

July 11, 2011

Call to Order

Board of Governors President, Scott Himelstein, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Item 1 Special Presentation

Item 1.1 2011 Dr. John W. Rice Diversity and Equity Awards

Presented by: Scott Himelstein, Jack Scott, Tosh Shikasho

Board President Scott Himelstein opened the awards ceremony that was held at the Sterling Hotel in Sacramento CA.

Sacramento Mayor Kevin Johnson welcomed everyone to the ceremony and to Sacramento. Board Vice President Alice Perez spoke about Dr. John W. Rice. Chancellor Jack Scott spoke about diversity at California community colleges and introduced Clara Rice.

Clara Rice spoke about her husband Dr. John W. Rice and acknowledged all of the award recipients. She also thanked everyone for honoring her husband's memory

The recipients of the *2011 Dr. John W. Rice Diversity and Equity Award* are:

Mr. Ignacio Ponce, Santa Barbara City College

Dr. Lisa Aguilera Lawrenson, American River College

The Veterans Support Program, Santa Barbara City College

Return to the Chancellors Office

Presidents Report

President Scott Himelstein:

Welcomed newly appointed Board member Danny Hawkins.

Gave the commencement speech at Cuyamaca College.

Board Members
Present on Monday
July 11, 2011

Manuel Baca
Barbara Davis-Lyman
Benita Haley
Danny Hawkins
Scott Himelstein
Lance Izumi
Peter MacDougall
Deborah Malumed
Alice Perez
Michelle Price
Henry Ramos
Gary Reed

Chancellor's Report

Chancellor Jack Scott

Thanked Paige Marlott-Dorr and the communications division for their hard work on the *Dr. John W. Rice Diversity and Equity Awards Program*.

Announced the appointments of Van Ton-Quinlivan, new vice chancellor for Economic and Workforce Development and Paul Feist, new vice chancellor for Communications.

Gave commencement speeches at Chaffey College, Merritt College and Palo Verde College.

Attended the Chancellor Circle events on May 25 at College of San Mateo and on June 28 at Los Angeles Valley College.

Participated in Governor Jerry Brown's press conference on the tax increase.

Item 1 Special Presentation

Item 1.2 Resolution

Presented by: Scott Himmelstein

This item presented a resolution to former Board member Robert V "Bobby" MacDonald.

Board Comments

Alice Perez, Manuel Baca

Item 1.3 Resolution

Presented by: Scott Himmelstein

This item presented a resolution to Dr. Norman Levan.

Item 1.4 Certificate of Appreciation

Presented by: Jack Scott and Marlene Garcia

This item presented a certificate of appreciation to Stephanie Puentes, Executive Fellow at the Chancellor's Office.

Item 2 Consent Calendar

Item 2.1 Approval of the Minutes

This item requested Board approval of the May 9-10, 2011, Board meeting minutes.

Board member Manuel Baca motioned for approval of the May 9-10, 2011, Board meeting minutes. Board Vice President Alice Perez seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in support of the motion.

Item 2.2 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 Lance Izumi motioned for approval of the contracts and grants. Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman seconded the motion. The votes was unanimous in support of the motion.

Board Comments

Deborah Malumed

Item 2.3 2012-13 Systemwide Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan

Presented by: Dan Troy

This item presented the *2012-13 Systemwide Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan* to the Board.

Board members suggested looking at what investment means in a more systematic evolving context and how the Board can monitor local projects without jeopardizing local control

Chancellor Scott spoke to the Board about how the facilities program is funded.

Board member Peter MacDougall motioned for approval of the *2012-13 Systemwide Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan*. Board member Benita Haley seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in support of the motion.

Board Comments

Peter MacDougall, Henry Ramos, Alice Perez

Item 2.2 Approval of Contracts and Grants

Presented by: Erik Skinner

Executive Vice Chancellor Erik Skinner spoke to the Board about a \$2 million grant that was given to the California Community Colleges from the California State Assembly. One million dollars of this grant will go toward augmenting book grants for Extended Opportunities Programs and Services students and the other million will go towards student success initiatives.

Board member Lance Izumi amended his original motion on the approval of contracts and grants to include this grant from the California State Assembly. The motion was seconded by Board member Benita Haley. The vote was unanimous in support of the motion.

Board Comments

Deborah Malumed, Scott Himelstein

Item 3 Action

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

Presented by: Linda Michalowski

This item addresses the issues of eligibility and conduct for the Student Senate for California Community Colleges (SSCCC). The Chancellor's Office is requesting that the Board amend their *Standing Orders*, so that the Chancellor's Office has the right to verify the eligibility of students who serve on the Student Senate and the right to immediately intervene if the conduct of students is improper when they are participating in all SSCCC events that the Chancellor's Office is directly responsible for, including contracting with hotels.

Vice Chancellor Michalowski introduced Kevin Feliciano, President of the Student Senate to the Board. Mr. Feliciano spoke to the Board about the proposed amendments to the *Standing Order*. He shared that the Student Senate supports the changes to the *Standing Orders* but would like the words *not limited to* and *establishing* in paragraph C to be removed.

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

Board member Michelle Price supports the *Standing Orders* item as is.

Board member Henry Ramos: Is there anyone who can give the Board an example of overreach by the Chancellor's Office?

