

**California Community Colleges Task Force on Student Success.  
Meeting December 7, 2011 in Sacramento at Le Rivage Hotel  
Informal notes.**

Chancellor Scott. The Task Force was appointed by the Board of Governors and they will choose what actions to take. There are three avenues for implementation. **Best practices**—example, encourage colleges to focus flex on basic skills. **Regulation** through the Board of Governors, subject to first reading and second reading. If they require **statute** must go to legislature, for instance the BOG waiver must go to the legislature.

**Feed back from idea scale, emails and letters.**

Kathy Booth. Update on online feedback. In the last six weeks 625 unique comments very carefully thought out. There have been conversations about these issues. Common values coming through, some of which people feel are being threatened. Two-page summary [distributed to Task Force members, but not to audience].

- It is important for the next phase to put recommendations in the context of the common values that the public feedback expressed. The community is passionate about the broad vision. People benefit from the things community colleges do that don't fit neatly into our ideas about what colleges do. Especially CTE, job skills, retraining. Older Adult and Ceramics (Visual Arts) cited as well.
- Chapter 2 recommendations, there are concerns about those. Agree that people need more support at the front door, but concerned that Task Force ideas are not feasible, that money is lacking. Also, the importance of allowing students to explore. There are concerns about students' ability to create an educational plan for themselves in the first few semesters. Identified as an equity issue, for students coming from impoverished families who are the first to go to college, all they know about career choices is what they learned on television, they aren't yet ready to make career decisions. Especially Science, Tech, Engineering, and Math careers, students tend to choose those a little later, not when they first walk in the door.
- Alarm about assessment tests—equity issues, grave concerns about off-the-shelf options, placement tests often inaccurate.
- Concerns about academic quality, will we end up turning over 80% of our resources to teaching basic skills.
- Balance of control—local control valued for decisions made through shared governance, elected boards, local bond measures, etc.
- Collaboration with K.-12. We'll be on the hook to collaborate with them, but not them with us.
- There are major concerns about not doing enough to make a case for more money.
- Concern that recommendations will harm our most vulnerable students, inadvertently, in many areas.
- People want more input, this process was rushed. Many people wrote to thank the Task Force for their work and for making changes from the September draft.
- Committee should reread comments, “. . . so much rich expertise . . . tremendously lucky to . . . receive such information.”

Rubén Lizardo. How will the report play in the context of talk at the state level about asking for money? The community colleges are not being included, how will the release of the report affect opportunities to include the community colleges? We should discuss this later today.

Dr. Jeannette Mann. Some comments echo each other, written without having read the report. Many

comments from San Francisco are like this.

Christopher Cabaldon. So many comments are negative, because that's who makes the effort to comment.

Dr. Brice Harris. Disagree that there hasn't been enough time. People have had plenty of time.

Dr. David Morse. Messages may echo because they're coming from one particular place, but you also get echoes because people share concerns. And you get things from organizations, that represents many people, and we've heard from different organizations acting independently of each other saying similar things, you shouldn't ignore that

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair: degree of involvement.

Richard Hansen. We must be very concerned with responses in terms of implementation. Time has been short for people to organize to create fully formed responses.

Kevin Feliciano. Concerns about those who will be shut out of the system.

Chancellor Scott. This feedback is very informative in terms of communication. We need to communicate our intentions more clearly. Responses show misunderstanding, clarification needed. We need to allay concerns.

Overview of major revisions. The Task Force members and the audience received a handout showing eight areas changed between September 30 and December 1. The handout was reviewed.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair: Character at outset "sells this". "Leave text to the writer." (Amy)

### **Discussion of Introduction**

Dr. Constance Carroll. Want the intro to start with framing with background of mission of the community colleges in the master plan. Objects to the fictionalized portrait It does frame the mission but doesn't provide context for the recommendations in terms of the master plan and the mission.

Rubén Lizardo. Doesn't object to the metaphor but it shouldn't be the first thing people engage.

Dr. Robert Gabriner. Starts with a person to try to unify, but it raises difficulty because it is too particular.

Christopher Cabaldon. Likes the story. It engages the policymakers. If problems with what comes first, suggest sidebar layout use a picture of gay Filipino boy, you can use my story.

### **BREAK**

### **Student Success Scorecard, Recommendation 7.3**

Dr. Nancy Shulock. On page 63 paragraph towards the bottom implies that scorecard will all be based on ARCC but ARCC doesn't include people taking zero through 12 units. People taking zero through 12 units are among those whom we want to follow.

