

May 9, 2011

Call to Order

Board of Governors President, Scott Himelstein, called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m.

Item 1 Consent Calendar

Item 1.1 Approval of the Minutes

This item requested Board approval of the March 7-8, 2011, Board meeting minutes.

Board vice president Alice Perez motion for approval of the March 2011 Board meeting minutes. Board member Gary Reed seconded the motion. The votes were unanimous in support of the motion.

Item 1.2 Approval of Contracts and Grants

This item was removed from the consent calendar.

President's Report

President Scott Himelstein:

Attended the White House Summit on community colleges in San Diego on April 15, 2011.

Attended the joint meeting of the California Community College Trustees (CCCT) and Chief Executive Officers (CEO) boards in San Diego.

Chancellor's Report Continues

Chancellor Jack Scott:

Attended the joint meeting of the CCCT and CEO boards in San Diego.

Will be speaking at four graduations.

Attended the White House Summit on community colleges in San Diego on April 15, 2011.

Board Members Present on Monday May 7, 2011
Manuel Baca
Geoffrey Baum
Isabel Barreras
Barbara Davis-Lyman
Benita Haley
Scott Himelstein
Lance Izumi
Peter MacDougall
Deborah Malumed
Alice Perez
Michelle Price
Henry Ramos
Gary Reed
Tanna Thomas

Chancellor's Report Continues

Spoke about the appointments of Henry Ramos, Peter MacDougall and Deborah Malumed and Governor Brown's Executive Order on Travel

Met with the Department of Finance with Executive Vice Chancellor Erik Skinner and Vice Chancellor Dan Troy.

The Student Success Task Force will be meeting on Wednesday, May 9. He is encouraged by the work of the task force.

Item 2 Action

Item 2.1 Amendments to the 2011-12 Career and Technical Education Improvement Act Expenditure Plan

Presented by: José Millan

The amendments presented in this item represent a contingency plan in anticipation of reduction to federal Perkins funding. Tech Prep (Title II) funding which represents over \$11 million will be eliminated and the Perkins Basic State Grant (Title I) will be reduced however the actual amount of the reduction is currently unknown as the Chancellor's Office has not received notification of its share of Perkins funding from the California Department of Education.

The recommended amendments to Title I:

- Fully funding advisory committees;
- Funding regional consortia at 90 percent of the full funding level; and,
- Funding statewide collaborative at 80 percent of the full funding level

The recommended amendments to Title II:

- Use the ten percent reserve fund over the next year to refocus the tech prep program into STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) program support.

Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Tanna Thomas: At the joint meeting of the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education in July 2010 we talked about working together on Career Technical Education, has there been any progress in that area? Also the Joint Advisory Committee on Career Technical Education hasn't met in awhile, has there been any discussion on when the next meeting will take place?

There has been discussion but no meeting has been scheduled at this time.

President Himelstein stated that he's had discussion with the State Board of Education and will report on those discussions during board member reports.

Board President Scott Himelstein: What is the statewide collaborative?

The statewide collaboratives are community colleges and local school districts that work on developing Career Technical Education programs within their regions.

Board member Gary Reed motioned for the Board to approve the recommended action on this item. Board member Isabel Barreras seconded the motion. The votes were unanimous in support of the motion.

Board Comments

Tanna Thomas, Scott Himelstein

Item 2.2 Title 5 Regulations: Proposed Revisions to the Conflict of Interest Code of the Board of Governors

Presented by: Steve Bruckman

The Board was asked to approval minor technical changes to the title 5 regulations on the conflict of interest code.

Board Vice President Alice Perez motioned for the Board to approve the recommended action on this item. Board member Lance Izumi seconded the motion. The votes were unanimous in support of the motion.

Item 3 First Reading

Item 3.1 Proposed Amendment to Board of Governors Standing Order, Chapter 3, Article 333- Student Senate

Presented by: Linda Michalowski and Sonia Ortiz-Mercado

At the November 2010 meeting, members of the Board raised concerns about the Student Senate and how the organization operates. As a result of those concerns the Chancellor's Office reviewed the *Standing Orders* related to the student senate. The recommended amendments will provide more clarity on the role of the Chancellor's Office as it relates to the operation of the Student Senate.

The amendment to the *Standing Orders* will address verification of student eligibility to serve on the student senate, establish minimum standards of conduct and establish the Chancellor's Office as the administrative arm of the Board in providing support and ensuring the integrity of the Student Senate. The amendments will also include a process of reviewing and responding to concerns about the Student Senate.

Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Manuel Baca: Can you give me more information on the academic progress issues? Students serving on the student senate didn't have academic eligibility. Some students would enroll in five units to meet participation requirements and then drop classes during the semester, and

students challenged the right of the Chancellor's Office to notify the president and student senate council members of their ineligibility to serve on the council due to these circumstances. We were able to resolve these problems by having students certify at the beginning of their term that they will maintain eligibility and to authorize the disclosure of information should they lose eligibility.

Board Comments

Manuel Baca

Public Comments

Rachael Richards, Alex Pader

Item 3.2 Proposed Title 5 Change on Appointment Limit for Enrollment in Credit Courses (Sections 55024, 55040, 55042, 58161 and 58161.5)

Presented by: Linda Michalowski

This item is seeking to amend the number of times a district can receive apportionment funding for students who re-enroll in a course they have previously taken. The amendments would allow districts to receive appointment funding up to three times, with the exception of a fourth time for a student going through the appeals process.

Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Tanna Thomas: Do you anticipate that local districts will need to do enrollment programming changes in order to implement this?

Yes, programming changing will need to be made.

Board member Tanna Thomas: Does the implementation date of Spring 2012 allow enough time for district to make the necessary changes?

I met with the admissions and records officers at their statewide conference and they generally felt that they would have time to put the changes into place by Spring 2012.

Board member Isabel Barreras: Would a documented catastrophic medical leave be considered an exception?

Yes

Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman: Would you talk a little more about the definition of outside of their control?

In the withdrawal regulation (55024a), extenuating circumstances are verified cases of accidents, illnesses or other circumstances beyond the control of students. The language is quite broad and allows the colleges discretion.

Chancellor Scott spoke to the Board in support of this change. He stated that the system is rationing enrollment and although he doesn't like to use that term it is happening. He stated this is an intelligent way to ration enrollment.

Board member Geoffrey Baum: How much of this is someone taking a class and passing it each time whether it be an art class, physical education or other?

Of the five courses that are most often repeated, three of those are activity courses and the other two are math and English.

Board Geoffrey Baum: Are most people retaking the class because they enjoyed it or is it the people who don't pass that are retaking it? Will this also limit the number of times someone can take a repeatable class? For the student who no longer qualifies for apportionment for an English or math class, can they enroll in another institution and start that cycle over again?

If a student passes a non-repeatable course such as math or English with a C or better they cannot retake the course. If a student gets less than a C they have two opportunities to retake the course for a better grade. This will limit apportionment for repeatable classes. The system advisory committee on curriculum and the academic affairs division will be looking at the whole issue of repeatable courses and considering policy changes in that area. The student can enroll in another district and start the cycle over again.

Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman: Does this change cover every course in our curriculum?

Yes, it covers every course in our curriculum.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: Is there a process in place for counselor to reach out to students who are repeating these courses?

That is certainly the way that it should work and we've talked about interventions to help students when they don't appear to be on the right track. But it's very difficult to do that when our resources for counseling have been cut so deeply.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: I would suggest that these changes include a recommendation that colleges develop a system to reach out to students if they don't already have one.

In the existing policy the Board has already included that each district have a policy in place to address repeat/withdrawals.

Board Comments

Tanna Thomas, Isabel Barreras, Barbara Davis-Lyman, Geoffrey Baum, Alice Perez

Public Comments

Leslie Smith, Marc Valenzuela

Item 4 Information and Reports

Item 4.1 Update on the Activities of the Foundation for California Community Colleges

Presented by: Paul Lanning

Paul Lanning, President/CEO of the Foundation, spoke to the Board about the following Foundation activities:

The Chancellor's Office legal division completed a policy analysis of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act regulations and how they apply to allowing college foundations

access to alumni/student records. The legal opinion which states that Foundations can have access to student records if they go through certain steps was distributed to the college/district foundations.

The level of financial support that the Foundation provides to the Chancellor's Office will remain the same for the coming fiscal year.

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) contract was terminated by the California Department of Education. The Foundation has operated this program for the past several years.

Dr. Lanning Spoke about what's next in regards to the capacity-building study funded by the Kresge Foundation.

Presented a slideshow on the Hands Across California event.

Board members had the following questions/comments and the panel responded.

Board President Scott Himelstein: Was the TANF contract set to expire or was it a budget cut?
The contract is set to expire on June 30, 2011.