Vice Chancellor Michalowski: *What the students have said to me is that they have not seen any examples where the Chancellor's Office has overreached its authority. The problem is that they believe this language would be in affect forever and that there could come a time in the future when someone else might be in charge and might wish to exercise a different control over the student senate than what they have experienced.*

Board member Peter MacDougall motioned for approval of the amendments to the *Standing Orders*. Board Vice President Alice Perez seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in support of the motion.

Board Comments

Michelle Price, Henry Ramos, Peter MacDougall

Public Comments

Kevin Feliciano, Anita Latham, Frankie Moore, Alex Pader, Rachael Richards, Jeffrey Fong, Lee Fuller, Michelle Pilati, Charles Stevens, Eric Chisler, Nevin Sarina

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

Presented by: Linda Michalowski and Barry Russell

The proposed regulation changes will:

Establish a limit on the number of times a district can receive apportionment funding for students who reenroll in a single credit course. District would be able to receive apportionment funding for three enrollments and be allowed one additional funded enrollment on an appeals basis.

Would not apply to certain students including but not limited to, students leaving for a military withdrawal and students who are required to repeat a course in order to meet the terms of their employment.

Vice Chancellor Michalowski explained that since the May 2011 meeting, the Chancellor's Office used a different methodology to get a clearer picture of what happens to students who take courses multiple times and the new data is included in the Board item.

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

Board member Deborah Malumed: A repeatable course sounds like an enrichment course, is that what you are talking about?

The discussion about enrichment classes may also bring in the discussion of noncredit courses as well. We are having discussion now on what would be the appropriate repeatable language to go forward with. That discussion includes courses that could be considered enrichment courses.

Board member Deborah Malumed: I've heard that some colleges have not decreased their enrichment classes. Why not include all the classes in this policy and then come out with some modifications?

The same class that is an enrichment class for one student can be a major for another. I don't think you can look entirely at the kind of class, in some cases you have to look at the enrollment pattern and the educational objective of the student.

Board member Henry Ramos: Would returning veterans be included in the disability category that you spoke about?

Any student with a disability whether they are a veteran or not is entitled to reasonable accommodations for their disability.

Board member Michelle Price: I've heard a lot of people say this item will shut the door on the students who need to repeat classes. I see it as shutting the door on the people who can't get classes. If you are repeating a class three or four times you are taking a seat from a student who can't get in at all.

Chancellor Scott spoke to the Board about this item and stated that the system is rationing classes. He said the real issue is telling first time students we don't have classes for them when you have students who are taking up seats that are repeating the classes several times.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: I was one of those students who had to repeat a class several times. I'm hopeful of two things. That everyone who is in support of this will take into consideration that sometimes the courses don't line up to what the student has to take and that on the local level you are ensuring that the student gets the support they need to be successful in the courses. Also if you have a student who is determined and driven take that into consideration and don't just say three strikes you're out but you find a way to help that student to be successful.

Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman: Many speakers talked about intervention. If this passes I think there has to be a strong statement from this Board that intervention is a part of this too.

Board Vice President Alice Perez made an amended motion to pass this item but to keep withdrawals separate from grades.

After the motion by Board Vice President Alice Perez, Vice Chancellor Linda Michalowski explained that the data that was handed out from City College of San Francisco separates the withdrawals from the grades, but the data in the Board item includes withdrawals with the grades. She further explained that in order for the regulations to separate withdrawals, this item would have to be rewritten and brought back to the Board at a future date.

Board member Peter MacDougall motioned for the Board to approve the item as it was presented in the agenda. Board member Michelle Price seconded the motion. Board Vice President Alice Perez abstained from the votes. Other than the abstention the vote was unanimous in support of the motion.

Board member Gary Reed: I thought the Student Success Task Force would be looking at issues like this and bundling them into a presentation that we would take into consideration as a whole. I'd like to ask the members of the task force, where are we going with the Student Success Task Force if we are going to take items like these separately?

Chancellor Scott: There are things that the Student Success Task Force is in agreement with and we don't mind these things being acted upon by the Board of Governors.

Board Comments

Deborah Malumed, Henry Ramos, Michelle Price, Alice Perez, Barbara Davis-Lyman, Gary Reed

Public Comments

Anita Latham, Karen Saginor, Jeffrey Fong, Leslie Smith, Kevin Feliciano, Toni Gomez, Richard Hansen, Michelle Pilati, Scott Lay, Nevin Sarina

Item 5 Information and Reports

Item 5.5 Little Hoover Commission Review of California Community Colleges

Presented by: Stuart Drown

Executive Vice Chancellor Erik Skinner introduced Stuart Drown, Executive Director of the Little Hoover Commission to the Board.

The Little Hoover Commission is looking at the systems' governance, structure, authority, and resources to see if the system is sufficient enough to serve students, employers and the state. The commission is also looking at what the state is asking community colleges to provide and if, based on current resources and other aspects of the educational master plan, the state is asking too much.

Mr. Drown spoke to the Board about:

What the commission knows.

- Individual colleges/districts are developing programs to meet local and regional needs.
- The Chancellor's Office and its partners are looking at ways to build more efficiency across the system.
- The Student Success Task Force is developing recommendations to improve student outcomes.

Concerns the commission has.

