

**DISTRICT CONSULTATION COUNCIL**  
**October 28, 2024**

**SUMMARY**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Byron D. Clift Breland, Jennifer Carey, Archie Delshad, Karla Frizler, Martha Gutierrez (for Valentina Purtell), Geoff Hurst, Bridget Kominek, Elaine Loayza, Candace Lynch (for Michelle Patrick Norng), Jaclyn Maggini, Kathleen McAlister, Flavio Medina-Martin, Cynthia Olivo, Jeremy Peters, Irma Ramos, Marlo Smith, Pamela Spence, Gabrielle Stanco (for Cherry Li-Bugg), Kai Stearns, Scott Thayer, Annalisa Webber, and Katie Wong.

**VISITORS:** Elizabeth Martinez, Leslie Tsubaki, and Davis Vo.

Chancellor Byron D. Clift Breland called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**Summary:** The summary of the September 23, 2024 meeting was approved, with the noted correction to page 5 of the BP/AP 7600 discussion regarding CSEA's continued advocacy in support of members being able to defend themselves with the use of an asp. **There was consensus to approve the summary with four abstentions** (Archie Delshad, Martha Gutierrez, Bridget Kominek, and Candace Lynch.)

**STRATEGIC GOALS & PLANNING**

**Impact of NOCCCD's Winter Term on Student Outcomes Report:** Gabrielle Stanco, District Director, Research, Planning & Data Management, and Davis Vo, UCLA Graduate Student Researcher presented the Impact of NOCCCD's Winter Term on Student Outcomes Report as an information item to DCC.

In the 2023-24 academic year, NOCCCD offered a winter term/intersession for students with asynchronous online course offerings. The District has partnered with researchers in the UCLA Department of Statistics and Data Science to help examine the impact of enrolling in the online winter term on various academic outcomes. In May 2024, an overview report sharing descriptive statistics of student enrollment, demographics, and course success rates, including some general comparisons with fall 2023 student data was shared. The new report provides more advanced statistical analysis of winter outcomes, using causal inference methods and statistically controlling for student demographics and characteristic variables. Across the different analysis methods, there is generally a statistically significant positive relationship between students enrolled in winter term and their academic outcomes, even when accounting for varied student characteristics and social contexts. The impact is notable for the following outcomes:

- Spring term enrollment (winter students more likely to enroll in spring after winter)
- Transfer-level Math/English completion (winter students more likely to complete transfer-level English and math courses)
- Degree/certificate completion (winter students more likely to earn a degree/certificate)
- Units earned (winter students earned more units during winter/spring combined than those who did not enroll in winter)

In the ensuing discussion, members inquired about the following:

- What percentage were already our students?
- Clarification on what the variable was for the text message campaign.
- It is unfair to compare student success during winter intersession with the fall and spring terms when 4-unit classes and transfer-level math and English courses weren't offered during the Intersession, and that is a complex variable that needs to be considered.
- Was there a sense of how students found out about this opportunity?
- Do we have data about how like students did in each of the three terms, how many units the students are taking, and the difference in success rates?
- Was there an assessment of the student experience during winter intersession since it was 100% online with regard to enrolling, available services, financial aid, etc.?
- There was also a desire to gather feedback regarding the holiday break involved with winter intersession term. How did students feel about that and was there any impact? Were they actually assigned work during the break?
- Based on this data, there might be an assumption that winter intersession classes will lead to more classes in the spring term.
- Do we have data for these students? Are these the students that always take more classes?

Gabrielle Stanco stated that her team would perform a deep dive into the data and develop a survey for winter intersession 2025 students and bring that information back to DCC. Chancellor Byron D. Clift Breland thanked the presenters and noted that the idea is to have a winter intersession with intentionality in order to best support and serve students and faculty.

## **POLICY**

**Revised AP 7230-2 Confidential Employees – Holidays and Revised AP 7240-3, Management Employees - Vacation:** AP 7230-2, Confidential Employees – Holidays was updated to reflect increasing the number of hours, from 8 to 10, for the Juneteenth holiday per the Side Letter of Understanding approved by the Board in 2024, and AP 7240-3, Management Employees – Vacation was updated to reflect increasing the number of vacation days (from 44 to 50) that a manager can accumulate per the Side Letter of Understanding approved by the Board in 2024.

