

AGENDA
Consultation Council
Thursday, September 16, 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

Welcome from Steve Bruckman

1. August 19, 2010 Meeting [Summary](#)

No comments or changes to the meeting summary from August.

2. State Budget Update

Erik Skinner is not in attendance but he gave a full report to the BOG earlier this week. With respect to the 2010-11 budget, there is no news--still at impasse.

Chancellor Scott states that pressure from the vendors and from the community colleges is increasing. \$480 million payment is supposed to go out Sept 28. This is one of the big payments of the year and if this does not go out some/many colleges will be hard pressed to cover costs. Some have already begun to borrow since July and August payments did not come. There is more pressure for a budget decision to occur. The Democratic leadership would like a continuance of taxes already in place, but Republican leadership is saying no.

Scott Lay states that a survey of CBOs yielded information that two districts have serious cash difficulties with no payment in Sept.

Today ties the record for the longest amount of time with no current budget passed.

The BOG approved the proposed 2011 – 12 budget. One suggestion is that we promote this budget, particularly since we are in the midst of a gubernatorial campaign.

Jack Scott says he has made himself available to both gubernatorial campaigns and has provided a report to the Brown campaign. But there has been no response from Whitman's campaign.

3. Government [Relations Update](#)

Marlene Garcia reports. August 31st was the end of the legislative session. A lot of last minute amendments, some of which had an impact on CCC.

SB 1440 did pass and was described as landmark legislation. A great deal of emphasis on college completion is at both the state and federal level, so this legislation and the expected increase in degrees awarded should help us.

SB 1440 is a good candidate for a signing ceremony. Padilla is in contact with the governor's office and it seems they are going to go to LA and may go to Santa Monica (Arnold's college) or something in the valley in Padilla's district for the ceremony.

Chancellors Scott and Reed (CSU) have agreed to an Implementation Taskforce for SB 1440. There has been one meeting between the chancellors' staff members. They hope to start the taskforce as soon as possible but must wait for the bill to be signed.

Scott Lay would like to move the SB 1440 agenda item up and discuss at this time. The big issue is the local CSU service area issue and we need to involve local districts in this discussion. We need CSU to be

transparent. The way the local service areas are determined will then determine where, and if, these students will be able to transfer.

CCLC wants a commitment that districts will be involved in local service area determination.

This is one issue among many to tackle.

Jane Patton sees three areas: (1) local service area, (2) administrative issue between CCC and CSU such as admissions/A&R/Catalogs, etc. and (3) there is the ACADEMIC area which the Senate sees as the biggest area.

“Plan B” is to have each 112 colleges come up with 112 ways to implement 1440. She feels that would be chaotic and not in the spirit of the bill or what LDTP tried to do.

“Plan A” version is to ask the discipline faculty from CCC to work with their counterparts at CSU to determine what the best lower level preparation for students is. The bill states CCC is in charge, but the AS wants to be collaborative. Jane says CSU faculty want to participate (as well as UC faculty).

There are typically one or two courses that everyone agrees that all students in a particular major need to take and after that there may be a couple more that may not even be in the same discipline.

The goal is to end up with a model template for a major, which is optional. If a college adopts the model curriculum for a particular major, then the Chancellor's Office will very quickly approve it.

If there is a very unique major, then a college does their own local major and gets it approved by the Chancellor's Office.

Jack Scott: there are a lot of details, some of which CCC can control and some of which CSU controls. CSU controls the decision of the local service area (we are in an advisory capacity).

The ideal of LDTP was that all leaders of CSU came up with a common lower division requirement and then students could take that and transfer to any CSU. This was Jack Scott's bill and his goal. But the CSU faculty rather than choosing a course they already offered came up with a composite course and then wanted CCC faculty to teach something that CSU didn't teach. So rather than the CSU faculty hammering out what the LDTP should be, they all just added what they wanted and created this grab bag composite course.

Maybe now, we can look at it again. We are opening the same discussion. We must move toward more system-wide approaches. As long as we have individual deals between a particular college and a particular university, the students will suffer. The average degree totals to 162 units for a student that transfers from CCC and graduates from CSU.