Board members congratulated Dr. Lanning on the Hands Across California event.

Board members Geoffrey Baum: Commented on the capacity building that has gone on over the past three years and how that will impact future fundraising efforts.

Board member Peter MacDougall: Are there foundations at the colleges that have raised nothing toward the Osher endowment? Do you have any understanding as to why they didn't leap on this opportunity?

Several of those colleges have foundations. There are several different explanations including lack of resources to focus on this, the idea that raising funds for scholarships is not the priority right now, etc.

Board member Gary Reed: Reminded the Board that when the Osher grant was given there was no money allocated for administrative expenses. Dr. Lanning and his staff have been able to generate this effort without any funding. He also stated that he attended a finance committee meeting with JP Morgan and they have done a great job of investing, a little over \$4 million has been earned. He complimented Keetha Mills, Vice President of Finance/Chief Financial Officer, at the Foundation and the advisory board for the efforts they have made with JP Morgan.

Board Comments

Scott Himelstein, Peter MacDougall, Geoffrey Baum, Manuel Baca, Peter MacDougall, Benita Haley, Alice Perez, Gary Reed, Barbara Davis-Lyman, Isabel Barreras

Item 1 Action Calendar

Item 1.2 Approval of Contracts and Grants

Presented by: Steve Bruckman

This item requested Board approval of the contracts and grants as described in this item.

Board member Geoffrey Baum: How is the funding in grant 24 allocated, how much is used for coverage of Board meetings and what is the rest of it used for?

Board meetings represent approximately \$25,000 of the grant. \$1.5 million goes to CCC Confer which is the systemwide audio conferencing services. The rest of the grant represents a consolidation of projects.

Board member Lance Izumi motion for the Board to approval the recommended action on this item. Board Vice President Alice Perez seconded the motion. The votes were unanimous in support of the motion.

Board Comments:

Geoffrey Baum

Item 4 Information and Reports

Item 4.2 State Budget Update

Presented by: Dan Troy (Handout)

Vice Chancellor Dan Troy updated the Board on the state budget.

1. The budget proposal for community colleges include a \$400 million base reduction, student fees have been increased to \$36 per unit and a new deferral of \$129 million has been approved.
2. The May revision will be released on May 16th. There is indication that revenues are running higher than estimated.

Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Gary Reed: As colleges use up their reserves do they turn to this agency for direction in terms of managing their budget?

We do monitor district budgets. We try to keep tabs on the amount of reserves they have. The Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team can also help districts.

Board Comments

Gary Reed

Item 4.4 Update on the Implementation of SB 1440: Student Transfer

Presented by: Linda Michalowski and Jane Patton (PowerPoint)

Vice Chancellor Linda Michalowski and Jane Patton, President of the Academic Senate, updated the Board on the implementation of Senate Bill 1440.

Vice Chancellor Michalowski provide background information on SB 1440. She also discussed the names of the SB 1440 degrees, benefits to students and some of the challenges that SB 1440 students may face.

President Patton provided a complete overview of the transfer model curriculum process to the Board.

Vice Chancellor Michalowski also reported that 15 degrees based on the completed TMCs have been approved and College of the Desert is the first community college in the state to create an associate degree for transfer. A website that will be primarily used by internal audiences in the two systems is being developed and it should be live in the next few weeks.

Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Lance Izumi: Have there been any major challenges or differences in this process?

I feel very good about the faculty-to-faculty dialogue. There are challenges, but so far everyone is working together to get through them.

Board member Deborah Malumed: When you have a college that tells you they are not going to accept your plan do you go back and change it?

All of the TMCs will be reviewed on a regular basis and yes we can revisit and make changes.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: Is it possible for each of the colleges to have different programs for obtaining the degrees?

Senate Bill 1440 did not require alignment. Technically 112 colleges could offer 112 degrees. We are trying to encourage uniformity as much as possible with some local flexibility.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: Is there a timeline that we are pushing towards for having all of the campuses offering degrees?

The law said by fall the colleges need to be offering degrees but it didn't stipulate how many. The Chancellor's Office has asked district to have two degrees in place by fall 2011.

Board member Peter MacDougall: Are we adhering to a ratio that enlarges the upper division ratio to ensure an opportunity is going to be available for our students?

The 40/60 ratio is in law and California State University (CSU) continues to honor that in its approach to enrollment management. From the beginning the CSU has said if necessary they will decrease the number of freshmen enrollments in order to make sure that community college transfer students that have these degrees will have a slot. The tricky part is that entitlement is only to somewhere in the CSU system. That is not necessarily a guarantee that every transfer student that is well qualified will be able to get into the CSU of their choice.

