

**DISTRICT CONSULTATION COUNCIL**  
**January 25, 2021**

**SUMMARY**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Morgan Beck, Tonya Cobb, Damon De La Cruz, Carlos Diaz, Christie Diep, Craig Goralski, Cherry Li-Bugg, Cheryl Marshall, Lisa McPheron, Arturo Ocampo, Kim Orlijan, Jeremy Peters, Valentina Purtell, Irma Ramos, Lizeth Sanchez, JoAnna Schilling, Greg Schulz, Kai Stearns, Joseph Vasquez, and Fred Williams.

**VISITORS:** Rod Garcia and Fola Odebunmi.

Chancellor Cheryl Marshall called the Zoom teleconference meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.

**CONSENT CALENDAR & SUMMARY**

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

**Summary:** The summary of the November 23, 2020, meeting was approved as submitted.

**STRATEGIC GOALS & PLANNING**

**2021-2022 Governor’s January Budget Proposal:** Fred Williams, Vice Chancellor of Finance & Facilities provided a brief overview of the Governor’s 2021-2022 Budget Proposal.

Community College One-time Funding: Emergency aid to students, work-based learning, mental health, student retention and (re)enrollment, on-line education infrastructure, and expansion of apprenticeship.

Community College On-going Funding: COLA, growth, and the buy down of deferrals.

Economic Forecast: 2021-22 – \$15 billion estimated surplus; 2022-23 – (\$7.6) billion deficit; 2023-24 – (\$8.7) billion deficit; and 2024-25 – (\$11.3) billion deficit.

Budget Highlights: COLA 1.5% (\$111.1 million); Growth .5% (\$23.1 million); Buy down of deferrals (\$1.1 billion leaving \$326.5 million); and PERS/STRS stabilization.

Estimated Cal PERS/STRS Rates

	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>
STRS	17.10%	16.15%	15.92%
PERS	19.721%	20.70%	23.00%

Other Funding: Emergency Financial Assistance – \$250 million (\$100 million for student financial needs and \$150 million for grade requirements); Zero Textbook Costs – \$15 million; Student Basic Needs – \$130 million (\$100 million over 3 years for housing and food security, and \$30 million for mental health); Student retention and (re)enrollment – \$20 million; On-line education support and infrastructure – \$13.1 million.

Flexible Federal Funding (Part of the 20-21 Year)

	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Minimum for Students</b>	<b>Maximum for Institution</b>
Fullerton	\$20,180,789	\$4,850,367	\$15,330,422
Cypress	\$15,639,532	\$3,573,967	\$12,065,565

There will be \$1.286 billion in flexible funding for California Community Colleges to use within one year. Allowable uses include operating expenses, backfill from lost revenue, authorized student support services, and Financial Aid grants without regard to immigration status.

Other: There is a difference in COLA funding for K-12 (3.84%) and community colleges (1.5%). Prop 98 funding will now go to student aid which will reduce the institutional funding and could be problematic in the long term.

Vice Chancellor Williams reminded the group that in January last year the State had a very good budget, but at the May Revise had significant differences. He noted that the District's enrollment decline at 7% is much better than other districts due to declining enrollment statewide with some districts declining by 40%. He cautioned that while the PERS/STRS rates were bought down for another year, and that is a direct savings for the District and budget centers, it is only temporary.

During the discussion, the following points were asked/stated:

- What is the timeline for the federal funds disbursement? Some districts have already received it with it going directly to Financial Aid. As soon as the campuses are notified they will have access to the funds, but there needs to be a discussion on the NOCE allocation.
- The federal funds do not include an allocation for NOCE, but the Department of Finance confirmed that non-credit students are eligible even without a designation. The State Chancellor's Office also used NOCE enrollment to calculate funding that was included with the financial allocation to the Colleges.
- The higher K-12 COLA is intended to partially cover this year and next year and designed to help open the schools. The belief is that open schools will help open the economy by allowing people to go back to work without children at home. The message to Governor will be that community colleges also have additional costs that warrant additional COLA.
- A status update on CARES funding will be coming soon and will include funds spent to date and allocated amounts.
- Vice Chancellor Williams suggested that the campuses reconsider the \$10 million in backfill allocations from one-time funding dollars due to the newly available federal funds.

**One-time Funding:** Vice Chancellor Fred Williams provided a status update of one-time funding from the December 7, 2020 Council on Budget & Facilities (CBF) meeting. He noted that adjustments for the hold harmless funding for 20-21 have not been made.

Categories for student basic needs, emergency preparedness, increase to revenue, student success and equity, sustainability, capital improvements, and institutional capacity that were previously removed have been added back to the listing. A line item for \$131,760 was added for Human Resources automated processes.

An allocation of \$5 million to backfill the campuses for the Spring 2021 semester was also added. Vice Chancellor Williams highlighted that the \$10 million in backfill to the campuses, for Fall 2020 and Spring 2021, is what he suggested could be taken back since those funds do not have spending restrictions and can be carried over.

He noted that the next two years of hold harmless funding have not been included, but cautioned that deficits are expected and those funds could be used to cover the deficits that the State will pass on to the District.

During the discussion, the following points were asked/stated:

- The rationale for the \$10 million makes sense. That information will be shared and Fullerton College is open to input as they continue their planning.
- There needs to be a systematic way to bring funding proposals, which is currently lacking, so that funding can be provided to the campuses. Perhaps use the list of criteria that was previously developed (by FTES, by enrollment, etc.) and take that back to CBF?
- With the federal funds freeing up one-time funding dollars, CBF needs to have a discussion that incorporates those facts.
- Have caution as to how the federal funds are split because they are not interchangeable dollars. CARES funding has specific criteria that needs to be tied to certain requirements and cannot be used for some of the projects.

