

AGENDA & NOTES  
Consultation Council  
Thursday, October 21, 2010  
Chancellor's Office, Rm 3A and B  
9:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.  
1102 Q Street, 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811

The items on this agenda will be discussed at the upcoming Consultation Council Meeting

Added SB 1440 to agenda (last item)

1. September 16, 2010 Meeting [Summary](#)

2. State Budget Update

Eric Skinner reports. See **BUDGET UPDATE** document (attached to email message) which includes all the changes. No COLA, basically we have \$126 million for enrollment which is a 2.21 percent increase, but the payment is deferred, funding us after the fact. SB 70 is outside of flexibility and was increased by \$20 mill to \$68 mill. Are the deferrals more likely to be cut? Eric thinks it is easy to defend and will not be cut. Discussion of the continuing cuts to categoricals. Eric says we will not see full restoration for awhile. Question is how do we increase completions, keep open access, and yet not have the funding to provide adequate student services support.

3.39% decrease in workload last year, now up 2.21, so we are 1% less than we were in 2008-09.

Discussion of what sort of campaign we can do. Some sort of full court press at all levels of local government. Make a more aggressive case to the public. Why are we not doing PSAs? What internal changes can we make? We are commended for not having any district go bankrupt.

Issues of access and success: The access message was heard, but the success was not. Success is a more difficult message to communicate since there is not one solution (categoricals for student services, BSI, etc).

3. Faculty Obligation Number ([Digest](#))

Chancellor's Office will be making a recommendation to the BOG. The FON is in regulation (Title V). The goal is 75% of courses taught by FT faculty. As a system, we interpreted this via the FON. The number goes up each year in terms of FTES increases. There is an exception if the BOG feels that there are insufficient funds to support this. In the 2009-10 and 2010-11 years, the BOG has determined there are insufficient resources and the FON has been frozen at the 2008-09 level.

Must look at 2010-11 budget in order to understand if it supports hiring in the spring to make a FON increase for next year.

When the FON is frozen, must still maintain the same number of full-time faculty, OR maintain the same percentage of FT as in the previous year. Therefore, you could be cutting FT and PT, and as long as you maintain the percentage, you are ok.

We have nearly 17,000 FT in the system and about 40,000 PT.

CTA, CFE and FACCC speak to hiring at least SOME FT this coming spring. They feel that if we don't continue to hire, the system will become unsustainable – over reliance on PT faculty. Senate also speaks in favor.

CCLC does not agree that we have resources to support increasing the FON.

Chancellor Scott states that we agree we need FT faculty. There is no question about the value of the goal. The problem is that the State is not funding the goal. We have no more money this year since the growth is going to be paid NEXT year due to the deferral. We are not talking about a reduction in FON. This year more classes were taught by FT than last year, since we reduced offers to PT faculty given the workload reductions. Placing another mandate on the districts to hire FT will not help the deep cuts in categoricals. Additionally, the costs of FT are going up (benefits) but there has been no COLA to support this. The colleges must decide now will they increase funds to categoricals or will they be mandated to have to hire more FT faculty?

FACCC: The statewide average is 58.5% FT. But this includes the overload the FT teach so this percentage is inflated. Thinks that districts that have 8% or more in reserves should hire faculty. The average reserve percentage in the system is 14%.

4. Proposed Regulations Change for Center and College Funding ([Digest](#))

Ambiguity as to when you are funded when you open a center or a new college is accredited. Centers were funded in the year they opened, but colleges were in the year after. Therefore, a bifurcated model was created between centers and colleges. CBOs were consulted and they reached consensus that funding for BOTH come in the next year.

This is a first read. Going to BOG in January.

CEO's support the Digest and the proposal to fund the next year. CCLC also supports this.

5. Government Relations Update

State wrap up distributed. See **November 2010 State Legislative Update and Legislative Matrix 2010** (attached to email message). Gives all veto information. All the compensation bills that were introduced were all vetoed.

