

AGENDA
Consultation Council
Thursday, January 20, 2011
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.

Board of Governors update from Steve Bruckman:

Title V proposed changes for College funding formula and EEO moved forward at BOG meeting last week with no comment. However, the Title V proposed changes for the FON relating to parcel taxes and Pre-reqs generated considerable testimony. All of these proposed changes will be coming back to the BOG in their March meeting for action.

The Board discussed their goals: Continue to work with State Board of Ed; Focus on advocacy with new legislature and administration; and, Continue to work on the Veterans' initiative.

1. **November 18, 2010** and **December 16, 2010** Meeting Summary's are accepted as is with no comment

2. **State Budget Update**

DAN TROY is introduced. Dan joined the office as Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Policy (Tuesday was his first day).

Dan presents budget report which is the same summary we have seen several times (no new news). See 9 points below.

(1) No mid-year cuts

(2) \$400 million cut

(3) Student fee increase of \$10 to \$36/unit

(4) 1.9% enrollment growth funded by the increase in student fees

(5) Additional \$129 million inter-year deferral (brings total CCC inter-yr deferrals to \$961 million)

(6) No further cuts to categorical

(7) Categorical flexibility extended through 2014 – 2015

(8) Modest downward adjustments in property taxes and student fee revenues for 2011-12 -- General fund adjusted to offset.

(9) Assumption that voters will approve a \$12 billion revenue increase in June election

BUDGET REPORT COMMENTS:

Dan states that we are trying to explain that this budget assumes we can grow while suffering a base cut and that this assumes greater efficiency, but CCC's are basically at the limit of efficiency improvements.

Governor is trying to set the example that everything needs to be squeezed (such as cell phones from state workers) and has cut his own budget by 25%. Skinner explains that Governor is walking a tight line as he is trying to increase efficiencies and campaign for the revenue increases.

Chancellor Scott does not think that a change in census date, for apportionment purposes, is likely. SB 1143 included this originally and it was taken out and the amended bill is a good faith effort to improve success rate. He does not think that the legislature as a whole is content with the census change idea.

Scott says we will ask for a workload reduction if there is the \$400 million cut. He states we need to argue against the growth. We cannot continue to do more with less. We went from 29 to 31 average class size as a system. This was done largely on the backs of faculty and represents a significant productivity increase. With no COLA for three years and a steady decline in funding, we cannot continue to try to grow. Trying to now change the census date is premature and not well thought out.

Scott states that the most difficult thing is the \$400 million cut. We will be 8 – 10% fewer dollars per student than three years ago if we keep the workload at the same level.

Dan says that this budget may be the best case scenario. All the other news out there would mean even more severe cuts.

Brown wants the reductions in place by the beginning of March and then he will campaign for the revenues. If the revenues fail, then we will start with further reductions. First discussion on higher ed is next week, so things are moving much more quickly than normal.

All CCC are experiencing fewer personnel in all categories compared to students.

Every district is looking at different, local options that make the most sense for them.

Scott states that registration data shows that over 95% of all classes were filled to capacity with 100,000's of students on wait lists. To suggest we are inefficient is not supported by the data.

Unions are speaking in favor of workload reductions. As a system we need to make the case that there are not a lot of inefficiencies out there.

However, if we educated 200,000 students with no funding (as we did last year), then that suggests that we CAN take a cut.

Scott said that going over cap by 2 – 3% was not a big problem (classes are just more full) but if you go over by 10%, then you need to cut offerings, as you are fiscally “too aggressive” and there is the greater likelihood of unsustainability.

Scott reiterates that the legislative intent is that we do not cut CTE, transfer and basic skills. This is triage. If we are able to get a workload reduction, then we must do triage and cut out the adult aerobics and provide transfer and CTE for unemployed, etc. Scott is again stating that we should not be offering courses that people can take at the athletic club.

CEO rep states that President Udall (UC) would like all freshmen and sophomores start at the CCC's allowing the UCs to preserve their resources. Should we be working together with the UC system?

Timing questions: we need to get catalogs out, schedules, faculty assignments...how do we develop a budget right now?

We as a system are at a cross-road. We will be attacked by the public for making cuts. We need to be prepared to make a case to the public so they do not turn on us, but rather we need them to support us.

Suggestion to have an op ed from the chancellors of each segment (CCC, CSU, UC) lay out the choice that the public has. We also need to make sure that every student is registered to vote.

Skinner thinks that Brown is counting on massive March 15 notices going out to force the public to vote for the tax increases. But we need to plan on “PLAN B” of NO increase in taxes and further reductions. We need to continue to educate the public. We need to put the reality of Plan B out there.

Trustee rep states: It is extremely difficult for locally elected trustees to cut any programs. It is most likely that older, more conservative people that vote. So we need to get more information out that we cannot offer classes to incoming freshmen to support these trustees.