There is the restriction on CCCs that no local requirements can be added. This was not well received by all colleges but we need to quit sticking it to the student. In Florida, the average is 130 units at graduation.

Jack Scott acknowledges the difficulty of implementation but in the end this benefits students and the State of CA can educate more students at the same price. We are turning students away, about 140,000 students this year came to CCC's and could not get a course. There was a 133,000 reduction in our first-time enrollments...because they were the last in line in registration.

Call to Valerie Purnell in Wash. DC: Talking about who would be invited to the summit. Right now, want to invite the Chancellor and a veteran student currently at Questa College.

Completion, financial aid, innovation and military families are the main topics.

Looks like a very heavy media focus. Biden's office and Dept of Ed are organizing this.

There is no public agenda available yet.

A full update will be provided when Valerie returns to CA. Any critical news will be sent tonight.

There are only 100 people expected to be invited to participate.

SB 1143: On the governor's desk. This bill would require a task force be convened to inform our decisions on how to improve student success and completion. We have Jan 2011 – Jan 2012 to develop something in order to present a plan by March 2012 which is the deadline in the bill.

This is to be overseen by the BOG. We must report to the Legislature but the BOG will make the decision. This will involve a group within the CCC but we need individuals from outside of CCC in order to have credibility.

When we opposed the original language of SB 1143 and the idea of two census dates that determine funding, we decided we needed to have meaningful reform, which will necessitate outside input. We hope to receive funding so we can have town hall meetings. Private foundations would provide this funding.

The League has developed a Commission on the Future. Scott Lay believes there is an alternative to bringing in external views. There are so many external voices. One way of getting credibility was to bring in all the current diverse viewpoints including Nancy Shulock's. The Commission on the Future report will be delivered to the Consultation Council in October. This will also be presented to the BOG in November.

Scott Lay would like to pursue any budget strategies as soon as possible and not wait. Particularly with respect to pre-requisites.

Jack Scott: Who will be on the task force? This will be before the BOG. This will not be a "rainbow" committee, but Scott will take suggestions on the membership. There is a suggestion for more faculty as there was only one faculty member on the Commission on the Future.

There is a lot of skepticism in the legislature on this task force. The key is to have a credible process that is communicated every step of the way. Participation will not just become a member of the taskforce. There will be a lot of open meetings. This will be an ongoing Consultation Council topic of discussion.

FACCC rep, John McDowell, was disturbed with the attitude that we don't seem to care about student success and additionally, colleges with major CTE programs will be negatively impacted...and there seemed to be no opportunity for dialogue. Some of the legislative critiques just came in with an agenda and simply wanted to force community colleges to change.

Jack Scott states: The history of 1143, the original bill was a hammer instead of a scalpel. This is why we opposed it and we didn't make much headway until it could not get out of the Senate. Scott got involved and took it out of the legislative area and into the BOG. We need to keep reminding people we really do care about student success. The original bill would have left us with 8% less funding and colleges would be disproportionately affected. Also, it would force colleges to schedule to only those programs with higher completion rates.

BUT now, Scott is excited with where we are at. The intention is not to have a majority of outsiders' on the task force. There is the intent to have significant faculty participation. Scott anticipates that the sensitive issues of pre-requisites and basic skills will come up in terms of student success.

Jack Scott thinks that our actions will probably stop bills coming up next year with simple, yet poor, solutions for reform, as long as we convince the legislature that we are serious about our own reform.

If the governor does not sign this bill, and he may not, we will still work to proceed with a task force and will try to obtain funding to allow this. This is not a perfect solution but a step in the right direction, just as SB 1440 is.

Jack Scott hopes that one year from now we will have seen some important outcomes in terms of student success. Community colleges will be the key to realizing Obama's educational goals.

Scott Lay's biggest concern is that we need a million more completions by 2020 and every day we don't do something we get further and further away from realizing that goal. A lot of the Commission on the Future recommendations could be embraced right now, it would be a mistake to push off the pre-requisite discussion for a year and half.