- Impact of budget cuts on the system.
- The number of students being turned away.
- How long it takes some students to finish at community college.

What questions the commission is asking.

- As currently structured does the system have the capacity to lead this charge?
- What structure would be better?
- What are the hurdles that exist to moving toward such a structure?

What the commission has heard from stakeholders.

- The community college system is challenged by its governance structure.
- The Chancellor's Office should be restructured and its statute as a state agency prevents the office from exercising adequate coordination and leadership.
- The Chancellor's Office doesn't have adequate authority on how the office itself operates.
- Problems can arise when state and local priorities don't align.

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

Board President Scott Himmelstein suggested talking to members of the Board.

Board member Deborah Malumed suggested that the Board visit the Little Hoover Commissions website to view their meeting and presentations.

Board member Peter MacDougall: Spoke about the contradiction/dilemma between educating students and turning students away. He also spoke about the cost of higher education.

Board member Henry Ramos: To what extent are you engaging with other stakeholders who are partner organizations in the enterprise of educating and preparing our population for future jobs? To keep pace with the challenges that have been discussed we are running behind, we're not synchronized, we're not aligned, and we're not talking about integrated strategies. My hope is that as the Little Hoover Commission looks at our work and our charge moving forward, that it will not do so in a vacuum but in an integrated, multi-part perspective about how these pieces all fit together in the most optimal way. Is that something that we can anticipate or is that too much to ask for in an already very large agenda?

We are looking at where the flexibility is and what can be done to encourage regional approaches. We also see where community colleges are working with nearby state colleges and universities.

Board Comments

Scott Himmelstein, Deborah Malumed, Peter MacDougall, Henry Ramos

Item 5.1 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:

A total of \$67,394,737.00 was raised for the Osher Endowment.

Becky Michael, Executive Director of the Columbia College Foundation and Mike Stepanovich, Executive Director of the Bakersfield College Foundation spoke to the Board about their efforts to raise money for the Osher Endowment.

32 colleges met or exceeded their Osher campaign goal.

JP Morgan has made a verbal commitment of \$1 million to be invested into the system to benefit veterans support services in our system over the next four years. JP Morgan will also underwrite some of the cost of the Veteran's Summit that is being planned for this fall.

The Foundation finished the 2010-11 fiscal year with net positive revenue. Despite the loss of the TANF contract taking effect July 1. They project net positive revenue, and greater net revenue, for the 2011-12 fiscal year.

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

Board President Scott Himmelstein: Congratulated Paul Lanning on his hard work. What are the criteria to get a scholarship from the endowment?

24 completed units, satisfactory academic standing, currently enrolled in six units and a Board of Governors fee waiver recipient. Some of the scholarships have additional criteria depending on how they were set up.

Board member Lance Izumi: Congratulated everyone involved with the Osher Endowment. For the representatives from Columbia and Bakersfield College, do you feel that going forward you have a donor base that will continue to give to the colleges?

I would say absolutely for Columbia College, that is definitely our goal. I agree with that for Bakersfield College. The Osher Endowment and the gift from Dr. Levan have created a huge awareness for the need for people to give to community colleges.

Board Vice President Alice Perez commended Paul Lanning and the staff at the Foundation on the job they did with the Osher Endowment.

Board member Peter MacDougall: Also thanked Paul Lanning. This morning Dr. Levan was acknowledged for his gift to Bakersfield College. If Bakersfield College had taken \$10 million of his gift and applied it to the Osher scholarship, would that have been augmented by \$5 million or would that not have been possible.

It would have been but the reason it did not happen is because Dr. Levan had other criteria and goals for his gift.

Board member Henry Ramos: We left about \$20 million dollars on the table and although the Osher match is no longer in play I would hope that we continue to work toward that \$100 million goal.

Board member Manuel Baca: This is a tremendous accomplishment and I congratulate everyone for their hard work. The Osher Endowment is a significant contribution to the system and there is no reason why we can't memorialize the scholarship by ensuring that it reaches that goal.

We have heard from some colleges that would like to continue to add to their endowment bucket because they do see the value of it and the excitement of it. They have also built operations that they didn't have a few years ago and now have the ability to continue to raise funds.

Board members Barbara Davis-Lyman: There are obviously some best practices here and we should put something together that talks about how you did it.

We have plans to create a case study around the entire experience of the campaign from negotiating the Osher gift back in 2007 all the way through the successes of some of our colleges and some of the challenges. The Osher Foundation would like to see a report also. This report will come to this Board, the Osher Board and the Foundation Board.

Board member Peter MacDougall: If money had been raised at the state level from money that was given to the Foundation could that have been used as a match or would it have had to be local campuses that raised the money?

The Edison gift that I referenced came through the Foundation. There were other donors that made gifts through the Foundation.

Board member Peter MacDougall: What percentage of what was raised came through the Foundation?

About 20–25 percent of the total.

Board member Deborah Malumed: Have you offered this information to the press, so that each community knows what their college raised?

Yes, the final date for the transfer of funds was Friday. This is hot off the press this morning and we are preparing a press announcement and sharing it with the field as well.

