Reminder to add update of 1140 SB 1440 and curriculum hot topics or legislative actions.
 - f. CIO as a visionary – recommend Rocky Young as speaker
 - g. Accreditation – recommend Linda Collins and Rocky Young as speakers
 - h. 2011 Spring Conference March 23 – 25, 2010, Monterey
 - i. Only CIO’s at this conference- not joint conference
 - ii. When we come back and discuss where we are in September for fall conference, we can talk more about the spring conference.
 - iii. Still looking for sponsors for both conferences – Brain Trust, Hansel Phelps, Randy Lawson
 - iv. Trying to get \$3,000 from one of firms Hensel Phelps
 - v. President’s reception sponsor happy to get 3sponsorships but ask for 5
 - vi. \$25,000 for entire conference
 - vii. Sponsors get name on program
 - viii. President’s reception – get time to speak
 - ix. Can bring materials to conference
 - x. M. Drummond -Suggested levels with accompanying recognition, some at \$500, some at \$1,000 and amounts that combine conferences, at this level you get recognition at both conferences.

12. Member's Reports and Issues – 11:30

a. Relations with For-Profit Educational Institutions – *Ray Maghroori*

R. Maghroori – distributed an article that appeared in LA Times discussing growing for-profits in higher education. Ultimately it falls within purview of each college to decide if it should establish a relationship with for-profit institutions.

- i. Focus on Kaplan – no assurance that courses will be accepted by UC/CSU
- ii. This is an issue that falls within scope of each college
- iii. From an academic point of view – do not endorse these entities as our endorsement may provide misleading information [credibility].
- iv. Often these programs result in higher student loans that would be difficult to repay with an average salary
- v. Requested a faculty response – faculty passed a couple of resolutions at the spring 2010 session not recognizing the MOU and encouraging faculty to reject at local level. Articulation officers have a lot of criticisms for Kaplan's recruitment strategies particularly their heavy sell tactics. J. Patton recommends looking at "College Inc." program. J. Patton commends CIO for addressing this issue. Concern is that the MOU implies that our public system is endorsing for-profit institutions.
- vi. B. Russell is hosting a meeting on Thursday in response to consultation council's concerns about Kaplan MOU and how MOU's are developed at Chancellor's Office. Chancellor has put a moratorium on MOU's and this meeting is about setting up a process to ensure a request is vetted through consultation before MOU is signed.
- vii. The MOU says CCCCO can pullout/terminate agreement which the Senate will encourage Chancellors office to do. J. Patton indicated that Chancellor should use the right to pull out of agreement.
- viii. Proposed resolution – "the CCCCO organization does not endorse or engage in organizational affiliation which can be construed as endorsement of for-profit higher educational institutions." R. Kilmer recommend that we wordsmith it and take to field. R. Maghroori is concerned that the board won't take the positions. R. Kilmer was concerned that there is still some unclear information and the field needs to have a chance to weigh in on the issue. M/s/u D.Fishbaugh/R.Maghroori – take forward to members as resolution pertaining to for-profit institutions and relationships of California community colleges from the perspective of CIO's. R. Stanback Stroud and R.Maghroori will draft whereas – look at existing relationships that colleges already have. Draft for September's meeting. Also, will want to look at senate resolution. R. Stanback Stroud and R.Maghroori will work on draft resolution for CIO's

b. **Update on Prerequisites Policy Proposal and Public Hearing** – *Dave Fishbaugh and Regina Stanback-Stroud*

J. Patton updated the group on the Board of Governors' meeting, indicating that the board held a discussion on the information item. The original language has been pulled and B. Russell recommended that the senate be given time to take all of the feedback into consideration and modify the proposed regulation language.

R. Stanback Stroud reported that Los Amigos of Orange County held a public hearing at Fullerton College. Los Amigos of Orange County are one of the original plaintiffs in the MALDEF suit related to prerequisites policies and practices. R. Stanback Stroud reported that several people spoke including a CEO, Vice President of Instruction, Chancellor, President, CSU Faculty, Community College Faculty, MALDEF representative, Los Amigos representative, Chancellor's office vice chancellor, Career Ladders Project Executive Director, California Tomorrow Executive Director and Community College faculty member, State senate president, prerequisites taskforce chair, parents from the public, community members at large, community college students, high school student, and a transferred UC student.