Board member Isabel Barreras: There is a subcommittee in place to develop information and tools for the counselors at transfer centers, what type of tools will they be using and is degree audit one they will be able to use?

We have just started the process of putting that subcommittee together. I don't have an answer for what the tools are going to be, the first task for this group will be to determine what is needed.

Board member Henry Ramos: On the bottom of your PowerPoint slide can you explain what you mean by budget cuts could reduce or eliminate spring 2012 transfers.

During the last round of budget cuts for higher education, the CSU Chancellor's Office offered guidance to the campuses about their enrollment targets. If you look at our annual transfer numbers to CSU from two years ago they plummeted by more than 10,000 enrollments because CSU got late news that their budget was being cut so the determination was that all of those cuts would occur in the spring term and almost all of their enrollments in the spring term are community college transfer students.

Board members thanked Vice Chancellor Michalowski and Jane Patton, President of the Academic Senate, for the work they have done and thanked Mrs. Patton for her work as president of the Academic Senate.

Jane Patton, President of the Academic Senate, announced that Michelle Pilati will be the new Academic Senate President and Beth Smith will be the Vice President. Beth Smith is currently the co-chair of the System Advisory Committee on Curriculum.

Board Comments

Lance Izumi, Deborah Malumed, Alice Perez, Peter MacDougall, Benita Haley, Isabel Barreras, Henry Ramos, Manuel Baca, Barbara Davis-Lyman

Item 4.6 Board Goals Update

Presented by: Scott Himelstein

Board President Scott Himelstein updated the Board on their goals. He stated that he has spoken to Mike Kirst, President of the State Board of Education, and the two boards will not be able to meet this year. The board will also need to add someone to the veterans committee.

Board members had the following questions/comments and President Himmelstein responded.

Board member Henry Ramos: Can we look at specific outcomes we would like to see in these areas?

At our retreat we focused on specific areas. With the State Board of Education we focused on concurrent enrollment and career and technical education and with veterans we focused on a database and earmarked funding to provide more programmatic options for veterans.

Board member Gary Reed: Regarding advocacy efforts with elected officials I would suggest that working with Vice Chancellor Garcia, Board members have a specific task and an agenda so we have better communication with our Assemblymembers and Senators.

Board member Peter MacDougall: Would like to request that the Board begins to increase its understanding of what is happening to the system as a result of these years of budgetary decline. Would also like to suggest that the Board set aside time in their meeting to look at what is taking place in the area of student success and how we are increasing the viability of our colleges in this area.

I would have to defer to the Chancellor to see if we have the capacity to do an in-depth look at what the past four years have meant on a systemwide basis.

Chancellor Scott: Here's what happened. Classified staff has been reduced; we have fewer administrators per 100 students than we did three to four years ago; we have largely cut part-time faculty; and, as full-time faculty retire they have not been replaced. The real infrastructure of student services has probably been the hardest hit of all the elements of community colleges. Community colleges around the state will be operating at about 95 percent of their capacity next year at the best and possibility 90 percent if there is an all cuts budget. If the Board would like speakers or a report on the impact of cuts on our colleges we can provide that.

President Himmelstein summarized the suggestions the Board requested:

The Board would like a report on the deterioration of the system over the past 3-4 years.

The Board would like to invite Mike Kirst, President and Sue Burr, Executive Director, of the State Board of Education to speak at an upcoming Board meeting.

The Board would like presentations on what is working in our system.

The Board would like Vice Chancellor Marlene Garcia to set up advocacy meetings for Tuesday afternoons.

Board Comments

Henry Ramos, Gary Reed, Peter MacDougall, Deborah Malumed, Alice Perez, Manuel Baca, Lance Izumi, Isabel Barreras

Item 4.7 Board Committees

Presented by: Alice Perez

Board Vice President Alice Perez asked Board member to give the name of the committees they preferred to serve on.

Board President Scott Himmelstein reported that he asked Board Vice President Alice Perez to work with Board member Michelle Price on the Student Affairs committee.

Public Forum

Jonathan Lightman, with the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), spoke to the Board about the budget and expressed gratitude for the work of Vice Chancellor Dan Troy. He also spoke about advocating with business partners, increasing their presence on in the blogosphere, and expressed disappointment over Robert “Bobby” McDonald not being re-appointed to the Board. FACCC is working with Board member Manuel Baca and staff at the Chancellor’s Office on the idea of a veteran’s conference in the fall.

