

**DISTRICT CONSULTATION COUNCIL**  
**May 20, 2024**

**SUMMARY**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Byron D. Clift Breland, Jennifer Carey, Jennifer Combs, Christie Diep, Jean Foster, Karla Frizler (for Treisa Cassens), Geoff Hurst, Cherry Li-Bugg, Kathleen McAlister, Flavio Medina-Martin, Jeremy Peters, Valentina Purtell, Irma Ramos, Jeanette Rodriguez, Marlo Smith (for Naveen Kanal), Pamela Spence, Kai Stearns, and Scott Thayer.

Cynthia Olivo and Fred Williams attended remotely and did not participate in voting.

**VISITORS:** Alexander Brown, Matt Coleman, Tyler Deacy, Jackie Eckhardt, Danielle Davy, Minsoo Kim, Patti Mason, Gabrielle Stanco, and Rick Williams.

Chancellor Byron D. Clift Breland called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**Summary:** The summary of the April 25, 2024 meeting was approved as submitted.

**STRATEGIC GOALS & PLANNING**

**One time Funding Request:** DCC consider the following one-time funding requests:

Success Advocate Pilot Program Request: At the March 21, 2024 DCC meeting, the Success Advocate Pilot program was presented for a first reading with the intent to hire success advocates to assist with student enrollment, retention and success. The constituency groups were asked to discuss the proposal with their respective groups and provide feedback.

Cynthia Olivo, Fullerton College President, noted that the pilot program would provide support to students—especially those who left us—to enroll, re-enroll, or remain enrolled through providing just-in-time help, referrals and support in a proactive manner via text messaging, phone calls, online support and in person assistance in caseloads. The campuses would also have autonomy to select advocates to best suit their needs.

Chancellor Byron D. Clift Breland expressed support for the pilot program using one-time funds and not usurping existing positions.

As part of the discussion, members stated the following:

- What does autonomous mean? Can the campuses embed them in existing structures?
- Support for implementation at NOCE in order to increase capacity.
- The Fullerton College Faculty Senate supports the concept, but has concern with implementation, overlapping efforts, workload on classified, and using one-time funds on a band aid to fix the problem instead of directly tackling the root cause.
- CSEA expressed concern with replacing CSEA positions with 80 professional experts.
- The Cypress College Academic Senate has concerns with the training piece and the timeline.

- The pilot sounds great to get started. How would we gauge if it's successful? If it is successful, is there a plan to institutionalize it?
- Ideally the pilot would be institutionalized, but currently we have one-time funding to attempt to address our structural deficit by getting and retaining students, and that's a great thing for our budget long term.
- The pilot could help increase enrollment to pre-pandemic numbers.
- How did we arrive at the 11,000 unretained students figure and how does that compare with the number of students who did not return?
- Hasn't enrollment been climbing? If so, then the funding can be better used in other areas, like marketing.
- Marketing will get students in the door, but statistically, we need the customer service piece to get there and this is an enrollment marketing tool that is worth trying.
- The budget talk is something that we've heard over and over again, but our numbers are going up and we need to not be so dramatic. We have a lot of money.
- We have one-time money and this is an opportunity to help our students.
- The plan needs have some permanent employees too, it can't be all temporary.
- There is urgency now and this program is a great approach that provides an opportunity to scale to retain students who are considering leaving with a hands on, high touch, collaborative approach.
- This structure would allow some instructional programs to more effectively use permanent classified staff to focus on how to solve issues in house.
- An evaluation plan at the outset could be set up to determine what we measure, who comes back, what supports were provided, incentives, etc.
- Beyond enrollment and numbers, this is a student success initiative and provides the missing piece with a case management approach.

Subsequent to the discussion, **the majority voted to approve the one-time funding request for the District-wide Success Advocates Pilot program in the amount of \$2,140,000 with five members voting against** (Jennifer Combs, Christie Diep, Jeremy Peters, Jeanette Rodriguez, and Pamela Spence).

Scheduled Maintenance: In the 2022-23 State budget, \$840.7 million was allocated for scheduled maintenance and instructional equipment; the District portion was \$19.2 million. As part of the State's budget for 2023-24, \$500 million of the previous scheduled maintenance and instructional materials funds were pulled back by the State which amounted to \$11.4 million for the District. In the Governor's May Revise, no funding for deferred maintenance and instructional equipment for the 2024-25 State Budget was provided.

At the May 13, 2024 meeting, Council on Budget and Facilities recommended that \$5 million of the District's one-time funds be allocated for scheduled maintenance: \$2 million for Cypress College, \$2 million for Fullerton College, and \$1 million for NOCE.

**The majority voted to approve the one-time funding request of \$5 million for scheduled maintenance to the three campuses with three members voting against** (Christie Diep, Jeremy Peters, and Pamela Spence).