Board Comments

Scott Himelstein, Lance Izumi, Alice Perez, Peter MacDougall, Henry Ramos, Manuel Baca, Gary Reed, Barbara Davis-Lyman, Deborah Malumed

Item 5.3 Update of the 2012-13 System Budget Request

Presented by: Dan Troy

This item was moved to the Tuesday, July 12, 2011, calendar. However the Board heard public comments on this item.

Public Comments

Paula McCraskey, Brandon Tartaglia

Item 5.2 State Budget Update

Presented by: Dan Troy

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

The state budget was passed by a majority vote.

Governor Jerry Brown signed the state budget on June 30.

California Community Colleges will receive a \$400 million cut to base funding, student fees will increase to \$36 per unit, there are new deferrals that total \$129 million, no funding was provided for COLA or growth, and there was no restoration of categorical program reductions.

There was an overall cut to higher education of \$1.7 billion.

Department of Finance (DOF) estimates a \$3 billion operational shortfall for 2012-13.

Vice Chancellor Troy spoke to the Board about some of the risk associated with this budget.

Fee Shortage – DOF may be over estimating the amount of fees that will be collected. Staff feels there is another \$25-\$30 million deficit unintentionally built into the system budget.

Assumed new revenues of \$11.8 billion – If the new revenues do not materialize by or before December 15, 2011 there will be midyear cuts that will impact community colleges. Community colleges could face an additional cut of up to \$102 million and fees could be increased to \$46 per unit.

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

Board member Peter MacDougall: Is there any option that will allow voters to decide if they want to increase or continue taxes that are already in place? Was there any impact on the Chancellor's Office budget that the Board should be aware of?

I don't think there will be a vote for the current year. There were no specific cuts to the Chancellor's Office budget.

Board member Manuel Baca: You mentioned the possible increase to \$46 per unit. Where do you think that conversation will lead?

We have had discussion with the Governor's Office and DOF on that. My sense is that the cut will be implemented if the revenue does not come in.

Board member Peter MacDougall: Should the Board go on record with a resolution of some type where we note the deterioration of access to higher education and the negative consequences of that access to the state of California. I would like to request that at our next meeting we have a resolution for Board actions that will voice our extreme displeasure for what is happening to the California community college and our ability to serve the state of California.

Board President Scott Himelstein: I will have a discussion with Vice President Alice Perez and Chancellor Scott to bring something forward for consideration.

Chancellor Jack Scott: Thank you for that suggestion. I will pledge that the staff will work on that. I agree that some kind of statement should go out. It may be appropriate for us to highlight what is happening to the Legislature and Governor. We will discuss a controversial two year bill tomorrow that proposes what community colleges can do when they can't serve thousands of students that are knocking on the door and how that will impact the state of California.

Board member Deborah Malumed: I would like to suggest a report on the deterioration of the system that we can present to the Legislature and Governor instead of a resolution.

Board President Scott Himelstein: I got the impression from Board member MacDougall's comments that this was not aimed at the Legislature but more a statement of concern. I would like to suggest that we take Board member Malumed suggestion and work on that report. I am also willing to work with the Chancellor and Vice President Perez on a potential statement, understanding that there is no intended blame, but a statement of our concern.

Board member Benita Haley: I agree with Board member Malumed. I also think it should be something that isn't necessarily aimed at the Legislature, but a public announcement of our general concern.

Board member Manuel Baca: I trust that both of you are in a position to say what needs to be said without offending a whole bunch of people.

Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman: We've heard from numerous speakers about how many degrees by 2020, and I think that kind of information needs to be in there.

Board Comments

Peter MacDougall, Manuel Baca, Deborah Malumed, Benita Haley, Barbara Davis-Lyman

Public Forum

There were no comments during public forum.

New Business

No new business was discussed at this meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:39 p.m. by Board President Scott Himelstein.

Board Members
Present on Tuesday,
July 12, 2011

Manuel Baca

Geoffrey Baum

Barbara Davis-Lyman

Benita Haley

Danny Hawkins

Scott Himelstein

Lance Izumi

Deborah Malumed

Peter MacDougall

Alice Perez

Michelle Price

Henry Ramos

Gary Reed

July 12, 2011

Call to Order

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

Item 5 Information and Reports

Item 5.4 State and Federal Update

Presented by: Marlene Garcia

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

State Update

The Legislature is on recess and will be returning on August 15.

Policy committees for both houses completed their work last week.

The final day of session is September 9. Bills that are not approved by then are eligible to be two year bills.

The Governor blue penciled funding for the California Postsecondary Education Commission as of July 1.

Key Bills

AB 515 (Brownley) Postsecondary Education: Community Colleges – This bill establishes a pilot community college extension program. The local community college governing board would be permitted to establish a pilot extension program that offers credit courses and set student fees that cover the full cost of instruction. The bill also specifies that collective bargaining and title 5 regulations would still apply.

Comments: At the request of the author, the bill was held in committee to provide the author and staff an opportunity to work with key policy makers in crafting additional amendments to the bill. This bill was sponsored by Santa Monica Community College and College of the Canyons.

Location: AB 515 was held in the Senate Committee on Education, and is now a 2-year bill.