Jack Scott says that Lay could move ahead and initiate a bill in January. And the pre-requisite issue may be solved by the BOG in the next 2 – 3 months. We are not going to have the BOG hold off on taking a decision.

Nothing will stop anyone from starting legislation in January.

Scott Lay: the League does not introduce legislation and asks that the Consultation Council has discussions at each of their meetings to move this agenda forward, such as disintegrating information in the data mart.

John McDowell: Would a task force would head off "bad bills"...is that a general assessment or have you been given any assurances?

Jack Scott: one of the first objections to SB 1143 was that it would prevent bringing reform legislation in. Our response that we would not support the original bill sends out a signal that we will not be complacent when we think we are under attack. But, we also want to make sure that we are seen as not being resistant to reform.

Marlene Garcia states that most legislators saw that the original SB 1143 was very onerous but it was moving so it indicated that people really do want to see reform in the CCC system.

We need broad faculty representation on the task force since any broad based educational reform is implemented by faculty. We want to be seen as proactive and not reactive.

AB 2682: This is the "Common Assessment" bill which was very popular legislatively. Unfortunately, ran out of time in negotiations with Finance, so not sure what the governor's final decision will be. Need letters submitted to help sway the governor to sign this.

A number of bills that dealt with compensation got caught in the Bell scandal. AB 827 which deals with CEO contracts and pay increases was modified. See the State Legislative Update (attached) for more information on this and other related bills.

SB1460, the Dream Act, which would extend fin aid to AB 540 student, but AB 1413 was also amended and added Cal Grant student aid as well.

First meeting of Legislative Task Force scheduled for October 7th with a follow up call. Marlene Garcia would like to take a different approach and use the task force to analyze the political landscape and look at our messaging. We want to emphasize student success. Even if a bill does not have a strong chance of success they may be vehicles to send a message. The Legislative Task Force will submit info item in Nov to BOG and then action item in Jan.

4. Accreditation Task Force Update

Jack Scott: task force will be meeting today and was formed as a decision of this council. It does have broad representation. Over a year of work has been done.

Jane Patton: There has been the Dept of Ed response, Barbara Beno's response, and then the Task Force response. Thinks the discussion today should be what should the task force should discuss today, what should the task force do next? One thing they will discuss if feedback to the bylaws changes they are proposing.

Jack Scott feels that Barbara Beno tried to minimize the Task Force's concerns. There is a suggestion we contact the Dept of Ed again. Scott states the Commission should not be impervious to the concerns to the people they represent. There is a high level of concern and November 1st is the deadline for the Commission to reply to the Dept of Ed and address the violations of lack of transparency and the selection of commissioners. This is a criticism that the commission is of one mind and selects those that agree with the prevailing opinions and self-perpetuates itself.

Ron Norton, CCA/CTA rep, feels that our letter was very narrow in scope by just looking at the bylaws issues.

Jack Scott: The letter of complaint sent to the Dept of Ed was the next step we took. We were not even sure we could send a complaint. It was done because we ran into a wall and could not get the Commission to allow us to speak with them and exchange ideas with us and institute some changes in response to the concerns. That is why we filed with the Dept of Ed.

Richard Hansen, CCCI rep: The real problem is with the selection committee. The bylaws are very poorly written. It allows the executive director to personally make some appointments. The revision is no better than the original. The revision is confusing and unclear. The Dept of Ed's response was also confusing. This is the problem...nothing is clear. A lot of leeway has been given to the Exec Director in the new bylaws draft. This is a large and varied commission, but with so much power given to the Executive Director, the commission is easily manipulated by one person, i.e., the executive director.

Jack Scott: The Dept of Ed response is read and states that the practice of the commission in selection of members does not promote diversity nor are there controls against conflict of interest. The letter states there are five areas in which it appears the Commission is in violation. Scott feels the response from Beno indicated resistance to this.