**Strategic Plan Allocation: Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Anti-racism:** The Strategic Plan Fund was set up over five years ago by the Board to support projects that would contribute to strategic directions, but the \$1 million allocation has not been used in the past four years. With the new Educational and Facilities Master Plan and the District's renewed commitment to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Anti-racism, Chancellor Marshall recommended earmarking \$400,000 of those funds to support campus and District-wide initiatives.

Suggestions for allocations were based on a review of the campus reports, meetings with the DEI Faculty Fellows, Campus Task Forces, United Faculty RJEC, and discussion in Chancellor's Staff, and include items that were consistently mentioned to address DEIA, social justice, and anti-Blackness in the District.

Proposed initial actions/initiatives include: Legacy and Umoja Program support, mental health counseling, mentoring for employees and students, student internships, expansion of the DEI Faculty Fellows, expansion of the Future Instructor Training Program, trained facilitators to guide discussions on DEIA (both external and internal), professional development, and stipends for work on selected projects at each campus.

Additional proposed actions that may be incorporated into the above list or be completed as a part of on-going responsibilities: communication and messaging campaigns; review of the Faculty of Color Survey and determination of next steps; changes to Campus Safety procedures; changes to recruitment and hiring procedures; review of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures; and changes to evaluation processes and tools.

The total proposed allocation of \$400,000 to be distributed as follows:

Budget Center	Spring 2021*	2021-22 Year
Cypress College and Fullerton College	\$35,000 each	\$110,000 each
NOCE	\$15,000	\$40,000
Districtwide or District Services	\$15,000	\$40,000

\* Funds would rollover if not spent

To ensure transparency and accountability, reports from each campus and District Services would be provided to CBF, DCC, and the Board of Trustees on a quarterly basis with the first report due in April 2021.

Chancellor Marshall noted that the proposal was previously shared with CBF and includes suggestions for what can be done based on that discussion across the District. The work noted would begin over the next 12 months. She stated that the allocation would be presented to the Board at the February 9 meeting and it would include a report to provide context, share the work that has already taken place, and longer term planning.

During the discussion, the following points were asked/stated:

- How much was allocated by the Board? \$1 million. The funding has not been used for the last few years because the projects were more operational in nature, so it was stopped. The funding previously used is not factored into this proposal; it would be a new \$1 million.
- If the Board asks, what is the plan for the remaining \$600,000? There is currently no exact answer, but since the District has a new EFMP, it might be used there, but what that looks like is unknown.
- The work on the campuses via the faculty-driven task forces might have planning suggestions.
- Reminded the Chancellor to take remember the Black Lives Matter Task Force recommendations when considering how to allocate the funds.
- Long term goals that need funding, like positions, will be included in the Board Report and that will include the BLM Task Force recommendation for an Ombudsperson position.
- The report to the Board will require input from campuses and Dr. Marshall asked the campuses to provide any finalized reports in order to help differentiate between the short-term and long-term needs.
- The Latino Faculty and Staff Association is working on document similar to the BLM Task Force recommendations and it might include overlapping recommendations.

## POLICY

**Board Subcommittee Revised Policies:** DCC received two board policies that were revised by the Board of Trustees Policy Subcommittee and initially reviewed by the Board.

**BP 2310, Regular Meetings of the Board:** This policy was revised to clarify when Board meetings occur in Section 1.0; to add language in the newly created Sections 7.0 and 8.0 regarding teleconferenced meetings and procedural rules; make grammatical corrections; and to cite the corresponding policies and procedures. **There was consensus to approve BP 2310 and forward it to the Board of Trustees for their consideration.**

BP 2715, Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice: This policy was substantially revised to expand on the expectations of trustees (Sections 1.0 – 1.16); clarify the formal complaint process related to trustee misconduct (Sections 2.0 – 5.0); make grammatical corrections; include gender neutral language; and to cite the corresponding policies and procedures.

During the discussion, members requested clarification from the Board Subcommittee regarding the following points:

- Section 3.0: Is the reporting on a resolution after speaking to the trustee done during a Board meeting and at open session?
- Section 3.0: Who deems that further action is needed? Board President or someone else?
- Section 3.0: What is the rationale behind making the ad hoc committee optional?
- Section 3.0: Can a timeframe for the process be outlined and/or suggestions given from DCC members?
- Section 4.0: What are some examples of “less severe sanctions”?
- Section 4.0: Why do less severe sanctions require a majority vote?

DCC recommended changing “may” to “will” in Section 3.0 to read, “If resolution is not achieved and further action is deemed necessary, the Board President **will** appoint...” Members were asked to solicit feedback on the appropriate length of time to file a complaint in Section 2.5.

Chancellor Marshall stated she would relay the inquires to the Subcommittee and provide responses so that they can be included in the BP when it is shared at the campus level. She requested that members share the BP at that time with their constituencies and campuses, and be prepared to share that feedback via Teams in preparation for the February DCC meeting.

**Revised AP 3720, Computer and Electronic Communication Systems**: DCC received revisions to AP 3720 that were made to reflect changes per the Community College League of California (CCLC) Policy and Procedure Legal Updates to add a section to address information security program requirements for institutions that participate in Title IV Educational Assistance Programs. Additional revisions were also recommended by the Technology Coordinating Council to reflect current terminology and practice.

During the discussion, members revised Section 4.3.14 to include “personal” to read, “**Personal** use which processes, stores, or transmits credit card information.” **There was consensus to approve revised AP 3720 and post it on the District website.**

**ADJOURNMENT**: The meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m.