Will Bruce, California Community College Extended Opportunity Programs and Services Association, announced that Allen Hancock College (home of the largest Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE) program in the state of California) is having a grand opening for the very first CARE center in the state of California, the center was established with private donations, and no state program funds were used for the center.

New Business

No new business was discussed at this meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m. by Board President Scott Himmelstein.

Board Members
Present on Tuesday,
May 10, 2011

Manuel Baca
Geoffrey Baum
Barbara Davis-Lyman
Benita Haley
Scott Himelstein
Lance Izumi
Deborah Malumed
Peter MacDougall
Alice Perez
Henry Ramos
Tanna Thomas

May 10, 2011

Call to Order

Board of Governors President, Scott Himelstein, called the meeting to order at 8:33 a.m.

Item 5 Special Presentation

Item 5.1 2010 Classified Employee of the Year Awards

Presented by: Tanna Thomas, Scott Himelstein, Jack Scott and Christopher Joyce

The following individuals received *2011 Classified Employee of the Year Awards*:

Trisha Albertsen, Chaffey Community College District

Dottie Arcangeli, Feather River Community College District

Stephanie Alves, Contra Costa Community College District

Susan Monahan, West-Valley Mission Community College District

Christie Boggs, Butte-Glenn Community College District

Barbara Cogert, Ventura County Community College District, not able to attend.

Item 5.3 Excellence in Technology Leadership Award

Presented by: Patrick Perry

James "Jim" Dolgonas, of the CENIC Corporation was presented with the *Excellence in Technology Leadership Award*.

Item 4 Information and Reports

Item 4.3 State and Federal Update

Presented by: Marlene Garcia

Board President Scott Himmelstein thanked Vice Chancellor Garcia for a great job with the legislative reception.

Vice Chancellor Marlene Garcia provided an update on state legislative activities.

State Update

The Legislature is dealing with some tough policy issues driven by the fiscal environment, the demand for community college education and a desire to help bring more access to students.

Key Bills

AB 515 (Brownley) Postsecondary Education: Community Colleges – This bill authorizes the governing board of any community college district, without approval of the Board of Governors, to establish and maintain an extension program offering credit courses. Recent amendments clarify that: 1) California Community College (CCC) district governing boards are prohibited from expending General Fund moneys to establish and maintain extension courses; 2) CCC district governing boards are allowed to charge students enrolled in extension classes such fees as they deem appropriate; 3) the program shall be subject to district collective bargaining agreements; 4) program enrollment shall be open to the public; 5) extension credit courses shall not supplant courses funded with state apportionment; and, 6) degree credit courses offered as extension courses are required to meet all of the requirements of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, which governs the development and approval of new curriculum for CCC credit courses.

Vice Chancellor Garcia reported that there were in depth discussion in the policy committee on the potential ramification of going in this direction. She also feels that Assembly member Brownley is interested in talking with community college leaders.

Vice Chancellor Garcia also reported that this bill is sponsored by Santa Monica Community College and the College of the Canyons but is facing a lot of opposition particularly from faculty groups.

Some of the issues with this legislation include:

The fee structure – how will it work and how would it be set.

Financial Aid – will these students have access to financial aid and is there some equity protection embedded in this type of proposal.

What should be the focus of the content that is provided in this kind of extension program?

Governance – who will approve this and ensure that colleges are equipped to move in this direction.

AB 1315 (Furutani) – This bill would establish Gateway Centers as model programs that provide adult learners’ basic skill educational opportunities that more readily lead to completion of a college occupational certificate. This bill is in response to the decline in K-12 funding for adult education given recent statutory changes allowing the Legislative Analyst Office authority to use adult education funding for any educational purpose. As a result, there has already been a steep decline in funding for adult education programs. This bill is a work in progress and is attempting to determine whether there is a way to leverage workforce resources to better serve adult learners.

Vice Chancellor Garcia thinks this bill in its current form needs a lot of work but feel the author would be willing to work with the system.