R. Stanback Stroud also reported that by in large the participants expressed concern that the changes allow for prerequisites that are fair and valid. In a letter read at the hearing, MALDEF

and Los Amigos cautioned that failure to honor the terms of the settlement agreement would result in reopening the suit. The academic Senate expressed the Senate's commitment is to student success and ensuring that students are equipped to succeed in the classes. She indicated that the Senate realized that they need to articulate more clearly their intent to be deliberate in its approach and make sure the right training on content review is completed.

MALDEF letter was read, taped and is available for viewing. R. Stanback Stroud stated that she has copies of the letters submitted to the Board of Governors from the CSSO's, Nancy Shullock (both indicating support), MALDEF and RP Group (both indicating opposition). J. Patton indicated that a Chancellor's office guideline could play a role regarding effective local implementation and what it would look like without being in Title 5.

J. Patton indicated that an idea emerging from earlier taskforce discussions included the requirement for local curriculum committee training on content review. Colleges would have to articulate how they see themselves going forward. Jane indicated that she has heard a lot of fears that faculty will apply too many prerequisites. There is development of an implementation plan with an examination of assessing number of students displaced and guarantee that any displacement is not disproportionate. The CSSO has been represented on this matter by Dick Robertson and Celia Esposito. Dick Robertson said he supports the language but had to go back to board. J. Patton indicated that perhaps the CIO's were not as engaged with the back and forth reporting. J. Patton indicated that there was frustration that Board of Governors would like to see data that we don't have. She also stated that the ongoing challenge is how we come up with processes that use content review and use the research capacity that we have.

J. Patton stated that the senate was dismayed at the concerns because:

- Content review is the way 90% of the faculty of colleges and university across the nation set prerequisites and they should not be treated any differently
- The validation process is onerous as evidence of the few prerequisites set across disciplines
- When you have students reading at 4th grade level they are not likely to succeed
- Has been an attack on faculty and is analogous to saying you can't trust them to give grades. This attacks their professionalism
- There has been the use of a lot of extreme language on this issue from those that oppose the changes.

R. Stanback Stroud stated that:

- Many of the institutions that are being referenced in the 90% pride themselves on whom they exclude.
- While it may be an issue of research capacity, it is not all together certain that validation is too onerous. The absence of few prerequisites set across disciplines might be evidence that they are not needed.
- Use of language like 4th grade reading may be more polemical and extreme than representative of California Community College students
- All need to be careful of extreme language.
- The opposition is not against prerequisites; the opposition is against a process that will not result in fair, unbiased, valid prerequisites that will have the effect of limiting access at a time when limited resources are causing the displacement of so many students who need an education, particularly students of color.

B. Russell indicated that the senate will make modification. It is clear that the process won't be content review alone. Some research will be included. And that the next steps are that senate will bring task group back together again after had a chance to collect information. It is not clear that the item will be an action item at the September Board of Governors meeting.

R. Kilmer indicated that she didn't want to give the impression that the CIO's have not been involved and didn't support the changes. She indicated that Dennis' and Mitjl's involvement on

the task force implies the CIO's support as they helped shape it. R. Stanback Stroud asked for a confirmation that the CIO's support prerequisite validation across disciplines with content review only. R. Kilmer indicated that the CIO's don't typically vote and take resolutions. She didn't think we would be in agreement right now and didn't think we should entertain a motion right now. R. Kilmer asked that the taskforce be allowed to revisit the work.

R. Kilmer requested that the CIO's receive a copy of the proposed language before it goes to the BOG. J. Patton and Richard Mahan indicated that there are extensive written notes from the task force. Renee asked for the actual language. J. Patton indicated that she thinks the faculty would want her to say that this is an academic and professional matter and they want input from others which is why they formed the taskforce. She indicated that this is not something that another group will decide. Not the RP group or any other.