**Governor's May Revise:** Fred Williams, Vice Chancellor of Finance & Facilities, presented a review of the Joint Analysis of the Governor's May Revise Budget and provided the following updates:

#### May Revise Updates

- Not much change from the January budget, except COLA increasing to 1.07% for the apportionment calculation and certain categorical programs.
- No scheduled maintenance funds.
- No changes to the hold harmless provision, still phased out after the 2024-25 year.
- Upon discussion with the State Chancellor's Office, they expect significant activity between May and when the budget is signed before July 1.
- Concern whether COLA will be funded, due to opposition with education being favored in the May Revise.
- Still expecting deficit in 2023-24 when P2 numbers are released, but the State Chancellor has not quantified this.

#### Key Changes

- Under the May Revision, the overall state budget would be lower than proposed in January and lower than the 2023-24 enacted budget, decreasing by about 7% to \$288 billion related to a projected budget deficit of \$45 billion. General Fund spending would decrease by about \$25 billion (11.1%) to \$201 billion.
- The budget proposal for the California Community Colleges focuses on stability in the context of the significant budget deficit. It includes no major core reductions to programs or services, instead drawing on reserves and operational savings to bring the overall budget in balance. Overall, funding increases slightly compared to the current year enacted budget.
- Revised proposals for ongoing spending include about \$100 million for a 1.07% cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for community college apportionments, \$31 million more than the Governor's original proposed COLA of 0.76% in the January budget proposal. The proposal also includes an additional \$13 million for COLAs and adjustments to certain categorical programs, and \$28 million for systemwide enrollment growth of 0.5%.
- One-time funding in the revised proposal remains limited but retains the previously proposed \$60 million for expansion of nursing program capacity from the Governor's Budget and adds \$35 million for several projects related to the system's Vision 2030 priorities.
- The Governor's revised proposal includes \$29 million in capital outlay funding from Proposition 51 to support the working drawings and construction phases for one continuing project, the same as included in the Governor's Budget.

Vice Chancellor Williams share that the budget assumptions are tentatively scheduled to be presented to the Council on Budget & Facilities at their June 10 meeting, with the Tentative Budget scheduled for presentation to the Board at their June 28 meeting.

Chancellor Cliff Breland reported on legislative advocacy efforts related to Strong Workforce funding that could potentially be pulled back by the State and asked the campuses to allocate unspent funds.

United Faculty representatives asked how the District could face a structural deficit when the District is "one of the fattest cows in the State of California" and continues to hire management positions without scaling back, and asked what is being done with the extra FTES funding that the District receives.

Vice Chancellor Williams responded that references to a structural deficit are because enrolment is down, but the District continues to be funded at a higher level and not at what we should be earning based on our actual enrollment. The extra funding is reflected in the ending balance increases that may continue to grow due to emergency condition funding. He noted that the District is not in a fiscal crisis, but reiterated that the District will no longer receive additional funding beyond the 2024-25 year if enrollment does not increase, which is his concern.

Chancellor Cliff Breland emphasized that the District is committed to competitive salary and benefits, but that the ending balance is misleading because it is more of a savings account that can buy the District time for operating expenses when funding goes away. We need to make sure that we don't over hire, and that we look at other savings measures because this budget deficit will look different than the last time we experienced one, and nothing will replenish District funds once they are spent due to the State budget status.

**Districtwide Sustainability Plan:** DCC reviewed the Districtwide Sustainability Plan which was developed in response to the District's adoption of AP 3580, Environmental Sustainability Plan in response to California Community Colleges Board of Governors Sustainability Policy (2019); (STARS) Sustainability Tracking, Assessment and Rating System; and (UNSDGs) United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. The District awarded a contract to DLR Group to support the development of a comprehensive sustainability plan based on an assessment of existing purchasing, transportation, waste and energy and water use and prepare a plan to meet the State Chancellor's Guidelines, the State Community College Board of Governors Energy, and Sustainability Policy.

The Plan's objective is to set the guiding principles for an integrated energy master plan, total cost of ownership plan and set a comprehensive approach to, the district's current sustainability vision to include priorities for wellness, mental health, and resilience of the campus community. The Plan was created over the course of eight months with the full engagement of constituents represented by students, faculty, and staff from diverse roles and departments across each campus, including the District. Various drafts of the Plan were then shared with campus committees, the academic senates, and student groups for review and input.

Jackie Eckhardt, consultant with the DLR Group, led a presentation outlining what a sustainability and climate action plan is, the project timeline, what elements are informing the Plan, the resilience dimensions used, district impact areas, decarbonization and energy use, and next steps.

During the discussion, members inquired about the costs associated with the plan (both related to the development of the Plan and those to move the concepts forward), whether state funding has been provided, the possibility of State Chancellor's Office penalties if a plan is not in place, and what the projected cost savings are.

Vice Chancellor Fred Williams noted that the target milestones are in years 2025 and 2030, and while there is a lot of work to be done, the District is farther ahead than most districts.

The Districtwide Sustainability Plan's will be presented to the Board on May 28 as a first reading with a second reading scheduled for the fall semester.