AB 160 (Portantino) Concurrent Enrollment in Secondary School and Community College – This bill would make several changes to existing law regarding concurrent enrollment. The bill:

- 1) allows a school district to enter into a partnership with a community college district to determine local concurrent enrollment policies for high school students;
- 2) permits a high school student to concurrently enroll in a community college during any session or term upon notification of the high school principal; current law requires the student to seek permission from the principal before concurrently enrolling in a community college. A student can exercise this opportunity only when all other options to enroll in an equivalent course at their local high school have been exhausted;
- 3) repeals the summer 5 percent cap on K-12 concurrent enrollment, along with related requirements and exemptions in current law; and,
- 4) strikes existing law assigning low priority to concurrent enrollment students to ensure that regularly admitted students are not displaced and replaces this with language that prohibits a community college district from assigning any enrollment priority to these students.

Vice Chancellor Garcia reported that the system has been in a lot of discussions with the author and that the author has amended the bill to allow local community college districts working in a partnership with K-12 districts the ability to relax some of the restrictions. The author is going to continue to allow students outside of the partnership to notify the high school principal if they are enrolling in concurrent enrollment instead of getting permission from the principal, because of this the Board/Chancellor’s Office has not taken a support position on this legislation.

Chancellor Scott spoke to the board and stated that we are in a time where we have to ration our education. He stated that community colleges would like to help but there comes a time when colleges have to let the legislature know that we can’t do all of this because we don’t want to crowd out the functions in our colleges that we consider our primary task.

Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Peter MacDougall: I concur with what the Chancellor has said, but I'd like to offer a slightly modified perspective. I think there is universal support for the intent of the bill but it is lacking the financial capability to implement it. I would like to see a position of supporting but highly modifying expectations.

Board member Manuel Baca: Agrees with what the Chancellor said. We've received data that shows high school graduates are not getting into community colleges because they are the last in line to register. It does seem that concurrent enrollment could help with prioritizing registration as they graduate.

Board President Scott Himmelstein: I'm very supportive of concurrent enrollment and I agree with member MacDougall. If this bill was to pass in its current form, local district still make the decisions in terms of priorities with the exception of priorities that are mandated by state law. So even if it passed and we supported it, it doesn't mandate that there be more concurrent enrollment. Is that correct?

Correct. Current law prohibits giving concurrent enrollment students higher priority. This legislation would give them (colleges/districts) the opportunity to change that when they are in partnership with a K-12 district.

Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman: Is this similar to the prerequisite policy we passed, that it was up to local control?

The part of the bill that says you can relax your enrollment requirements if you are in a relationship with a K-12 district would give the local districts the authority. The principal provision is outside of that.

Board President Scott Himmelstein: Chancellor, do you see that particular provision as being a competitive pressure on the locals that you would be opposed to?

I don't know that I oppose it. I'm probably more deeply concerned about older adults taking enrichment courses. I find colleges moving in that direction. In the next legislative session there may be a bill that deals with priority registration because sometimes I think the local colleges need their hands strengthened on this issue.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: We serve a diverse population and I think if we can help those students get enrolled into our colleges and advance themselves sooner, we should be supportive of that as long as we get the funding to help do that.

Board member Peter MacDougall: I think we should remind ourselves that this is not a mandate. This is an opportunity to change and allow for greater flexibility. I have tremendous confidence in the local districts ability to manage this so that it does not become a conflict.

Board President Scott Himelstein: I tend to be supportive of this with one caveat, this issues of receiving permission and us not knowing what the impact would be. I'm sensing a desire to support from the Board, however I know there are always good reason for the positions you recommend. It would be helpful for the board if you can provide us with more information on this issue.

Thank you for this robust policy discussion. This issue has taken the form that it has because of the fiscal environment we're in. I think the provision that says concurrent enrollment should be done as a partnership is a significant improvement in the policy. The issue is, should any student outside of the partnership be allowed to decide whether they should be taking concurrent enrollment classes. That is the reason we did not support it. I will be happy to come back with more information on the impact of the permission provision of the legislation.

AB 684 (Block) Community College Districts: Trustee Elections – This bill would allow community college districts that wish to switch from at-large trustee elections to trustee area elections to do so via a waiver process. The waiver would be approved by the California Community Colleges Board of Governors.

This bill is sponsored by the Community College League of California.

Bonnie Slosson, Director of Government Relations for the Community College League of California, spoke about AB 684.

Board Comments

Peter MacDougall, Manuel Baca, Scott Himelstein, Barbara Davis-Lyman, Alice Perez, Deborah Malumed

Public Comments

Jonathan Lightman, Jane Patton, Leslie Smith, Alex Pader

Item 5 Special Presentation

Item 5.4 Federal Update with Jee Hang Lee

Presented by: Jee Hang Lee (PowerPoint)

Vice Chancellor Marlene Garcia introduced Jee Hang Lee, Director of Public Policy for the Association of Community College Trustees, to the Board of Governors.