Vice Chancellor Garcia reported that there was almost unanimous opposition on the part of faculty and strong support among some of the colleges, CEOs and boards of trustees around the state. The Chancellor's Office was called on by the author of the bill to help resolve some of the major policy issues and to help narrow the scope of this bill. The Chancellor's Office indicated to the author that it may support a pilot of this bill if the pilot were narrow in scope and if other provision and conditions were made including ensured financial aid access to low income and needy students, prohibiting colleges to participate if they had not met or exceeded their cap for the prior year, etc.

SB 292 (Padilla) Community Colleges: Transfers – This bill clarifies issues that have emerged due to implementation of the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act (STAR program). The bill amends the Act by requiring that for the purposes of enrollment planning and admissions to the California State University community college students who complete the STAR program degree shall be granted priority in enrollment consistent with the priorities outlined in existing law. Another major amendment to SB 292 requires community colleges and districts to ensure reciprocity in the acceptance of similar courses/credits from other community college campuses.

Vice Chancellor Garcia reported that this bill is a placeholder for Senator Padilla. An informational hearing will be held July 20, at Southwest College. After the hearing staff will revisit the language to see if there are any suggestions that they would like to make to the author.

Position: Support

AB 1115 (Lara) Local Workforce Investment Boards – This establishes statewide standards for local workforce investment boards. One new standard would allow the local workforce investment board to create a list of approved training providers. Community college career technical education programs would automatically be placed on this list.

Location: AB 1115 passed the Senate Committee on Labor and Industrial Relations, and is set for hearing on August 15, 2011, in the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Position: Support

AB 160 (Portantino) Concurrent Enrollment in Secondary School and Community College – This bill allows a school district to enter into a partnership with a community college district to determine local concurrent enrollment policies for K-12 students, including the ability to establish enrollment priority for concurrent enrollment students and to remove the five percent summer enrollment cap. Another key provision permits a school district to authorize a student, upon the recommendation from a community college administrator in a career technical education program area or other appropriate administrator, to attend a community college and take career technical education courses. This provision applies to students attending partnership and non-partnership school districts. Current law requires a high school student to secure a principal's recommendation to attend at a community college.

Location: AB 160 passed the Senate Committee on Education, and is set for hearing on August 15, 2011 in the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Position: Support

Federal Update

Congress has not addressed the debt ceiling issue. The August 2, deadline is approaching and they need to have a compromise in order to move forward on various budgeting matters.

The House has its version of the budget that has stalled in the Senate. The Senate is looking at its appropriation measures and has yet to take action.

The three items that we are paying close attention to:

Gainful Employment Regulations from the Department of Education effective July 1, 2011 – These regulations require all higher education institution that offers occupational training programs to display program information on their website such as program cost, on time completion rates, job placement rates for students completing a program, etc.

Federal Pell Grant Program – There is an \$11.2 billion shortfall in Pell Grant funding. Republicans have suggested reducing the maximum Pell Grants award to around \$3000, while Democrats would like to maintain the maximum Pell Grant award at \$5,550.

Trade Adjustment Assistant (TAA) Program – This program includes the community college and career training grant. There was talk of eliminating the TAA program however the Obama Administration reached a deal with key lawmakers to renew the TAA program in combination with the free trade agreements.

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

Board member Deborah Malumed: How does SB 79 affect community colleges?

That bill is part of a large tax measure. We are looking at it right now and trying to understand if there are implications for community colleges.

Board member Deborah Malumed: Are they taking money that we have sitting around, waiting to be disbursed and putting it into a higher interest account? Will it affect the local colleges?

Unlike UC and CSU we aren't going to have reserves from the prior year's sitting around. Our concern is if they were to take a big chunk of our apportionment and put it into an account like this it would cause colleges to be concerned that the money wouldn't come in and maybe they would reduce offerings for that year. This bill could undergo many changes.

Board President Scott Himmelstein: Will CPEC continue to hold board meeting and will we continue to be represented there.

Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman: CPEC will be meeting with the Governor's Office to discuss having their scheduled September meeting and possibly the December meeting.

Board Comments

Deborah Malumed, Scott Himmelstein

Item 5.3 Update on the 2012-13 System Budget Request

Presented by: Dan Troy

Vice Chancellor Dan Troy spoke to the Board about the *2012-13 System Budget Request*.

The budget workgroup met in June and the recommendations are as follows:

Categorical restoration

COLA restoration

Growth funding

These requests are similar to the 2011-12 requests.

The workgroup also suggested the following new funding proposals:

Equalization funding for career development and college preparation noncredit courses.

Grants for district to study ways to improve retention rates for distance education courses.

Funding for the student senate.

Setting money aside for the recommendations of the student success task force.

Setting money aside for unemployment and/or returning veterans. No specific dollar amount was suggested.

Proposals for one-time funding that may be available.

Vice Chancellor Troy asked the Board to provide feedback on and to consider the priorities that the workgroup laid out.

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

Board Vice President Alice Perez: I would question asking for an increase in funding when it doesn't look like that is likely to happen. I think it's more appropriate to look at the current funding that we have and how to manage within that budget. When you talk about supporting student success are there specific areas of student success that we are looking at from a funding perspective to support?