From the Floor: We need to make the task force appear more reasonable and make it the entity that the Commission would/should prefer to deal with. Is there a strategic way to deal bring this about? Maybe some legislators friendly to the CCC could start bombarding the commission with communications expressing concerns and perhaps helping push the Commission to want to deal with the task force rather than legislative scrutiny. So maybe we need to adopt more of a strategic analysis and process.

Jack Scott wants to have more direct collaboration between the colleges and the Commission so that is it seen as a more collaborative group that focuses on improvements and not a punitive relationship.

Steve Bruckman asks that we keep an eye on the big picture. We started out with the disturbing number of colleges that were being placed on sanctions. Then we started looking at the teams, their training, and the selection of commissioners. If we continue to look at sanctions, that has reduced, far less significant than a couple of years ago. There are multiple reasons for this and one reason may be the pressure brought to bear on the commission from the task force as well as the work the colleges are doing. The issue of the make-up of the selection committee might be getting down into the weeds and not keeping our eye on the big picture. If there have been improvements, such as less sanctions, we should note that.

Scott Lay states that we are starting to focus too much on specific processes and there is an external chatter that a pissing match is going on between the Task Force and the Commission. We don't want to go to members of Congress or the legislature...we will not "win" beyond the small things we got in the letter from the Dept of Ed. We need to watch carefully how the bylaws change but we need to watch carefully and make sure our colleges do not suffer from the Commission's wrath.

Jane Patton: sanctions were one thing but there also was the "gotcha behavior" of the commission. Jane keeps hearing that colleges are talking about the inordinate amount of time and money spent on accreditation. It's not because of a poorly run college but because of how the Commission does business. Some teams go out with one or none faculty members on them. Just because there are less sanctions, it is frustrating to say that there is nothing more to do. Changing the bylaws may or may not see any progress.

John McDowell states that as a faculty at Trade Tech he is spending 3 – 4 hours per week every week for this year as well as having done so the past year and for the years to come in performing asinine activities to satisfy commission standards. Workshops, program review, integrated planning, etc. etc. are being conducted but this will not improve student success. The real purpose of accreditation should be that colleges are serving students well. These extra accreditation activities are draining time and energy away from what we should be doing.

Scott Lay: 90% of the discussions we have been having have not dealt with these issues such as those raised by John and we need to get back to discussing these more reasonable/relevant issues.

Richard Hanses: there should be an audit to the colleges of the cost of meeting the standards. There is a fear factor and no college really wants to volunteer to the audit and admit this.

Jeff Michaels (Contra Costa district faculty union rep): The resources marshaled to meet the commission's decision (show cause for DVC) were extreme and continue to be so as the college prepare for the next visit.

October 1st is the deadline for feedback on the bylaws.

Jane Patton: overall the new/draft bylaws indicate more of a move to further insulation and a lack of transparency.

Jack Scott: Appreciates the comments of faculty and reps documenting the amount of work done at the colleges for accreditation. To add to this, the past year's average class size was 31, highest it has been, so faculty are having to work harder with more students. CEOs have indicated a sense of fear out there. There are quite a number that are afraid to speak up because they think their next visit will be harsher. He has had quite a number of CEOs who have stated they will no longer chair a site visit team because their report on previous teams was not followed. This is a volunteer organization and you must be dependent to a large degree on goodwill. There is a concern out there that goodwill is not there. CEOs bring up the topic of accreditation, not Scott, and he feels that he is getting confidential information, including the message of fear that these CEOs are expressing.

Steve Bruckman: One thing to add, this is a very, very difficult problem. There is a fundamental disconnect and misperceptions. The Commission has been advised that there have been on more than one occasion CEOs approach the Commission and thank for the sanction and say that without that sanction they would not have had the leverage to make a necessary change.

5. SB 1440 Implementation: Discussed above.

6. SB 1143 Task Force: Discussed above.

7. Student Senate Report

Day of Action is coming up. Planning rallies at UC Davis and Fresno's debates.

Look forward to providing input to the taskforces for 1140 and 1143. Will have a new student rep for the BOG at their next meeting.

8. Other: No other comments

Meeting adjourned at approximately 12:10 pm.