Jee Hang Lee thanked Chancellor Scott and Vice Chancellor Garcia for the invitation to speak before the Board of Governors. Mr. Lee's PowerPoint presentation provided an overview of federal government issues including information on fiscal year 2011 appropriations, the budget for fiscal year 2012, the Pell grant program, WIA authorization, etc.

Board members had the following questions/comments and the speaker responded.

Board member Henry Ramos: Do you think not unlike the period after the end of the cold war, there might be something like a peace dividend that could create a different kind of sensibility about how we budget particularly around education with California as a leader and our leadership in the higher education field, sort of helping to advance that discussion. Is this something not foreseeable in the future in your judgment?

We have a number of candidates that have expressed interest in demolishing the Department of Education at the federal level. I just noted the problems we are having with Pell and the cost of Pell. I have hopes something like that might occur but I don't really foresee it.

Board Comments

Henry Ramos

Public Comments

Valerie Purnell

Item 4.5 Bi-Annual Report on Distance Education

Presented by: Barry Russell and LeBaron Woodyard (PowerPoint)

Vice Chancellor Barry Russell and Dean LeBaron Woodyard presented a PowerPoint on distance education in the community college system. The distance education (DE) presentation included information on different forms of DE, the impact of the state budget on DE, DE student retention issues and strategies, DE recommendations from staff, etc.

Board members had the following questions/comments and staff responded.

Board member Lance Izumi: In your opinion, has the increase in distance learning over the years contributed to the issue of impacted courses that we have seen across the system? Secondly when you cite the Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) study, which talks about cost savings in terms of facilities, they seem to be focusing on the prospective cost of facilities in the future and the need for them if there is a large increase in distance learning, I would like to know your comments about that.

As far as the impact issue, as colleges do enrollment managements it is very important for campuses to continue to have discussions among themselves about the proper class size and methodology that is being used. I think the challenge is, where you might be restricted in a classroom setting to 25 seats, in an online setting you don't have that same restriction and the temptation maybe to try to push the increased enrollment into distance education on the back of faculty who are teaching distance education classes.

As far as the LAO issue, I think some of that discussion is targeted not necessarily to community colleges but to the University of California and California State University. I do think these things go hand in hand and we need to be careful about how we push them out into the future.

Board member Geoffrey Baum: Which recommendations require legislative action and which can go through our coordinating bodies?

Recommendation number one would require legislative action. Number two would require more money. Many of the others are more internal activities that we can deal with as a system.

Board member Geoffrey Baum: So that process would be that you would work through the Consultation Council and ultimately bring something back to the Board for action?

We would work through our coordinating bodies and bring it back to the Board if it required action.

Board member Tanna Thomas: What percentage of our distance education students are out of state or out of country?

We haven't asked for that data.

Board member Tanna Thomas: Based on the comment about the possibility of licensure issues, I was wondering what the scope of that impact might be if colleges have to get a state license if they have students taking distance education courses in other states.

State authorization has sent ripples through the higher education community. Even though the Higher Education Act for 2008 was passed in August of 2009 and it wasn't until October of 2010 that the whole state authorization issue came up and caught a lot of people off guard. It was supposed to be implemented as of July 1, 2011, but it caused such an uproar that 16 U.S. Senators signed a common letter to the U.S. Department of Education asking for some relief. A few weeks ago the U.S. Department of Education sent out a letter letting the field know they were giving colleges until July 1, 2012, to become compliant.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: Thank you for the comprehensive report. There are several colleges out there that are very successful with this model of distance education and I would recommend to staff that when you are looking at these additional things, we also look at those models for best practices and analyze what they are doing compared to what we are doing. I would recommend that the Board support the recommendations that staff have presented.

Board member Henry Ramos: I am also a fan of looking at best practices and trying to bring them in when we can. Where would these retention strategies that have been identified align with the recommendations that are before us?

Recommendations one and two are very retention strategy oriented. We don't provide the detail here but in some discussions we've talk about the feasibility of looking at a distance education technology fee and that fee would be used for retention efforts.

Board member Henry Ramos: I'm interested in these retention strategies being specifically attached to that kind of a general policy. To me that's the combination that will insure that it's not just framework that we are establishing for success but we are actually filling in that framework with something that the campuses are being incentivized to standardize across the system.