- c. **CIO List Serve – Pamela Deegan**
 - i. Everyone is on the listserv. It is much more public than people realize. Ask IT department to remove anyone that is not a CIO. Maybe we should develop our own list server.
 - ii. Consider social networking technology for this purpose
 - iii. Consider password protected listserv
 - iv. P. Deegan and Debbie will investigate options further
13. **Academic Senate Report –Jane Patton and Richard Mahan 1:00**
- a. Had curriculum institute last week. 225 people attended. The day before was the SLO institute which was a big hit. Jane indicated that a lot of colleges no longer have SLO coordinators.
 - b. Legislation 1440 – transfer legislation not having opposition – would like to see tweaks in 1440 that would strengthen articulation with CSU. Seems to be a slam-dunk.
 - c. AB 2302 (Fong) is a transfer bill. Before 1440 took shape, Fong was working on it. Primarily what it will do is extend 1440 net to UC. UC has indicated some interest—state cannot mandate UC do anything but will encourage them to participate in same way CSU participates. Transferring students will receive junior status upon transferring with an AA degree.
 - d. 1143 – initially opposed (performance funding) – appears it will move forward. Board of Governors is on board and there is now a study bill and taskforce will have to convene quickly and engage its work. The taskforce has a year to establish some recommendations.
 - e. UC faculty are having a conversation about accepting both IGETC and CSU GE requirements.
14. **Chancellor's Office Report – Barry Russell 2:00**
- a. AB 1712 – to grant an unpaid leave of absence for classified employees who are elected to office. Already applies to faculty but not for classified.
 - i. Might be important to put in collective bargaining
 - ii. Concerns about bumping rights
 - iii. Concerns about ability to replace temporarily.
 - b. Part-Time Faculty Meeting – Purpose is to provide Part-time faculty an opportunity to have a meeting. They want an opportunity to have their voice heard. Meeting on the 30th will do that.
 - i. R. Rosenthal and F. Arce are the CIO representatives
 - ii. B. Russell asked a dean to attend
 - iii. Chancellor Scott had a conversation with part-time faculty who wanted a formal statewide group
 - iv. Issues are more union related and specific to campus
 - v. AB 1807 about seniority
 - vi. Won't continue – anticipate will be last meeting
 - c. MOU meeting – already discussed
 - d. Board of Governor's Meeting – present awards and highlights programs – need to identify leading instructional programs in the state.
 - e. WICHE – recommend things to do together
 - i. Emulating transfer agreements at 150 of out of state tuition

- ii. Transfer bill to emulate it to any higher education and western states and certify their lower division GE's. Interested in having CIO group participate in this discussion. Need to get faculty together to address the issues.

15. Budget Update – Erik Skinner 3:00

- a. Congratulations to Erik Skinner for appointment as vice chancellor.
- b. On budget front- no news- summer stalemate in the capital. Some leadership conversations between Steinberg (d) and Hollingsworth (r). Most expecting the budget to drag out for a long time.
- c. Overall resource perspective – big differences between assembly and senate versions
- d. Assembly – use oil severance tax (4.5 billion above governor's level with colleges getting \$100 million for economic development, restoration and growth funds – wasn't very realistic)
- e. Senate – extend temporary tax increases, delaying tax breaks, would have funded prop 98 at \$2.5 billion above governors Prop 98. Most given to K-12 and child care.
- f. Anticipating coming together with – enrollment growth, rejection of negative cola, fee increase, etc.
- g. Language changes that would have changed funding formulas for basic skills and financial aid (senate side) additionally LAO driven language to insert pay for performance by incentivizing pell and incentivizing course completion. Financial aid language rejected and basic skills pushed back to be pushed a year out to change the funding formula. Language was adopted then undid vote so issue is undecided.
- h. Question about physical education LAO recommendation. Not gaining traction or interest right now. If there will be cuts they will be looking at ways to do so. That proposal is largely viewed as a low yield investment.

16. Liaison Reports - 3:30

- a. ACCE – *Kerry Campbell- Price*. Looking at Title 5 noncredit language and the academic deans retreat previously discussed.
- b. CCCAOE – *John Means*
- c. CCL – *Jim Mathews*
Last month, there was a meeting with Chancellor's Office Staff, to discuss the Library and Learning Resources Advisory Committee; how it can be strengthened and how its mission fits current needs. CCL also discussed the financial and staff supports that CCL and the Chancellor's Office provides to the Advisory Committee. Based on those discussions, CCL plans on calling a meeting a committee meeting in September where the mission will be re-affirmed and an action plan for the committee will be adopted. Both CCL and the Chancellors Office continues to look at any opportunities that develop that would fund a statewide database purchase which will save all of our colleges at least 50% in its current database costs. Finally, CCL will be holding its annual retreat on Friday 7/16/10 where our 2 year Work-Plan for 2010-2012 will be developed which will be shared with this group at the September meeting.

17. Adjournment - 4:00

- a. Farewell and departing liaisons – thanks to all who have served. Thanks to R. Lawson for his extensive service, being a great mentor, being available at all times and always willing to step in, serve and support. R. Lawson will continue on with SAC and other duties as assigned.

Next meeting September 15, 2010