

## CONSULTATION COUNCIL

November 19, 2009

**1. State Budget Update:** Eric Skinner gave a brief update. Nothing particularly new was stated, although the state budget shortfall continues to worsen.

**2. Title 5 Revisions to the Fifty Percent Law:** Update on the plans for BOG to waive the 50% law requirements for Districts who apply for the waiver based on the established reasons:

Under existing regulations, a district may request exemption from the 50 percent requirement if compliance would have resulted in serious hardship and/or if salaries of classroom instructors are higher than comparable districts. The district declares on the exemption application the basis for its exemption request. Districts may choose either one or both of the categories. Serious hardship includes four criteria, defined in section 59204(c), summarized below:

- Conformance with the 50 percent requirement would have resulted in the district's inability to discharge financial liabilities. Consideration must be given to the following factors: whether the district's general fund ending balance is less than three percent; and whether the district's credit base FTES is less than 3,001.
- The first year of infusion of new moneys would have resulted in the district's inability to comply with the requirements of the Fifty Percent Law. The percentage is recalculated without including these new moneys in order to determine if the district would have been in compliance.
- Unanticipated, unbudgeted, and necessary expenditures resulted in the district's inability to comply with the Fifty Percent Law. Litigation, arbitration, costs of energy, insurance and security are among the items to be considered.
- Districts with an unexempted deficiency from a prior cycle may expend funds for other than salaries of classroom instructors, but count the expenditures as instructional after reaching an agreement with faculty representatives that these expenditures, as itemized in title 5, section 59213(f), are necessary.

The waivers may be particularly important over the next few years because of the dramatic cuts in categoricals and the need for many districts to backfill those cuts with the ARRA funds, which are General Purpose funds, or other General Fund backfill to the categoricals. Such transfers of funds will upset the balance of expenditures, possibly resulting in colleges not meeting the 50% requirement.

### **3. Government Relations Update:**

- State legislation of particular interest to us include AB 440, which was stalled this year, but is likely to be re-introduced next year. This is the bill that would allow colleges to offer general transfer degrees upon the completion of 60 units, without students fulfilling local graduation requirements. We will keep a watch on it.
- There also is legislative interest in Concurrent Enrollment, and there may be legislation introduced in next year's session to limit it or to "allow" or "require" colleges to use a stricter priority enrollment process. Local Chambers of Commerce and other local organizations tend to support Concurrent Enrollment. We will watch this one carefully as well.
- CCCCO will be forming teams who are ready to generate advocacy and capacity building for advocacy both for the state and federal levels. (eg: activating letters, calls, meetings with legislators, etc). more details about this are forthcoming, probably at the next Consultation Council meeting in January.

### **4. Update on C-ID (Course Identification Numbering System, C-ID.net):**

- A descriptor-based system of articulation that addresses the need for a common numbering system
- Intended to help students find courses that are equivalent across community colleges and across segments (CSU/UC) and to facilitate articulation
- Intersegmental discipline teams were formed to develop descriptors for courses that commonly transfer. Draft descriptors are available on the C-ID website for review. Courses that are consistent with the descriptors (upon review) would be granted a C-ID number and the associated articulation.
- As CSU's LDTP project is being restructured, C-ID is now able to address all courses and has absorbed LDTP descriptors where appropriate.
- Currently, C-ID is working towards finalizing descriptors in accounting, communication studies, history, and sociology.

## **5. Student Senate Report;**

- Student Senate held a candlelight vigil in San Francisco at their November conference.
- The same weekend as the General Assembly the students marched.
- They focused sessions on advocacy and advocacy training for students.
- Student Senate is working with FACCC on their advocacy conference.
- Student Senate sponsored a resolution to encourage faculty to include civic engagement in their curriculum.
- They are planning a march in March (March 22), and are working with CSU for this event. Last year 5000 community college students participated and they hope to break that record this year.

## **6. A Report from the Accreditation Task Force:**

Jack gave an update on the Accreditation Task Force efforts to work with ACCJC in improving accreditation processes. He summarized the meeting that 5 members of the Task Force held with 5 members of the Commission, including the Executive Director Barbara Beno. He also shared the 7 recommendations that the Task Force presented to the Commissioners at that meeting. The commissions agreed to share our concerns with the full commission at their January meeting and would respond formally after that. The summary document and recommendations are attached below.

### Summary of Actions - Accreditation Task Force

By Jack Scott

At several meetings of the Consultation Council, issues and concerns about the accreditation process in California community colleges were discussed. It was decided to form an accreditation task force to address this matter. The following members of the Consultation Council were appointed to this task force:

Richard Hansen, FACCC  
Nicki Harrington, CEO  
Renee Kilmer, CIO  
Ron Norton Reel, CTA  
Jan Patton, Academic Senate  
Manuel Payan, Classified Staff  
Jack Scott, Chancellor

Later Barbara Davis Lyman was added to the task force to represent the Board of Governors.

After some discussion, the task force devised a survey on accreditation and sent this to the President and Accreditation Liaison Officer at each community college. After receiving the results of the survey, the task force formulated seven recommendations to present to the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges. These recommendations accompany this memo.

On October 26 five representatives from the task force (Barbara Davis-Lyman, Nicki Harrington, Renee Kilmer, Jane Patton, and Jack Scott) met with five representatives of the Commission. A discussion of three hours followed. The representatives of the Accrediting Commission indicated that they could take no action since only the entire Commission could act. Their next meeting is in January.

We are hopeful that this process is fruitful. All of us recognize the value of accreditation and simply want to work together to make it more effective.

.....  
Document presented to ACCJC

In the spirit of collaboration, and with the belief that accreditation is necessary and important, we provide the following recommendations to the ACCJC to enhance the process, especially as it applies to the California Community Colleges. We pledge our ongoing support to this effort to ensure the success of accreditation, the ACCJC and the California Community College System.

**Recommendations to ACCJC**

1. Develop a means for colleges to provide periodic feedback to ACCJC on the accreditation processes and their experiences, including both commendations for what went well and identification of what needs improvement.
2. Strengthen standards-based training of both visiting-team members and ALOs. Consider instituting an annual multi-day statewide California Community College conference to provide training and information to all interested constituencies. This could be co-presented with the Academic Senate and the CC League at the November annual CCC conference. Colleges could also present their best practices.
3. Review the ACCJC visiting-team selection process and consider means to involve a wider cross-section of the individuals in our system who desire to participate. Team participation should be treated as a professional development opportunity.
4. Scale accreditation expectations of Western Region colleges to benchmarks formulated relative to evidence of best practices documented in all of the accrediting regions in the country.
5. Consider lengthening the cycle of accreditation to 8 -10 years.
6. Employ cooperative ways to have accreditation result in improvement rather than just compliance. Also, develop more non-public ways to communicate to campuses their need for improvement.
7. Avoid recommendations that encroach on negotiable issues.