These are things that need to be discussed in a broader context where these kinds of recommendations can get down to that level of detail. It wasn't within our purview to go into details, but to allow the system the opportunity to have that discussion.

Board member Henry Ramos: If we can work with you to drill down on more concrete ways to take the general recommendations and turn them into practices that will likely lead to more success in this area, I think we will be better served.

Board member Lance Izumi: When looking at the report in which subjects is distance education more prone to be employed?

Patrick Perry: The top Full Time Equivalent Student generators for distance education are social sciences, business and management, humanities, information technology, and math.

Board Vice President Alice Perez motioned for the Board to endorse the staff recommendations that were presented in this report. Board member Lance Izumi seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in support of the motion.

This item was not an action item.

Board Comments

Lance Izumi, Geoffrey Baum, Tanna Thomas, Alice Perez, Henry Ramos

Item 6.1 Board Member Reports

Lance Izumi

Thanked Board member Tanna Thomas for chairing the Classified Employee of the Year committee.

Threw out the first pitch at the Sacramento River Cats second home game of the season.

Barbara Davis-Lyman

Attended the California Connects event at American River College.

Attended the Community College League of California luncheon for Phi Beta Kappa with Board Vice President Alice Perez, where they presented the certificates.

Attended Intersegmental Lobby Day.

Thanked the governmental relations staff for putting together the Legislative Reception.

Attended the Academic Senate Spring Plenary Session.

Attended a ceremony at Sierra College where the new Science and Technology building was named after Kevin Ramirez.

Henry Ramos

Has continued to serve on the board of the Foundation for California Community Colleges and is working with Patricia Sullivan to evaluate this past year's performance of the Foundation's Chief Executive Officer (CEO) They are also working on a proposal to improve the process of evaluation for the CEO and other top level performers at the Foundation.

Continues to serve on the Cuesta College Foundation Board.

Thanked Chancellor Scott, members of the Board, Executive Vice Chancellor Erik Skinner and Vice Chancellor Marlene Garcia for all of their support and encouragement during the confirmation process.

Attended a meeting with Board member Peter MacDougall and vice chancellor Marlene Garcia with the Governor's staff and the Senate Rules Committee. At the meeting, they discussed; transparency with executive compensation in the community college system, ethical contract compliance, and more active and early communication around any major policy issues that the system is hoping to move.

Manuel Baca

Congratulated the Classified Employee of the Year recipients.

Attended the Academic Senate Plenary Session.

Attended an accreditation seminar where he was a panelist for the discussion on the role of trustees and accreditation.

Attended a couple of events with Hilda Solis, Secretary for the Department of Labor, on jobs and the economy.

He reported that the Student Success Task Force is talking about several issues including performance based funding; assessment; and, late and priority registration.

He continues to work on ways that our system can assist veterans, and is currently working on a veteran's conference with Faculty Association of California Community Colleges for September 2011 in San Diego.

Alice Perez

Attended the Community College League of California Phi Beta Kappa luncheon with Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman.

Attended the Student Senate General Assembly and participated in a roundtable discussion with Vice Chancellor Linda Michalowski.

Attended Intersegmental Lobby Day.

Participated in Hands Across California at Sierra College

Scott Himmelstein

Toured Palomar and Grossmont Colleges.

Will be giving the commencement address at Cuymaca College in June.

Geoffrey Baum

Participated in Hands Across California at Pasadena College.

Requested that videos from the Board meeting get posted to the web as soon as possible.

Had a meeting with Linda Wong and Estela Bensimon with the Center for Urban Education at University of Southern California. They wanted the Board and staff at the Chancellor's Office to know that they are a resource for research and information about higher education policy.

Tanna Thomas

Thanked everyone who helped with the Classified Employee of the Year Awards.

Participated in Hands Across California at Woodland community college.

Benita Haley

Congratulated all of the Classified Employee of the Year recipients.

Thanked the Governmental Relations staff for their work on the Legislative Reception.

Deborah Malumed

Spoke at the registrar and admission officers' conference.

Has been going through the appointments process.

Participated in Hands Across California at Long Beach City College.

Public Forum

Mark Valenzuela, Student Senate Representative – thanked Board Vice President Alice Perez and Board member Michelle Price for attending the Student Senate General Assembly. Also thanked the Board and the Chancellor's Office for the wonderful experience he had being the Student Senate representative to the Board of Governors.

New Business

No new business was discussed at the meeting

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:21 p.m. by Board of Governors President Scott Himmelstein.