

Consultation Council March 15, 2012

The order of the agenda was changed at the request of council.

Item #1: Implementation of the SSTF Update

Recommendation 3.1:

There is a 16 member work group for this issue including 2 CSSO, 2 CIOs, 4 faculty, 1 CTE administrator, 2 students, a CEO and a researcher. Linda Michelowski is leading Title 5 work group. The intent is for this group to complete their work after meeting 3-4 times this spring. Continuing students in good standing get priority as long as they are making significant progress. 1st time students would also receive the highest priority if they do orientation and assessment with education plan and/or do their Basic Skills courses the first semester/year. Priority would be lost if a student has more than 100 units not including Basic skills or is not making progress toward an educational goal. The next meetings for the workgroup are on March 21st and sometime after April 4th. At the first meeting the group members reviewed data and research in order to define a framework for their discussion. An ancillary concern with new statewide priorities is system capacity. Most participants agree that they would recommend a phased in approach. Areas that will require additional dialogue are unit thresholds and how to retain priority for some special populations. There also is a question regarding MIS capacity for many colleges and questions about regarding how to develop student education plans in a timely and cost effective manner. Finally, how do we communicate with students on the changes that are being made? The earliest the workgroups recommendations could end up as proposed changes to Title 5 is probably May.

Questions arose about the number of students who this will affect. The Chancellor indicated that he thinks the biggest effect will be on avocational students. Other questions were raised regarding what constitutes the 100 units that are proposed as a cap? Is it per college? Independent by college? What are the exemptions we would consider and what will be the appeal process? Is ESL considered basic skills for these measures? How do you prioritize those with priority? (for example, DSPS versus first time students). DSPS and EOPS are in title 5, while Veterans and Foster Youth are legislatively mandated. What about specific cohorts groups? The actual time allowed for each priority would most likely remain a local decision.

The workgroup for a statewide Score Card hasn't met yet.

SB1456 (BOG and matriculation leg). This bill is set for April 18 Senate hearing. A set of technical errors are being submitted to fix the bill. Goal is to have it in print 2 weeks before hearing. The more substantive amendments are currently being discussed by facilitated conversations. The bill is currently in the public domain and open for comment. It has been said loudly and clearly that we work through issues and set the framework correctly to avoid

unintended consequences. It will be a tight timeline. The BOG fee waiver is a key area that needs to be refined and modified. The education goals provision is one area and the satisfactory academic progress, intervention and appeals process and the unit cap are the others. Meetings scheduled: Friday the 16th several equity groups have meetings scheduled. Meeting with Matriculation Committee and additional speakers March 29th and Counselor advisory committee April 13th.

In regards to the Matriculation portion of 1456, the term program of study seems to be the biggest problem. We will need another term for the function intended. Most concerns are around making sure we adequately express what was meant. The legislation is the framework. Students have been very involved. What happens to enrollments? Many are concerned that this may cause huge declines in enrollments for well run districts. We need better data. Colleges who voluntarily want to implement early may do so (including mandatory orientation).

SB 1062: The language is fairly straight forward but most likely there will be intent language added. This is the bill that puts the intent to create the CCCC as a more cohesive system like our CSU and UC counterparts. Chancellor Scott requested that all CC members quash rumor and correct myths if we hear them.

Item #2: Student Senate Update

Revisions to the constitution and bylaws were made and support was given to the March in March. Over 10K students attended. They are very concerned about the new Santa Monica direction where students will be charged full fair for courses also offered via normal channels.

Item #3: Doing What Matters for Jobs and the Economy Framework

What are the barriers, opportunities, ways to work this? A lively discussion ensued around a Powerpoint presented by Van from the CCCC. Problems arise when curriculum and programs are locally determined, the jobs are regional and the response is expected from the Statewide level. The big issue is how to fill the skills gap now, with stackable credentials that lead to long-term success. A new concept is the Skills Panel that is activated when a need is identified. It would include workers, faculty, employers, etc. Success is defined here as the ability to meet the four goals consider labor market needs, retool our programs to meet those job needs, adopt common metrics and skills panels regionally, and deliver that training in a timely fashion. Powerpoint available on CCCC website for consultation council.

Item A#4 Search for new Chancellor:

BOG has met and will be scheduling a special closed session meeting to begin the process. Will most likely be constituent representation but a short discussion was held to get the process rolling. Stay tuned! Special meetings will be held.

Item #4: Santa Monica College issue:

Santa Monica is proposing that when classes are full they would offer courses through contract ed and the rate would be higher than enrollment fee. In the past when the issue was brought up CCCCCO advised against it as thought statute for contract was with a specific agency. SM does not agree and they are moving forward with their board approval to offer these courses during the summer and intersession only at this time. Their perspective is that there is a need and students are willing to pay. The CCCCCO has not informed ahead of time. A lively discussion ensued surrounding ethics, the system mission, the introduction of a 2-tier system of educational availability, etc. This was not encouraged by the CCCCCO. The decentralized nature of the system makes the CCCCCO response limited.

Item #5: Budget

There is a better chance of the fall ballot initiative to pass now that the folks from the Millionaire's Tax group and the Governor have determined a combined bill. There are general fund schemes abounding to offset the revenue decline for specific sectors. As a consequence of Governor Brown eliminating the RDAs, the RDA committees are gearing up. There are too many variables and a real likelihood of more bad news. A concern was expressed about how to handle cuts in smaller districts in particular.

Item #6: Government Relations Update:

Five bills are now coming forward to limit the costs of textbooks for students, particularly looking for electronic means. AB 1441 for tax credit for education is flying forward. AB1721 prohibits e-transcripts unless you meet certain conditions. SB721 Accountability (state policy goals) bill establishes some larger policy goals around equity, efficiency, completion and workforce development. It is not meant to be punitive but rather providing the means for dialogue and an ed plan for the state's support. Probably won't be in committee until June. AB2482 Interior Design would increase scope and practice and increase the number of units needed to 3 years full time! There are also 7 Veteran student bills in development.

Adjourned!