The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

**Board Members Present:** President Dave Mandelkern, Vice President Helen Hausman, Trustees Richard Holober, Patricia Miljanich and Karen Schwarz, and Student Trustee Patiane Gladstone

**Others Present:** Chancellor Ron Galatolo, Executive Vice Chancellor Kathy Blackwood, Skyline College President Regina Stanback Stroud, College of San Mateo President Michael Claire, Cañada College President Jim Keller and District Academic Senate President Diana Bennett

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**DISCUSSION OF THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

None

**MINUTES**

It was moved by Vice President Hausman and seconded by Trustee Holober to approve the minutes of the December 14, 2011 meeting of the Board. The motion carried, all members voting “Aye.”

Trustee Schwarz asked whether a letter has been prepared in regard to the San Mateo County Treasury Oversight Committee, as mentioned on page 2 of the minutes. Chancellor Galatolo said staff is in the process of composing the letter.

It was moved by Trustee Holober and seconded by Vice President Hausman to approve the minutes of the special closed session of the Board of January 5, 2012. The motion carried, all members voting “Aye.”

**STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

College of San Mateo student Bailey Girard distributed a petition seeking signatures for the initiative measure titled “Tax on California Oil and Natural Gas Revenues to Education” and said he is asking for the Board’s support. President Mandelkern said the Board cannot discuss or take action on a topic which is not on the agenda; however, the Board will take this measure under advisement and potentially consider it at a future meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**APPROVAL OF PERSONNEL ACTIONS: CHANGES IN ASSIGNMENT, COMPENSATION, PLACEMENT, LEAVES, STAFF ALLOCATIONS AND CLASSIFICATION OF ACADEMIC AND CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL (12-1-1A)**

It was moved by Vice President Hausman and seconded by Trustee Schwarz to approve the actions in Board Report No. 12-1-1A. The motion carried, all members voting “Aye.”

**Other Recommendations**

**ADOPTION OF DISTRICT ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR 2012-2013**

It was moved by Vice President Hausman and seconded by Trustee Holober to approve the calendar as presented in the report. The motion carried, all members voting “Aye.”

**INFORMATION REPORTS**

**INFORMATION REPORT ON PLAN AHEAD – PAY AHEAD (12-1-1C)**

Executive Vice Chancellor Blackwood asked if there were questions concerning the information contained in the written report. President Mandelkern asked how the number of students dropped (7%) compares with the prior
Executive Vice Chancellor Blackwood said there is no data to track from prior years because students were not dropped for nonpayment. Data will be tracked as it is available at this time. Executive Vice Chancellor Blackwood said it was clear that there was an impact as a result of the new policy because the District processed approximately $1,663,000 in payments between January 1 and 4 of this year compared with $87,000 on those same days in January 2011. It is assumed that some portion of the non-paying students are those who register for classes, are uncertain whether they will attend, and then decide not to attend; these students would have been no shows with or without the new policy. Chancellor Galatolo said there are 1,700 students on waitlists, which is approximately 45% fewer than last year. He said this is probably a combination of fewer students interested in taking classes and students who were on waitlists getting into classes because other students were dropped.

Trustee Schwarz asked if the District and Colleges will be prepared for the next enrollment period. Executive Vice Chancellor Blackwood said it will run even more smoothly as debriefings with staff and faculty are in progress; discussions are in progress with Sallie Mae, particularly regarding lengthy telephone wait times; and students will better understand the process. She said the process will eventually become routine for students.

President Mandelkern asked if there is information from neighboring colleges regarding the number of non-paying students. Executive Vice Chancellor Blackwood said Ohlone College reports an increase in enrollment since it implemented a plan similar to the District’s new policy.

Mr. Girard asked if the 7% of non-paying students includes those who receive financial aid or other support. Executive Vice Chancellor Blackwood said students who have applied for financial aid, enrolled in a payment plan or have a third party payer are excluded from being dropped.

President Mandelkern thanked all who were involved in the implementation of the new policy for their diligence in lowering the percentage of students who would be dropped. Trustee Miljanich added her thanks to staff and faculty who took the time to talk with students about the change in policy. Executive Vice Chancellor Blackwood said Admissions and Records staff and Counseling staff also deserve a great deal of credit.