Dr. Robert Gabriner. Do we really want to get involved in the 12 unit issue?

[A draft of what the metrics might look like was distributed to the Task Force members but was not visible to the audience.]

There was a discussion of including or excluding students who take less than 12 units including the

math or English.

Dr. Nancy Shulock. feels is completely contrary to the Task Force concern for most vulnerable students to not track those taking less than 12 units.

Chancellor Scott. Agrees with Nancy.

Christopher Cabaldon. Wants it to be students who have created education plan.

Suzanne Reed (Staffer for Senator Carol Liu). Wishes they had spent more time on the scorecard.

Dr. Robert Gabriner. Suggest turn over resolving this to Patrick and the writers.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. As a group there is an intent to find ways to look at students taking one through 12 units.

Dr. Yasmin Delahoussaye. There needs to be some way to take out students who should not be included, example, CSU students taking one or two courses.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. Successful course completion is one of the measures.

Dr. Brice Harris. On page 10 talks about the percentage of students who complete their stated educational goal. A student who comes to the community college saying they want to learn Java and then they take one course, they have completed their educational goals they are successful.

Richard Hansen. Implementation work on this needs to be done in an open way.

David Rattray. ARCC is dynamic but it is hard coded, changing ARCC requires agreement among several state entities.

David Rattray. Acknowledge that in order to make the score card work you need some types of data that are not in ARCC. So if you say ARCC is your measure, then you need to say that we will add things to ARCC.

Chancellor Scott. Echoes concerns expressed by Yasmin of colleges being held accountable for students that were never intended to be part of this (CSU students taking one or two courses). Each college should have a student success scorecard so everyone can see how that college is doing.

Amy Supinger. Not intended that ARCC be the whole thing, just that scorecard will use existing, familiar measures.

Patrick [Vice Chancellor Patrick Perry?]. Determining who is decreased seeking is the hardest job to do.

Dr. Constance Carroll. Intent is that the scorecard not create an additional reporting system that is redundant to ARCC.

### **Professional Development, Recommendations 6.1 and 6.2.**

Dr. David Morse. Two things. The original language has been changed but the bullet saying amend Title 5 is still here. If the Chancellor is just going to make recommendations, not requirements, then we don't need changes to Title 5. Second thing. The second is about involving part-time faculty equally, we suggest changing that word to "also" instead of "equally." And there's no need for a Title 5 change for this.

Dr. Robert Gabriner. Shares the concern that flex days as currently practiced, there is a lack of commitment to long-term teaching and learning issues.

Vice Chancellor Barry Russell. If the board of governor identifies this [flex activities about basic skills] as something that's very important to the state then we have an interest in making it clearer to the community college that it's important.

Dr. Jane Patton. Best practices, for instance a year-long teaching and learning seminar for new faculty, can be recommended to the colleges by the State Chancellor already. The implementation team should be dominated by faculty. Why prescribe changes to Title 5 at this point? A change to Title 5 can always be initiated later if needed.

Dr. Robert Gabriner. Want to make sure that this state leadership will push local colleges.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. Bob has made the rationale clear.

Dr. Manuel Baca. There has been drift in the focus of flex.

Dr. David Morse. Urge that the Task Force change the language to remove the requirement that changes to Title 5 be proposed.

Chancellor Scott. We can work on the language about Title 5.

Dr. Robert Gabriner. There needs to be more attention to flex for part-time faculty. Many faculty work at multiple community colleges within an area. Regionalization of some levels of professional development would be useful to these part-time faculty.

Dr. Jane Patton. Summarize that there will be a change of "equal" to some other word and that there is a request to remove the language about requiring change to Title 5. Recognition of contractual agreement aspect to flex and its implementation.

#### **Align Course Offerings to meet Student Need, Recommendation 4.1**

Dr. Constance Carroll. Input about education plans. Noncredit education plans need to relate to the areas given in 4.1, that is, they cannot be recreational. But we are silent here. There has been talk about "Ukulele for Seniors." Wants to be sure that we are not targeting older adults. Needs to be language about inclusion of older adults.

Chancellor Scott. This is something that's being discussed out in public. The colleges should drop courses such as "Senior Topics." If we don't do it, if we don't reform ourselves, then it will be done to us.