During the discussion of AP 7230-2, members made a grammatical revision to section 4.3 and CSEA representatives stated that they are in the midst of negotiating something similar and what is being negotiated is not equitable.

Members supported the revisions and **there was general consensus to approve AP 7230-2 and post it to the District website with one no vote** (Pamela Spence) **and five members abstaining** (Archie Delshad, Bridget Kominek, Elaine Loayza, Marlo Smith, and Katie Wong).

Chancellor Byron D. Clift Breland noted that with regard to equity, the District is attempting to get everyone caught up, but despite some matters being dependent on negotiations, he looked forward to addressing the issues with all groups.

The group then took a separate vote on AP 7240-3 and members supported the revisions. **There was consensus to approve AP 7240-3 and post it to the District website with three members abstaining** (Archie Delshad, Jeremy Peters, and Katie Wong).

**Revised Board Policies & Administrative Procedures in Chapters 6 and 7 – Reference Revisions:** The following Board Policies and Administrative Procedures were revised to update the reference section pursuant to the 2024 changes to ACCJC Accreditation Standards or to update citations as provided by the CCLC Policy and Procedure Legal Updates Service:

- **BP 6200, Budget Preparation**
- **BP 6300, Fiscal Management**
- **AP 6300, Fiscal Management**
- **BP 6340, Bids and Contracts**
- **BP 6400, Financial Audits**
- **AP 6400, Financial Audits**
- **BP 6520, Security for District Property**
- **AP 6520, Security for District Property**
- **BP 7100, Commitment to Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity**
- **BP 7120, Recruitment and Hiring**
- **AP 7120-3, Classified Employee Hiring**
- **AP 7120-4, Management Employee Hiring**
- **BP 7160, Professional Development**
- **BP 7340, Employee Leaves**

Subsequent to members clarifying that revisions were only to the reference section and that the revision dates would reflect that, **there was consensus to approve the revised Administrative Procedures and posted them on the District website and forward the revised Board Policies to the Board for their consideration.**

**Revised BP/AP 7600, Campus Safety Officers:** At the February 23, 2022 meeting, a DCC item was submitted by Interim Fullerton College Vice President, Student Services for proposed revisions for BP/AP 7600, Campus Safety Officers. At that meeting, changes and rationale were shared with DCC members, so that campus representatives could vet the policies/procedures concurrently and bring their recommendations back to a Safety Committee workgroup. No feedback was received, so the Vice Chancellor, Finance & Facilities was asked to start the discussion over. BP 7600 included minimal changes, but there were significant changes proposed for AP 7600. Changes included adding definitions explaining community-oriented safety philosophy and outlining the general authority and role of Campus Safety Officers, including providing guidance on use of force, conducting searches, engaging in pursuits, authorization regarding traffic and parking violations, equipment, patrolling, and training. The revision's secondary purpose is so that the Standard Operating Procedures, required by board policy, are established and documented. At the August 26, 2024, DCC meeting, proposed revisions to BP/AP 7600 were reintroduced for review and discussion. It was requested that members share the proposed policies with their constituencies and be prepared to share feedback at the next DCC meeting. The policies were discussed again at the September 23, 2024 DCC meeting where members provided feedback on preliminary discussions with their constituencies and noted that they were not prepared to make recommendations.

Chancellor Byron D. Clift Breland asked members if there was additional information from what has previously been shared and inquired about student input or any discussions filtering through any student services areas. He stated, again, that DCC will likely not ever come to consensus since similar issues are bifurcated across the country, but the intent is to keep the District safe.