The legislative taskforce was convened this week, Monday. The question is what can we do, we have momentum behind us, but we have severe fiscal constraints.

Consultants thought the inter-segmental legislative advocacy was extremely effective. We need to pursue ideas that streamline and make more efficient use of resources, as well as those that are student-centered (such as completion). Consultants also stated that we need to improve in communicating our story.

Proposals of the taskforce:

**Common assessment:** want to make sure that common assessment is built upon the K-12 and CSU. But the language was not strong enough and the bill was vetoed. There is still strong interest. There were no negative votes in the legislature. We need to reintroduce and it will not be a pilot but a program to allow colleges who use it to save money by not having to pay for the assessment packages they are paying for now.

**E-transcripts** discussed. 40% of all colleges are on e-transcripts. When it first started there were mini-grants – about \$5 start-up cost. But the savings are huge. What do we need to get all the colleges to convert? Most CSU are participating but not very many UCs. This should be another intersegmental issue. Technically don't have to have a bill but this might be a good one to show how well we are working together and helping students. CSSO rep would like to discuss with constituencies but does not think we should put operational things into legislation.

**Continuous appropriations and property tax backfill.** Probably will not get these, but bringing up these discussions in the legislature will allow us to keep the dialogue going.

**Federal Relations:** Update summarizes the grants that came out of the Summit. The Gates foundation grant is being looked at closely (Completion by Design). Dept of Ed thinks that if CA comes in applying for grants in an organized way we might get up to \$20 million. The Chancellor's Office wants to help coordinate regions to work together on this so we don't have districts competing against one another.

Looking at a federal proposal for CA CCC's. Last year we had a \$5 million earmark for veterans. This year we are looking for assistance with financial aid. Our students are not all taking advantage of federal financial aid and are not completing the FAFSA. How do we reach out to students that are not applying for anything? We will be looking for either grant opportunities or earmarks.

6. Title 5 Regulation, International Baccalaureate ([Digest](#))

Tabled.

7. Student Senate Report

Day of Action was October 7<sup>th</sup> and General Assembly will be next week in San Diego.

8. SB 1440

No guarantee for a specific CSU campus or major, but students with an SB 1440 transfer degree will receive priority for a similar major at their local CSU campus. The CSU has an operational definition of "local campus", but the law does not enshrine the CSU definition. Challenges will be defining what is "similar" and what is "local."

CSU and CCC faculty have been in conversation about this since last spring -- in earnest, since August. Faculty are advocating for a statewide, coordinated approach.

C-ID is the foundation for the first set of "model major curricula." At least 20 disciplines are meeting this year and defining the model curriculum. Drafts will be vetted online so that CCC and CSU faculty can see it and make changes. Once it is adopted, it will be given to the Chancellor's Office as well and there will be an expedited approval process. This is being called: TMC (transfer model curricula). 14 disciplines have already met.

Double-counting is encouraged for developing the models and there will be recommendations to boards to allow and encourage double-counting. Double-counting means being able to count one course for both the major and the GE pattern.

Each TMC has a major "core" which is a minimum of 6 units. There will be a list of additional courses to add to the core to equal 18 units for the major. The additional course lists allow flexibility at the local CCC.

For impacted majors, the impacted GPA criterion at the CSU has priority. Once a student meets the GPA and has the SB 1440 degree, they will then have priority for the local CSU in that major. But if the student doesn't meet the impacted GPA requirement, they are guaranteed into the CSU but not the local and not necessarily in the specific major.

There cannot be any extra local courses added for impacted degrees.

The oversight taskforce (Pam Deegan serving for CCCCIO) is in place and will be meeting November 2.

Faculty need to go on the C-ID website and get on their discipline listserv ([www.c-id.net](http://www.c-id.net)). They need to provide input to the draft TMC and volunteer to help with statewide C-ID and 1440 work and groups ([info@ascc.org](mailto:info@ascc.org)).