I think it is beneficial to make a significant request, if we don't document our needs and ask for things I think there will be a growing sense that we don't think it's necessary. I do think we want to have a document where we lay out the hits that the system has taken and how we do need the money to support students. I think there are some benefits to making the full request even though

we know it won't be granted. That said, I think we do want to show that we are being efficient and if we are going to make proposals for new programs showing a willingness to move some money around may be a wise approach. There was no specific proposal there. I think the group just wanted to show support for the work of the task force.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: From a student success perspective I'd like to see specific funding request in the categories of counseling services and basic skills services.

Board member Peter MacDougall: I support the three priority items. I think the request to be made whole on all three of those areas is absolutely critical. What is the amount of funding that is required to make us whole in all three categories?

We need \$360 million in growth restoration, \$830 million in COLA restoration, and \$313 million in categorical restoration.

Board member Henry Ramos: I want to talk about the distance education request. I'd like to know a little bit about the logic behind that request. If I understand correctly you were talking about grants that would be made to different segments of the system to do individual research on certain related topics. I wonder if it would be better to do a singular assessment. I think the price seems high based on the comments of Vice President Perez of the funding environment. There should be more substantiation on what the case is for this additional funding.

I think you can argue that a grant for \$1 million a year would be fine to do that study. I think if we go forward with that request we could fund it at many different levels.

Board President Scott Himmelstein: While I agree with making us whole I think we have to ask the people who are going to be in the meetings with the Legislature and the Governor, is that the appropriate way to go or do we present it in a way where we say we'd like to get a certain amount now and over time get more. I would also request putting a member of the Board on the budget workgroup.

Chancellor Scott stated that he feels you always have to ask for more and if you come to the table saying we can live with what we have the Legislature and the Governor are more than willing to accept that estimate. He also thinks the three priorities are the most important.

Board member Peter MacDougall: I concur with everything that the Chancellor has said. I think our fundamental responsibility as a Board is to present a budget that represents the fundamental needs of the system and as the process proceeds being politically astute as to what is possible to obtain.

Board Comments

Alice Perez, Peter MacDougall, Henry Ramos, Scott Himmelstein

Public Comments

Kevin Feliciano, Rachael Richards

Item 4 First Reading

Item 4.1 Proposed Revisions to the Title 5 Regulations: Noncredit Course and Program Approval (Sections 55150, 55151, 55152, 55153, 55154, and 55155)

Presented by: Barry Russell and Stephanie Low

Vice Chancellor Barry Russell and Dean Stephanie Low spoke to the Board about the revisions to the title 5 regulations on noncredit course and program approval. The significant changes to these regulations are:

All noncredit courses must be approved by the Chancellor's Office

The benchmark of 288 hours to determine the type of vocational course has been eliminated.

Colleges can develop their own certificates and offer them locally, when a certificate requires less than 18 units.

Item 6 Recognition

Item 6.1 Recognition for Deborah Malumed, Immediate Past President of the Board of Governors

Presented by: Scott Himelstein

Board President Scott Himelstein presented a crystal gavel to Deborah Malumed, Immediate Past President of the Board, in recognition of her leadership while serving as the President of the Board.

Chancellor Jack Scott also said a few words and thanked Board member Malumed for her service.

Board member Malumed thanked the members of the Board and the community college family for the recognition.

Board Comments

Lance Izumi

Item 6.2 2010-11 Recognition for the Past President of the Student Senate for California Community Colleges

Presented by: Linda Michalowski

This item recognized Alex Pader for his service as President of the Student Senate for California Community Colleges.

Item 4 First Reading

Item 4.2 Board of Governors Meeting Locations for 2012

Presented by: Jack Scott

Chancellor Scott spoke to the Board about the out of town meeting for 2012. The meeting will be held in Southern California and possible site locations are San Diego CCD, Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD, LA CCD, Pasadena CCD, Glendale CCD, and a district within the Inland Empire.

Board members requested that College of the Desert and Mt. San Antonio College be considered for possible locations in 2012. Board members also suggested looking at the possibility of having two meetings out of town in 2012.

Board Comments

Benita Haley, Barbara Davis-Lyman, Manuel Baca, Deborah Malumed, Michelle Price, Geoffrey Baum, Alice Perez.

Item 7 Information and Reports

Item 7.1 Update on the California STEM Learning Network

Presented by: Barry Russell and Chris Roe (Handout)

Chris Roe, Chief Executive Officer of the California Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Learning Network (CSLNET) spoke to the Board about the goals of this organization. Those goals include increasing interest and competencies among all K-14 students in STEM disciplines, ensuring all California students are college and career ready and building a network that connects existing assets.

CSLNET is working on a regional basis to try and create mini CSLNETs in each region. Currently they are working with six groups to build a network that will share resources, develop common understanding and develop new knowledge. There are four different initiatives that this group is working on. Those initiatives include providing high quality STEM activities afterschool and teacher pathways into teaching careers in STEM.

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

Board member Geoffrey Baum: There are several groups that are mobilized for various causes around education (arts, physical education, etc.) how do you integrate all of that and make it happen in this landscape?

We are working on a policy and advocacy agenda and actually building this through a very collaborative process with our regional alliances and also bringing stakeholders into the discussion.

Board member Geoffrey Baum: How big is your staff and how big of a budget do you have to help achieve some of these goals?

We are one year old so we are fairly small at this point. There is currently a staff of four and our budget is slightly under \$2 million for next year. The organization is looking to grow over the next couple of years.