Christopher Cabaldon. talked about triage in an emergency room as a metaphor for the crisis of availability of courses and community colleges. 10,000 people are taking ceramics for seniors and courses of that sort, keeping first-time students from access to essential basic skills.

Dr. Constance Carroll. It is fashionable to mock programs for older adults. Should come to San Diego to see that these are not privileged people. Older adults who are poor, older adults of color, are going back to work and they need to learn skills. These are not people to be thrown into the street. Is the Task Force going to comb through the noncredit curriculum to identify inappropriate classes or eliminate entire lists of classes? Older adult programs should also have education plans associated with them. We will have a stronger Chancellor's Office, the Chancellor's Office will look at curriculum to make sure it's appropriate.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. Choice is to swipe with an ax and eliminate programs or at the Chancellor's Office will look at individual courses and say whether they meet the criteria.

David Rattray. The recommendation as currently worded is that okay?

Kevin Feliciano. Question about the fee-based issue.

Rubén Lizardo. Agrees with the Chancellor but wants to understand the second to last bullet. For instance, a course on violence prevention, will the Chancellor's Office know the context?

Dr. Nancy Shulock. How will the Chancellor's Office monitor courses?

Chancellor Scott. The Chancellor's Office is not able to monitor every course. We have more responsibility than we have authority. At one college, more than 20% of the curriculum was P.E. They don't have to pay attention to the Chancellor.

Dr. Jane Patton and Dr. David Morse Morse. The fourth bullet says to increase the Chancellor's authority over course offerings and mentions recommendation 7.1. How does it relate to 7.1?

Amy Supinger. Recommendation 7.1 Increases authority in broad strokes, this would be included.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. For example, already there are nine categories for noncredit and funding can be withheld for any course outside the nine categories.

Further discussion on this issue.

Chancellor Scott. There is value for all the courses, but in times of rationing we have to change our behavior. We are in a crisis. It's not bad that people enjoyed quilting, but were turning people away from core classes.

Richard Hansen. It's clear that Bullet Two requires education plans. We should change the language in Bullet One to say "community education," not "community service."

Dr. Jeannette Mann. Just ran for reelection. Older adults in district want classes for their grandsons, not for themselves.

Dr. Constance Carroll. Base what we do not on anecdotes, but on evidence. Want to make sure that we are clear about supporting this language, and not injecting nuances. It is the job of the Chancellor's Office to send directives, the system Office should monitor courses.

Dr. Jane Patton. The fourth Bullet which references 7.1. We are suggesting removing the first sentence and replacing it with [did not get exact text] language about consulting with administrators and faculty to develop and disseminate best practices.

Amy Supinger. Recommendation 7.1 does not list all the areas, but look at the recommendation itself, not the bullet points underneath it. If in 4.1 you remove mention of 7.1, it will weaken 7.1.

Dr. Robert Gabriner. Does the question of whether all the folks in older adults will create education plans, and this will roll over.

Dr. Constance Carroll. There are ways to implement this that are not difficult. Someone comes forward with a specified goal when they register for class, and then measure at the end.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. Lends itself to all kinds of interpretation. Wide open for manipulation, can't be seen as comparable.

Christopher Cabaldon. Can't cut off the item at the second bullet, because it's a waste of time for colleges to create and process all those education plans. The politics of this—the student needing basic skills doesn't vote and the senior taking "Finding Buried Treasure" or "Organizing Your Clutter" is a voter.

Dr. Nancy Shulock. We should rewrite this to be clear.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. This is our last meeting. Why don't we rewrite at lunch and look at it after lunch.

Dr. Constance Carroll. Rewrite that last bullet.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. We have consensus on One) we are rationing access at this point. Two) need to put funds where they are most needed. Three) recreational courses should not be receiving funds.

Various comments made.

Dr. Jane Patton rereads her suggested statement.

Dr. David Morse. So mention 7.1 but there's no need to amend the statute to do what's said here.

Back-and-forth discussion.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. Small team will work on this over lunch.

Suzanne Reed (Staffer for Senator Carol Liu) Bullet One is talking about credit and fee based.

Kevin Feliciano. Difficulties with equitable implementation.

Richard Hansen. Good questions. Concerns about paying students.

Dr. Constance Carroll. Make the fourth bullet more reflective of the language in 7.1. Stay away from value judgments of who comes first, who comes last, etc. If we're going to denigrate courses, we can also demonize credit electives. Strengthen language in regards to 7.1.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. What we don't want is a peripheral courses taken away from core courses.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair names the eight people to work on this.