In the ensuing discussion, members shared the following:

- When will a vote on the proposed policies take place? (The spring semester.)
- The Cypress College Academic Senate received feedback on the general philosophy and its members are evenly divided. They had questions about the number of incidents that occur whether the additional equipment is for self-defense or something else. The concept of detaining was concerning and not outlined enough in the AP.
- CSEA stated they want their members to be able to defend themselves, that campus safety officers are not detaining people, and that they wear uniforms instead of polos so there is an expectation that they are going to assist in situations.
- The Fullerton College Faculty Senate has the discussion planned for November 7 with the goal of getting a “Sense of the Senate” on several things: 1) the policies as revised; 2) the use of asps; 3) the use of sworn officers or local police departments; and 4) the idea of using additional technology like a panic card. Concern was expressed regarding bringing officers on campuses and using technology funds when they could be used to address issues with Wi-Fi and DegreeWorks.
- NOCE representatives shared that their campus is supportive of community policing and keeping officers safe, but noted the need to explore additional training for campus safety officers so they can fully perform their responsibilities. They noted that the pursuit language needs to be revisited, that questions regarding what reasonable force entails need to be addressed, and that more districtwide safety discussions on the revisions—that include campus safety officers—need to take place.
- Is the plan to determine the philosophy first and then draft the policy language? Will someone be brought in to draft another version? (The District will move forward with this draft and as discussions occur there will be opportunities to address the philosophy.)
- Are the policy revisions in response to a specific incident, because if so, that is only a snapshot of where we are and could lead to unnecessarily overreacting.
- CSEA stated that the number of incidents that campus safety officers face are increasing and that they were reclassified because of the work that they are required to do and cited the job duty descriptions duties that were approved by the District. That the Clery Reports aren't always clear because they only include incidents that require the involvement of law enforcement, and that officers should have an option to carry a baton and if some don't want to carry it then they should also have that option. They asked if the District wanted campus safety officers to simply observe and report.
- The Cypress College Campus Safety Director met with the Cypress College Academic Senate to discuss the legal aspects of the policies and he stated that the AP includes things that all citizens are allowed to do.
- Do campus safety officers have to have a guard card when they are hired?
- In response to a statement about Clery Reports not providing a full picture, members expressed concern about rhetoric being used to describe incidents that campus safety officers face and making decisions based on anecdotal evidence. Instead, they encouraged the campuses to look at their past program review processes to see if there has been a history of requests and patterns to determine needs in order to serve students.
- A request to share the Clery Reports.
- Clery Reports are due October 1 and every time a crime occurs, it must be logged in.
- When the proposed revisions were developed in 2022, the goals were to make sure there was inclusive language, to provide clarification for the campus safety officers regarding their authority, and to provide proper training. If we are looking at providing additional equipment, then we do need additional data or reports to see what the impact of that would be.

- The Cypress College President shared that the College has a comprehensive document on its website that lists crime on and around the campus and that they are required to list serious incidents, but it also lists other events that occurred. As part of the process, the College also confirmed their MOU with law enforcement and assessed their campus structure.
- The draft language as written did not have support from the Fullerton College Faculty Senate because it made campus safety officers more like police due to the detainment aspect.
- Fullerton College Associated Students have discussed the matter at length over recent meetings and are preparing to provide feedback to the College President and then to the President's Advisory Council.
- Cypress College Associated Students were evenly split and are looking to conduct a survey which will be shared at a Board meeting.
- The Fullerton College President reported on her meeting with the Fullerton College Police Department and that she is in the midst of fact finding and gathering information.
- Adjunct Faculty Untied, the largest workgroup on all three campuses, will survey members and share the results at a future DCC meeting.
- It was noted the group was going around in circles and it was suggested that the policies be broken down into sections to determine which areas there is agreement on and where there isn't in order to find a resolution.

Chancellor Clift Breland concluded the discussion by reiterating the need to have student feedback and making a request that Clery Reports be shared at the next meeting.

## **OTHER ITEMS**

Chancellor Byron D. Clift Breland shared that earlier in the day he met with representatives from the State Chancellor's Office regarding the Orange County Regional Convening on November 7-8 which is the first of eight events being hosted to align local goals and strategic planning with statewide plans. He encouraged attendance at the event which will include the presentation on Vision 2030 by State Chancellor Sonya Christian, as well as data specific to the District and Orange County, and an opportunity for workgroups to work on facilitating alignment.

**Next DCC Meeting:** The next DCC meeting will take place on Monday, November 25 at Fullerton College.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 4:01 p.m.