Board member Henry Ramos: It sounds like your model may be help to us in terms of how to mobilize some kind of an effort on the STEM front. How would we link with you to explore the possibility of a central coast contingent?

We are doing that as we speak. I met with several folks in that area a couple of week ago. I believe that they will be the next regional alliance to get off the ground.

Board Comments

Geoffrey Baum, Henry Ramos, Peter MacDougall, Barbara Davis-Lyman

Item 7.2 Update on Student Enrollment and Course Offering Trends

Presented by: Patrick Perry

Vice Chancellor Patrick Perry discussed several items with the Board relating to enrollment and course offering trends. His presentation included information on student data (race, gender, age, etc) and course offerings (section size, full-time equivalent students generated, credit course retention/success rate, etc.).

Item 8 Guest Speakers

8.1 Update from the California State Board of Education

Presented by: Mike Kirst and Sue Burr

Mike Kirst, President of the State Board of Education (SBE) spoke to the Board about common core standards and assessments.

Mr. Kirst reviewed a handout with the Board that discussed what common core can do to help transitions students from high school to community colleges. He spoke about several things common core can do including helping to improve student readiness, providing opportunities for early intervention and remediation and strengthening CTE readiness.

Sue Burr, Executive Director of the State Board of Education spoke about how the SBE is moving forward with the common core implementation process. The standards were adopted in August 2010 and an implementation plan will go before the SBE for adoption in September 2011.

Mike Kirst concluded his comments by stating that the two systems need to have more collaboration.

The Board thanked President Kirst and Executive Director Burr for coming to the meeting.

Chancellor Scott and member of the Board had the following questions/comments and the speakers responded.

Chancellor Jack Scott: Will common core be a means of assessing students when they are in K-12 and will it be very helpful in terms of assessing if they are college ready?

Common core affects every major policy area that the SBE has in curriculum and instruction. Common core will be infused through everything and should be alive in the classroom as the basis for teaching; the assessment is on the back end.

Chancellor Jack Scott: At what juncture will the assessment take place in K-12?

According to federal law, this test would be given annually in grades three thru eight, and once in high school, probably the eleventh grade. The California state testing law is grades second thru twelfth so as long as there is no change to the state testing law we would give the test annually beginning in grade two.

Chancellor Jack Scott: How would you compare Common Core to the early assessment program that was pioneered by California State University?

That's a technical determination that I don't think I can comment on with any certainty. I'll offer an opinion. I think these assessments will be quite different and I think it will cause a reconsideration of the current way of the early assessment program. I don't think the level of the test will change in terms of its demands on students, but the format and style of the assessment will probably be different.

Chancellor Jack Scott: Will the common core do what EAP does; indicate to a student whether or not if they are ready for college work?

The Common Core unlike our current curriculum and assessments will have college readiness embedded within it. That's the big switch it. As to what our eleventh grade assessment will look like and whether that would carry out the purposes of the current EAP that would be a decision for the postsecondary education system to make and I hope we could negotiate that the way the EAP was negotiated.

Chancellor Jack Scott: How will higher education here in California have an input in the Common Core?

One of my suggestions was that we work through the Intersegmental Coordinating Council (ICC) if that makes sense to folks. But we are certainly open to other suggestions.

Chancellor Jack Scott: Maybe we can form a working group right away and start talking about this. In the Student Success Task Force one of the first things we recognized, in order to improve success in community colleges, was to align the K-12 and community colleges more closely together.

To discuss your idea of a working group, we are not in great shape in California in term of the structural ways to work together on this. We have three different postsecondary systems, three different boards, the K-12 board and system have not had a long history of tightly coupled relationships, and we don't have a coordinating commission any longer. So the machinery of this is really a problem. We are on one of the more fragmented ends of the state spectrum in terms of getting this job done, that we need to get done.

Chancellor Jack Scott: You said the assessments in Common Core would be grades two thru eight and then again in eleventh grade, is that right?

Under federal law states are required to assess in grade three thru eight annually and once in high school. But our state law goes beyond that we test annually in second thru twelfth grade.

Chancellor Jack Scott: So you believe that this will be a improvement on the testing that's done and therefore the signal may occur before the 11th grade?

Well before the eleventh grade.

Board President Scott Himelstein: To follow up on what you said, I agree that our machinery isn't very good. But is that to suggest that you and the other segments should move forward to help build that machinery or that's not a very ripe area right now?

I think there are opportunities, the ICC and the California Education Roundtable, seem to be the best shot that we have right now.

Board member Henry Ramos: As part of the integrated dialogue we're talking about having. It can't only be about the idea of looking at the question of how folks are performing on exams or how they are doing in these incremental steps of assessment. It also has to be looking back at the ways we help them succeed from one stage to the next with support.

Board member Peter MacDougall: What is the time to production for when we might reasonably expect to have a portfolio of assessment data on readiness and specific competency and what is the means of transmission to receive that data?

The first year of administration for the national consortia test is 2014-15, so spring of 2015 would be the first time it is administered on a statewide basis. The production of actual records would occur subsequently to that. There have been specific conversations about how the transmission would occur and what that would look like. But 2015 is the earliest we could expect it.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: You mentioned a national assessment. I was recently given some information from the National Assessment Governing Board about assessment they are looking to do. It doesn't focus so much on readiness but more on preparedness for college and job training programs. Are you currently collaborating with them?