**2022-26 Districtwide Strategic Plan:** In spring 2022, DCC authorized the formation of a Districtwide Workgroup (Design Team) to develop the 2022-2026 Districtwide Strategic Plan. The Design Team, along with consultant Matt Coleman, developed the Strategic Plan using a strategic compass approach which shifts the focus from rigid planning to flexible thinking and adaptation guided by a collective set of values, beliefs, and sense of purpose. The resulting 2022-2026 Districtwide Strategic Plan represents the collective effort of a collaborative group of stakeholders from across the District and provides a framework for implementing, evaluating, and achieving the District Strategic Directions, which guide NOCCCD's districtwide initiatives. A districtwide feedback forum was hosted in May 2024 to get input and recommendations on the draft 2022-2026 Districtwide Strategic Plan prior to presenting the Plan for DCC final review and approval.

Vice Chancellor Cherry Li-Bugg noted that agility is a major departure from the District's traditional strategic planning, and members praised the Plan which connects to the success advocates pilot program, allows for adjustments along the way, and reflects interrelated activities that are no longer happening in isolation.

Subsequent to the discussion, **there was consensus to approve the 2022-2026 Districtwide Strategic Plan with one noted abstention.**

## **POLICY**

**Revised AP 5020, Nonresident Tuition and AP 5030, Fees:** AP 5020, Fees and AP 5030, Nonresident Tuition were revised by DCC in February 2024 to specify the conditions under which the District would drop nonresident students and international students for nonpayment of tuition and fees. Subsequent to the approval of the revisions, concern was expressed by Fullerton College Faculty Senate regarding the impact on ESL students (AP 5030), implementation of the new procedures (AP 5030), and concern of the lack of a payment plan option or international students (AP 5020 and AP 5030).

During the discussion, Alexander Brown proposed the following revisions:

- AP 5020: Strike "excluding international students" from section 10.1 and delete section 10.2.
- AP 5030: Strike "excluding international students" from section 4.1.3 and delete section 4.1.4.

Members supported the revisions and **there was consensus to approve AP 5020 and 5030 and post them to the District website.**

**Program Discontinuance Workgroup:** DCC discussed the proposed composition of the Program Discontinuance Workgroup which includes members from Cypress College (Kathleen McAlister, Jill Bauer, Joyce Peacock, and Bryan Ventura); Fullerton College (Jeanette Rodriguez, Mary Bogan and/or Bridget Kominek, John Ison, and Daniel Berumen); and United Faculty (appointment pending).

During the discussion, Kathleen McAlister described how the participants were selected and members requested that comparable positions from NOCE be included along with additional District Services representatives whose names would be provided by Vice Chancellor Cherry Li-Bugg. It was requested that names be forwarded to Kathleen McAlister as soon as possible so that the workgroup can begin their work.

## OTHER ITEMS

**Winter Term 2024 Enrollment and Course Success Rates Report:** DCC received the NOCCCD Winter Term 2024 Enrollment and Course Success Rates report as information. The report was prepared with descriptive statistics of student enrollment, demographics, and course success rates, including some general comparisons with fall 2023 student data as a first step to help examine the impact of the 2023-24 online winter term/intersession on student enrollment and success. The research questions included:

- What are the similarities and differences between the composition of students enrolled in an online winter term at a community college and students enrolled during different terms of the same academic year (fall, spring, summer)?
- What are the similarities and differences between the composition of students enrolled in the academic year with a winter term and in academic years without a winter term?
- What is the effect of a personalized text message campaign on enrollment of an online winter term?
- What is the effect of enrolling in an online winter term on various academic outcomes?

A second report will also be prepared by early fall with a more advanced statistical analysis of winter outcomes, using causal inference methods and statistically controlling for student demographics and characteristic variables using a quasi-experimental design.

Data highlights included:

- 3,879 students were enrolled during winter 2024 across the District.
- The majority of winter 2024 students were female, 24 years old or younger, and continuing from a prior term.
- Latina/e/o/x students made up the largest racial/ethnic group of winter term students, followed by Asian, two or more races, and White students (with some differences by college).
- Relative to the fall term, winter enrollment had larger proportions of students who had a higher college GPA, were more likely to be BOG/CCPG or Pell Grant recipients, had more credit units earned, had an education goal/program of study related to transfer, and were female.
- The winter 2024 average success rate was 80%, which is 11 points higher than the average fall 2023 rate of 69%.
- Male, Black/African American, less than 24 years old, first time, and transfer students experienced notably higher course success during the winter term compared to the fall term.

During the discussion, members noted that historically we see lower success rates for asynchronous students so the increase was surprising; whether the increase would be further analyzed; whether the financial aid students were Pell Grant recipients seeking to preserve their aid awards; what fill rates were; if classes filled; if the intersession was successful; and if there were any dual enrollment participants.

**Next DCC Meeting:** The next DCC meeting will take place on Monday, August 27.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Chancellor Cliff Breland thanked everyone for an outstanding semester and adjourned the meeting at 4:07 p.m.