Rubén Lizardo. Suggests voting on this after lunch.

Christopher Cabaldon. Suggests the eight people appointed to bring back several choices.

That suggestion is overruled.

## **LUNCH**

### **Basic Skills funding. Recommendation 8.3**

Dr. Jane Patton. About 8.3, suggest getting rid of first bullet and revising others. As it stands it's kind of a back door performance-based funding.

Dr. Jane Patton and Dr. David Morse. The suggested change gives the colleges the opportunity to get the resources in order to make the innovation and then show that they are getting results from the innovation.

Rubén Lizardo. Does this say that if you want to keep doing the innovation you need to show that it works? Then, yes, I'm in favor.

Christopher Cabaldon. This would change what we voted on twice before.

Speaker (Who is this?). By limiting it to basic skills, it would mean you can't contextualize, basic skills taught to history, for example.

Dr. Jane Patton. Basic skills instruction, it's meant to say basic skills instruction, it's not just basic skills courses.

Dr. Jeannette Mann. Can't support this, it's too different.

Dr. Jane Patton and Dr. David Morse. It needs to be different because we decided not to support performance-based funding.

Dr. Robert Gabriner. I supported performance-based funding and I saw this as a good way to try it out because we want to continue to look at this.

Richard Hansen. What is in the report now is too narrow.

Speaker. Helped with the wording of the current version. It's not meant to be performance-based funding. Don't see how it's being read that way.

Dr. Brice Harris. Wants to keep it as written. Local academic Senate will have to approve, we'll keep guard to make sure that it's not performance-based funding.

Dr. David Morse. The existing language uses plural for interventions and strategies and then singular for model.

Dr. Nancy Shulock. Not intended to mean single delivery model, just single funding model.

Speaker. Make it "models," plural.

Suzanne Reed (Staffer for Senator Carol Liu). It could be done in many different ways to advance people through the basic skills faster.

Dr. Jane Patton and Dr. David Morse. That's it, that's the single model. Acceleration, the elephant in the room.

Dr. Brice Harris. If the Academic Senate is in charge of it, then they decide what approach is appropriate. They'll have to convince someone in the Chancellor's office.

Dr. Jane Patton. In the case of Brice, he would be sure not to put pressure on a Senate to go along with something that he learned at the conference, say. But other CEOs...

Chancellor Scott. The Academic Senate are tenured faculty, and the CEO is not tenured. As CEO at two local colleges found that if something seems outrageous to the local Senate it doesn't go very far.

Dr. David Morse. The suggested change doesn't stop anything from being done. It opens it up to more options. You've seen opposition to the current language in letters sent to us and from many sources.

Dr. Jeannette Mann. Just make "models" plural.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. Calls for a vote. Votes are 10 to 7 to keep the existing language changing only the word "model" to "models," plural.

Dr. Brice Harris. Notice that all the faculty voted against keeping the language as is. This is not good.

More discussion.

Dr. David Morse. I heard it said that the goal is acceleration, but that's supposed to be just one possible strategy.

Christopher Cabaldon. Originally a number of things were listed, but we took that language out in order to not mention acceleration as part of list.

Dr. Jane Patton. There will clearly be pressure to get students to reach their planned unit goal faster.

Spoke about the second part of the first bullet.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. You seem to be opposed.

Dr. Jane Patton. No, I think it's a very sexy option for people who want to save money.

Dr. Nancy Shulock. It's not just about saving money, it's about helping people move on and get through.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. We can reword...

Dr. Jane Patton. We just tried to propose changes to the wording it was rejected.

Richard Hansen. Chapter 5 has lots about innovation. I remember the day this was proposed, it was about funding.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. We'll come back to this. Here's what else we have. The topics are: categorical. Use of technology. Chancellor's office. Bog fee waiver.

### **Categorical. Recommendations 8.1**

Dr. Nancy Shulock. 8.1 first bullet it's intended to streamline, to relieve them of the burden of reporting.

Dr. Yasmin Delahoussaye. Will these be in the scorecard?

Dr. Nancy Shulock. No.

Discussion about reporting for categorical programs.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. Anyone opposing? No, we'll change that wording.

### **Technology. Recommendation 2.3**

Dr. Robert Gabriner. On page 30, recommendation 2.3. Technology. We need to recognize that the digital divide is now around WiFi access. 60% don't have WiFi at home. Want to say that local implementation planning should include students in this planning.