We've mentioned three assessment instruments today, the Common Core assessments which are developing, the Early Assessment Program, and the National Assessment of Educational Progress. These have to be aligned over time. I think there will be some merging. The interesting thing about the national assessment is it's talking about career clusters and showing whether students on the national assessment are ready to enter training for those career clusters. Common Core is geared to a higher level. This is an issue that our two institutions really have to confront.

The other distinction that I would make between the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and what the two national consortia are doing is that NAEP is kind of a dipstick test, it's pulling sample information from various school districts, and then it gives you a report card of what is happening in the system. The assessments we are talking about are actually individual students.

Board member Lance Izumi: The EAP was designed to let students know, in eleventh grade, where they stand on college readiness and hopefully do something about it in their senior year if necessary. Do we have a sense of whether students who are not doing well on the EAP or who are not testing college ready are actually taking advantage of that information?

You would have to check with CSU for their detailed assessments. My one remark would be that the EAP was designed for the four year sector taking A-G. The reason I'm enthusiastic about Common Core is because over time it will provide earlier signals and also get students more aware of things before the senior year.

Board Comments

Scott Himmelstein, Henry Ramos, Peter MacDougall, Alice Perez, Lance Izumi,

Item 7 Information and Reports

Item 7.2 Update on Student Enrollment and Course Offering Trends continues

Presented by: Patrick Perry

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

Board member Peter MacDougall: In terms of what the projected enrollment might be versus the actual enrollment. My assumption here is that in some ways this presents even less of a problem than exist because we would have had a higher expectation for enrollment given the larger graduation class that was coming out of high school. I don't want us to underestimate the degree of the loss that exist, that's my reason for the questions.

I don't have numbers on hand. But if I go into our projection series a few years ago we would have a number for what we thought we were going to get this year.

Chancellor Jack Scott: The projection I saw was 140,000. We took the curve of how our enrollment was going up and then we saw the dip in enrollment. That information has been presented in this material. The only conclusion I can draw is that the first time students were the last to register and that's the reason we had a dip in first time students.

Board member Barbara Davis-Lyman: The full impact of the decline of first time students takes about three years to feel?

That's generally correct.

Board member Geoffrey Baum: One of the things I was interested in is the lessons we will be able to learn from the data. In some ways we are demonstrating more efficiency, the district are actually focusing their diminishing resources on the core mission of the system and there have been results of increases in student success. The other item that I noted is that as the profile of our students becomes younger, that means we are fulfilling more of the role of the other four year institutions. Is there a way we can make that case political, that the state is actually trying to make its higher education structure more efficient and therefore a greater investment in community colleges is a worthwhile track. Am I wrong in saying that this looks like the system as a whole, for

lack of a better term, is becoming more efficient and focused, and there are success results that can be demonstrated?

I think you can make that point with the numbers. As far as efficient, if the goal was for the system to be more degree seeking and serving a younger population then that has clearly been portrayed here. As far as the success metrics it's a little less clear.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: On table 8 where it shows that the basic skills sections decreased by 4.6 percent, I don't see the course offerings depicted in table 10 B, is that because it's less than 1,000 FTE or is it embedded in there somewhere?

It's embedded

Vice Chancellor Barry Russell: On the reduction in basic skills, we did an informal survey of the colleges, and received some really good information. The colleges have heard through the basic skills initiative that they need to restructure their basic skills courses, so many of them are reducing the number of basic skills course that students have to take.

Board Vice President Alice Perez: At some future date can you present some of that information so we get a better understanding of where colleges are reducing the number of course offerings versus reductions. Can we also get a recap of where we are seeing the increase in distance education courses?

Yes

Board Comments

Peter MacDougall, Barbara Davis-Lyman, Geoffrey Baum, Alice Perez

Item 7.3 Board Member Reports

Peter MacDougall

Spoke to the doctoral candidates at San Diego State University, on leadership and community college instruction.

Alice Perez

Thanked Vice Chancellor's Millan, Perry, Michalowski and Russell for helping to provide data for a presentation she made to the National Assessment Governing Board.

Barbara Davis-Lyman

Let the Board know that member Baca will submit his report electronically.

Attended the Economic and Workforce Program meeting in June.

Deborah Malumed

Attended the May meeting of the Student Success Task Force.

Attended the *Education Nation* meeting in Los Angeles hosted by NBC News Anchor Brian Williams.

Lance Izumi

Invited to Governor Brown's charter school in Oakland, The Oakland Military Institute, and had the opportunity to take the salute of the cadets.

Geoffrey Baum

Attended the last CPEC meeting and wasn't prepared to hear the announcement that came out two weeks later. Hopes this body will find a way to work with our other partners in higher education to maintain the assets and the work of CPEC

Proud to see that the Pasadena Area community college district met it's Osher grant total at 179 percent of its goal and was the largest donor to the Osher scholarship fund.

Excited to see the new cameras and is looking forward to seeing how this will facilitate public access to Board meetings.

Scott Himmelstein

The Board will have a retreat in September.

Public Forum

New Business

No new business was discussed at the meeting

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:04 p.m. by Board of Governors President Scott Himmelstein.