Lay states that he is very skeptical about the tax increase and there is even a racism component. What are we doing for the workforce? The kids coming out of high school need to be educated as the key to our future.

Proposed fee increase: FACCC feels that this is a slippery slope and that we will see fee increases each year.

Student response is that the students are asking for no fee increase.

3. Government Relations Update

Marlene Garcia presents.

Of interest: all eyes on budget. The fast track budget process is getting in the way of what normally is the policy build up.

We are going to need to make sure our policy friends understand the implications of the budget (including the census change that is proposed). Key is to have main thrust of advocacy next month.

Key legislation:

Series of bills dealing with AB 540 students:

(1) AB 130 is the California Dream Act of 2011 exempting AB 540 students from non-resident tuition at CCC & CSU.

(2) AB 131 allows AB 540 students to receive Cal Grants.

(3) AB 26 illegal immigrants – replicates the legislation that was enacted in AZ.

(4) AB 63 would repeal AB 540 and direct those resources to veterans.

AB 2 Higher Ed Accountability bill (same as last year). We need to pay attention a commission that will be formed and announced with higher education goals...need to continue to monitor.

AB 91 financial aid (same as last year that got vetoed). CCC is aggressively trying to find funds to pilot financial aid programs to increase student participation.

The proposed budget cuts are not going to lead to efficiencies; they are going to CUT ACCESS. Therefore, we need to get the message across that we are now making a choice of reducing access.

Common assessment and e-transcripts bills are two pieces of new legislation that we as a system are asked to get behind. These will bring system-wide savings.

Asked to participate in the BOG and Chancellor's Advocacy day: March 8, 2011. Must RSVP by Feb 14th.

Urge PIOs to identify local legislators and opinion makers who can help make our case.

Marlene suggests a subcommittee to draft talking points.

We also have the budget facts communication that is being distributed to the press.

We need to add CTE to our advocacy plan. We need to emphasize the job component.

What is our plan for the anti-AB 540? Scott states that we will be vigilant but he thinks that this bill is a non-starter and doesn't think it will even get out of committee.

4. Report from the Accreditation Task Force

Scott gives a brief history: The Consultation Council has formed the taskforce (nearly two years ago), surveys have been conducted, recommendations have been made and these recommendations were accepted. There was some difficulty in meeting with the ACCJC. First denied, and then decision taken to allow only a 5 minutes presentation.

Scott continues:

Our approach was collaborative. We thought that the process to select commissioners was not as open as it should be.

Since we were rebuffed, we filed a complaint with the Department of Ed. DOE stated 4 violations and ACCJC did change its selection procedures in response.

Secondly, we discovered that the RP group was also doing a study of accreditation. They are now coming out with their report. FINAL report is coming out in two weeks. RP report questions if WASC would consider a merger of their two commissions (they are the only regional association that has this separation).

COMMENTS:

Jane Patton and Renee Kilmer (taskforce members) report on their perspectives and we all acknowledge that something has started, but CIO rep reiterates that we want more directed training, in agreement with the RP group's findings.

Bruckman reports that the ACCJC met last week (Tues – Thurs). Everything on the agenda was voted on and passed including ALL bylaw changes. Right now they are getting the letters out to those that did self-studies in October.

Scott states that there has been some information gathering about combining the WASC and ACCJC and it would require a sub change, but it would be hard to do so if ACCJC was to resist this type of change. Scott does not believe that there is any enthusiasm of the Commission's staff to merge.

The task force will be meeting with Judy Eaton of CHEA. We want to support reducing the number of subcomponents to the standards. We want to keep the taskforce to keep pursuing their work.

We need to keep looking and see what the changes are, if any, hoping for some, from the ACCJC.

Selection of commissioners has changed, training improvements have started, and the number of sanctions have decreased, so it looks as though there has been some movement.

5. Hands Across California ([PowerPoint](#))

April 17, 2011 is the date for the "Hands Across" event. (We are the World and Hands Across America...same organizer that they are using for the CA event.)

This is the 25th anniversary of Hands Across America and is linked to the Osher gift (trying to get the donations up for our 50% part of the deal). Student Senate is working to help reach out to all students in the state. Student interns will be hired to help work on this and rally students to join. Have a look at the PPT.

Quincy Jones just signed on board to support this project, and they are working to engage other celebrities to join.

We want to bring to focus to the fact that we are the single largest educational system in the world.

An opportunity to work collaboratively, and come together to create the single largest media event we could even contemplate.

The sprint now is to drive people to the website and get people to sign up. Goal is to drive participation. Everything falls into place if you can fill the line. They feel they need 1.5 million to participate.

Will have three contests: one for theme song, one for the day of the event photo contest and video contest.

6. Student Senate Report is very brief, they want to add their support for the Hands Across California event.

7. Other: Student Success Task Force (SB 1143) met this week. Scott feels it was a very profitable beginning with a highly participatory/representative set of members.