Dr. Jane Patton. Agreed, and the second paragraph forgets what you just said, and predicates that students will all have access.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. Agreement?

Christopher Cabaldon. Technology is changing fast. Day laborers now using cell phones, etc. technology is now aspirational even for families who lack access to it. Technological and financial literacy are important parts of what we teach.

Dr. Robert Gabriner. It needs to be made specific.

Kevin Feliciano. WiFi should be provided on campus.

Suzanne Reed (Staffer for Senator Carol Liu). Include the students.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair: Do we want to actually specify student involvement?

### **Chancellor's Office. Recommendation 7.1**

Chancellor Scott. Wants to make sure that we keep bullet that Chancellor appoints vice chancellors. Willing to delete third bullet. Having the chancellor's office be a part of the state government is not a good thing. It's different for CSU and UC.

Dr. David Morse. On the second bullet, agree to change to allow Board of Governors to appoint vice chancellors. It wouldn't be a direct appointment by the Chancellor.

Richard Hansen. It can't work without funding.

### **BOG Fee Waiver Discussion. Recommendation 3.2**

Rubén Lizardo. Want to make the point, did everyone read the e-mail I sent? Then I won't repeat what it said. It's bad to penalize the students that we want to help. I can see this recommendation coming in 2 to 3 years after the other changes.

Richard Hansen. On the face of this, it is not a plan for student success.

Rubén Lizardo. The BOG fee waiver limit. It's not an incentive, it's a penalty.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. How is it a penalty?

Rubén Lizardo. Having the limit doesn't cause the system to do what we want to support the students.

Cynthia Rico-Bravo. The academic standards of progress are for all students. Colleges intervene and sanction all students. I don't feel that this is equitable. We need to help colleges to tighten up and intervene earlier. With a practice that's more equitable for everyone, not just these students. There's a perception that were just picking on these students.

Chancellor Scott. A penalty is an incentive. A carrot or stick, either is an incentive. We allow students to become professional students, when we can't get the first-time students in the door. There's finally a penalty if you take 110 units. This is on taxpayer dollars, on the taxpayers' dime. If you ask the taxpayers -- we are going to stop it at 110 units, the taxpayers would say, "Why'd you let them go that long?" They would want to stop it sooner.

Kevin Feliciano. The students do not have a position on this. Personally, I agree with Cynthia. The 110 limit doesn't include various things, but they are not listed. I don't think they should get free education.

Christopher Cabaldon. Tells story about a guy taken off kidney transplant list because he was using alcohol, marijuana, etc. The financial aid dollar is just as valuable as a kidney.

Dr. Yasmin Delahoussaye. This puts us in line with federal financial aid, and there will be opportunities to appeal.

Dr. Benjamin Duran. Usually agree with my brother Reuben. But we looked at students at home, and saw no profile, they're all different. When you allow them to go beyond 110 units, they're taking a seat away. For those who are at risk there is ability to appeal. We will not see a huge population thrown out onto the street.

Cynthia Rico-Bravo. For students who come back to us because they need retraining and already have 110 units, there are ways around this. For the public, they don't understand that there will be opportunities for appeal.

Rubén Lizardo I agree with the goals and respect the views of others. Just think that this is not the lever that will get us what we want.

### **Back to Basic Skills funding. Recommendation 8.3**

Dr. David Morse. Reads change to last sentence of first paragraph. First sentence of second paragraph, make it “models,” plural. Add sentence to specify increased success at coarse level, sequence level, or both. Funding would be provided as a lump sum etc.

Discussion with Suzanne Reed (Staffer for Senator Carol Liu) and others about how this is different from Basic Skills Initiative funding, and how it would work.

Christopher Cabaldon. This is very different from the original, because the original says you have to get to the same goal for the money. This version is more like categorical funding.

Dr. Peter MacDougall, Chair. Suggests adding “within the FTE allocation.”

Dr. Benjamin Duran. The difference is you can get the dollars up front.

More discussion.

Dr. Constance Carroll and Cynthia Rico-Bravo leave to head back to San Diego.

### **Wrap up.**

Chancellor Scott talks about having been involved in original bill.

They go around the table and each participant speaks briefly.

Richard Hansen: Notes that the discussion didn't address all recommendations before the meeting was ended and so related concerns were not addressed.