

**DISTRICT CONSULTATION COUNCIL**  
**August 27, 2018**

**SUMMARY**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Josh Ashenmiller, Dana Clahane, Richard Fee, Craig Goralski, Manjit Grewall, Sharon Kelly, Cheryl Marshall, Tina McClurkin, Dawnmarie Neate, Arturo Ocampo, Kim Orlijan, Valentina Purtell, Irma Ramos, Greg Schulz, JoAnna Schilling, Bryan Seiling, Kai Stearns Moore, Ty Volcy, Fred Williams, and Marcus Wilson.

**VISITORS:** Albert Abutin, Joyce Carrigan, Jennifer Combs, Gil Contreras, Monica Gomez, Mark Greenhalgh, Richard Hartmann, Adam Howard, Victor Manchik, Jose Ramon Nuñez, Jeremy Peters, and Laurie Triefenbach.

Chancellor Cheryl Marshall called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

**CONSENT CALENDAR & SUMMARY**

**Consent Items:** The agenda contained no consent items.

**Summary:** The summary of the May 21, 2018, meeting was approved as submitted.

**STRATEGIC GOALS & PLANNING**

**District Consultation Council 2018-19**

**2017-18 DCC Self-evaluation:** Chancellor Marshall led a brief review of the results of the 2017-18 DCC self-evaluation. Committee members expressed the need to communicate more broadly, and Dr. Marshall stated that she would attempt to send out a recap summary after meetings as her schedule allows.

**Goals:** After reviewing a copy of the 2017-18 DCC goals, the group recommended revising the goals for the upcoming year to include the Master Plan; back and forth communication with DEMAC; maximizing interventions in high impact practices and programs; capturing accurate data for each of the components of the new State funding formula; strategizing with regard to legislative advocacy; and adding a measurement of goals. Chancellor Marshall will present a draft of the 2018-19 DCC goals at the next meeting.

**Membership:** The committee reviewed the membership list; any revisions should be forwarded to the Chancellor's Office.

**Meeting Schedule:** During the review of the 2018-19 meeting schedule committee members agreed to the following: August 27, September 24, October 22, November 26, January 28, February 25, March 25, and April 22. The group agreed to cancel the December meeting (but leave it as an option if it becomes necessary), eliminate the May meeting, and conduct a June 24 meeting if needed.

**Policy Review: Overview of Process for 2018-19:** Chancellor Marshall stated that for the upcoming academic year, she would like to focus policy review on the following:

- Selection of up to ten policies for substantive review based on discussion in DCC and with the Board of Trustees. DCC would provide recommendations at the September 24 meeting, and those recommendations, along with those identified by trustees, would be discussed at the September 25 Board Policy study session.
- Board policy recommendations for discussion currently include:
  - BP 3900, Speech: Time, Place, and Manner – to address free speech
  - BP 6620, Naming of Facilities and Properties – due to the current construction program
  - BP 2745, Board Self-Evaluation – to change to an annual evaluation
  - BP 241, Board Policies and Administrative Procedures – to address Board involvement in policy development
  - BP 2740, Board Education – to address professional development
- Update all remaining policies and procedures with the appropriate legal language to ensure compliance with assistance from a CCLC consultant.
- Post all policies and procedures online to Teams to allow for input and comments in advance of meetings with a consolidated listing of comments to be shared with DCC. A demonstration of online posting will take place at the next DCC meeting.

In future years the District would follow the proposed schedule (originally shared at the April 23 DCC meeting) and conduct a substantive review by addressing one chapter per year. The goal would be to continuously improve the process for interaction and sustain regular progress on policy updates in order to address the accreditation finding and provide evidence for the mid-term report.

**Subcommittees:** After a brief discussion on the four subcommittees of the DCC – Council on Budget and Facilities (CBF), District Curriculum Coordinating Committee (DCCC), Institutional Effectiveness Coordinating Council (IECC), and the Technology Coordinating Council (TCC) – the consensus was that the body would like to continue to receive regular subcommittee updates. The DCC also requested to receive updates from the Districtwide Enrollment Management Advisory Committee (DEMAC) once a semester.

### **Anaheim Pledge/Promise Program Status Update**

As of last week, the District has approximately 1,500 Pledge registered students, close to 2,000 with signed agreements, and the campuses have hosted summer activities and welcome events. The State budget includes funding for the promise programs that will almost cover the entire cost, but the District has also received \$80,000 in donations. District one-time money will be used to cover the cost of English and math textbooks for Pledge students.

### **Budget/Funding Formula Update**

Fred Williams, Vice Chancellor of Finance & Facilities, distributed handouts that provided: 1) State information related to the new student centered funding formula and links for additional information; 2) the 2018-19 funding formula simulations; and 3) charts illustrating how the new formula is being calculated and its metrics. Vice Chancellor Williams stated that the simulations shared by the State still contains glitches and used 16-17 data, and that there has been no information on the FON number yet.

## **Winter Intersession and Next Steps**

DCC and DEMAC committee members conducted a joint discussion on Winter Intersession to discuss the work and changes that have taken place since May 2018 and consideration of options in order to make a decision on whether or not to proceed with a pilot Winter intersession.

### **Important Changes**

- The new funding formula is being implemented and will be based on 60% enrollment, 20% serving low-income students, and 20% performance metrics. NOCCCD will have “hold harmless” funds for three years and then will be funded based on MIS data submission.
- A United Faculty survey has not been conducted. It appears that faculty do not want to change the academic calendar; they do not want to end after Memorial Day, and want to keep spring break. Currently the calendar only leaves a 4-week break which will limit the courses that can be offered during an intersession.
- A faculty survey has been prepared and will be distributed to inquire about faculty interest in teaching during an intersession given its length and which classes they would teach.
- There is a significant decline in enrollment in summer and fall registration to date. The targets set in DEMAC are not changing, but there is concern. Enrollment in pre-transfer level math and English courses has also declined.

### **Guided Pathways**

- Winter could play a role in helping to retain students and/or make progress on their educational plan.

### **Cost and Impact**

- **Financial Aid**
  - Impact on the grade submission timeline in order to determine satisfactory academic progress including pre-requisites.
  - The financial aid award would need to be combined with fall or spring and there could be an impact on staff holidays for spring disbursement.
  - The programming Banner would need to take place beginning in October.
- **Facilities**
  - If Winter starts the first day after the break, there is impact on doing inspections and equipment startup which usually takes place during the holiday break.
  - Careful planning would be needed to schedule deep cleaning and maintenance that is typically done during the same time period.
  - One strategy would be to limit the number of buildings that are operational during the intersession.
  - Vacation and work schedules for facilities and M&O staff would be impacted and some overtime would be required (approximately 5-10%).
  - Cost estimates range from \$15,000 to \$20,000 districtwide with an additional cost estimate ranging from \$7,500–10,000 for additional supplies.
- **Health Center**
  - A session of at least 4 weeks does allow for an additional fee to students,

- Some employees would need to move from 10 or 11-month contracts up to 12 months with cost estimates that are up to \$100,000.
- Additional lab and supply costs would be incurred with cost estimates are up to \$10,000
- **Counseling**
  - Banner 9 implementation is beginning in Fall 2018.
  - Many counselors are usually scheduled to be off in January, and there could be a cost impact for additional days or for adjunct faculty.
- **Library/LRC**
  - Some 10 or 11-month employees would need to be extended.
  - Additional tutoring costs (approximately \$10-\$12 per hour).
  - Estimated costs district-wide: \$33,000–37,000.

### **Discussion on a 4-Week Winter Intersession and a 10-Week Summer Session**

The lengthy discussion on piloting a 4-week Winter Intersession and/or a 10-week Summer Session included the following points:

- The original premise for offering a winter intersession shifted due to the State funding formula. Now the District needs to consider how an intersession fits into guided pathways plans, and how students who cannot take more than 12 units might pick-up an extra class during intersession which would affect student success indicators and timely completion.
- Faculty stated that it is pedagogically ridiculous for a student to take a course, and for faculty to teach it, with the necessary time requirements.
- Instructors can do a lot in four weeks, but they cannot teach classes due to in-class and out-of-class commitments because there are not enough hours in the day. The majority of classes cannot be taught; some yes, but most no.
- The dialogue has changed since the initial intersession conversation began. An intersession doesn't make sense with a 4-week parameter. Perhaps boost type classes in preparation for Spring could be offered, but not courses that were originally envisioned to increase FTES.
- While some faculty were in favor of a 4-week intersession, others were not due to the lack of information available and suggested looking at making the summer session offerings more robust.
- CSEA voiced concern on the impact an intersession would have on classified staff who would be required to come in during a period that they might normally be off.
- Confidential staff expressed uncertainty on how that would impact the processing of employees in Human Resources.
- Adjunct faculty would be interested in a pilot Winter Intersession.
- Others suggested not separating the winter and summer options, and doing both in order to offer boost type two-week courses, workshops, and classes that might encourage attendance.
- There was a suggestion to offer online courses which could do very well in an intersession and might attract students from the CSU system.
- Would it even be possible in 2020 to have a 4-week intersession? A February 1 Spring semester start date would end the semester on May 29.
- Would the small handful of classes that can be offered in four weeks be enough to help students? Maybe we don't need all that and should do it in 2-3 weeks?

- Consider a 10-week summer session that would allow for two 5-week sessions that are back-to-back.
- There might be a challenge for sequential classes if doing back-to-back summer sessions.
- Would taking an extra class in the summer cause students to lose financial aid?
- A 10-week summer session would allow for 6-week or 8-week classes with a larger window to work with.
- Parents are usually supportive of varied schedule to allow for vacations, etc.
- Expanding the summer session wouldn't be as disruptive because it would not include adding an entire new term to allow for the winter intersession.
- Suggestions to model the CSU system schedule to capture missed enrollment opportunities.

Chancellor Marshall concluded the discussion by asking the group to vote –in a non-binding poll– for one of the following options based on the information available at this point in time:

- Offer a Winter Intersession Pilot in January 2020 – 8 votes
- Offer an enhanced Summer Session to achieve the same goals – 19 votes
- Make no changes (no Winter Intersession and no changes to summer) – 1 vote

Dr. Marshall asked everyone to continue to send information to her (no later than Monday, September 10) and that she would consider everything and make a decision within the next few weeks.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING:** September 24, 2018