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT SUCCESS TASKFORCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

(12-1-2C)

Vice Chancellor Jing Luan said the California Community Colleges Student Success Task Force recommendations were the result of California Senate Bill 1143. The intention of the recommendations is to increase student success and retention rates. The California Community Colleges Board of Governors has received hundreds of emails and thousands of letters providing feedback on, and concerns about, the recommendations. The District has concerns in three general areas:

1. Process – the recommendations were formed by a limited group, with a small window of time given for others to react.
3. Deficiencies – obvious deficiencies in the recommendations will be discussed tonight.

Vice Chancellor Luan asked faculty, students and administrative staff who are participating in the presentation to identify themselves by a show of hands. He said a packet of materials provided to the Board was put together by those participating in the presentation; the materials are included in the official minutes of record. Although the Board of Governors approved the recommendations, the discussion will focus on how to have continuing engagement with the State during the implementation phase.

District Academic Senate President Diana Bennett said the State Academic Senate has been concerned with student success for years. She said the Task Force recommendations were the primary focus of the most recent Academic Senate Plenary Session. She thanked the College Senate leaders for their participation and asked each one to share his/her concerns.

David Clay, Cañada College Academic Senate President, said that at a forum on the recommendations, there was input regarding adult education. He said that Cañada College’s adult education program currently functions very well within the community. Professor Clay said the recommendation to utilize a Statewide placement test is a
serious concern, particularly with regard to equity and the College’s dedication to working with individual students. He said Mt. San Antonio College developed its own successful placement testing as described in a letter submitted in response to the recommendations. Professor Clay said the District’s placement testing is also more accurate than standardized testing in correctly placing students. He said an overall concern is the potential to reduce or lose local control.

Leigh Anne Shaw, Skyline College Academic Senate Vice President, said another concern is that the recommendations seem to be focused more on high schools than community colleges. She said that draft recommendation 1.1 stated, “Collaborate with K-12 to jointly develop common core standards for college and career readiness.” The final recommendation added the following to that sentence: “that are aligned with high school exit standards.” Professor Shaw said it is troubling that this seems to indicate that the intent is to scale everything down.

James Carranza, College of San Mateo Academic Senate President, said that everyone at the College already supports student success and is working hard to achieve it. He said that some of the Task Force recommendations may be good ideas but they are very broad and how they will be implemented causes concern. For example, recommendation 2.2 calls for community college students to participate in diagnostic assessment and orientation and to develop an education plan; however, this would be another unfunded mandate. Another example is the call for a student success scorecard as called for in recommendation 7.3. Professor Carranza said the College already collects data and this would take it further, adding another layer of bureaucracy rather than devising a simpler way to improve existing systems.

Trustee Miljanich asked how diagnostic assessment is different than placement testing to determine where a student should be placed. President Stroud said that common testing is not actually diagnostic, although it is referred to as “diagnostic assessment” in the recommendations, and is not necessarily linked to curriculum as true diagnostic assessment would be. Sarah Perkins, Vice President of Instruction at Cañada College, said this is indicative of a fundamental flaw in the recommendations, in that they lack substance and are not based on data and research. For instance, Long Beach City College found that achieving a grade of A or B in 12th grade English is more indicative of success in community college English than the students’ scores in the 11th grade standardized testing. Trustee Miljanich said the recommendations lack a clear definition of student success and how to evaluate it.

Jim Roberts, Professor of History at College of San Mateo, said faculty in the Social Science Division are concerned about recommendation 2.5, which requires students to declare a program of study early in their academic careers. They are particularly concerned about locking students into an area of study so early that they do not have an opportunity to experiment with new kinds of courses to which they have not been exposed. He said students should have the opportunity to grow in an educational environment and should be given the flexibility to experience areas outside of their anticipated majors. Vice President Hausman noted that the Task Force recommends that students be required to declare a program of study by the end of their third semester in order to maintain enrollment priority; she asked if there was consensus on this recommendation. Jennifer Hughes, Vice President of Student Services at College of San Mateo, said this is not a consensus document. She said that it is problematic to lock all students into a program of study by the end of their second or third semester. She said a concern from the Student Services standpoint is that many of the recommendations deal with matriculation which, along with other categorical programs, has been largely dismantled and was never adequately funded. Vice President Hughes said that with adequate resources, the system to orient students and help them define their goals when the time was right for them would work well. Mr. Girard said students are concerned about this issue because while they are working to get through their general education requirements, they often find new areas that they like and they decide to change majors. President Stanback Stroud said the underlying issue is political and centers on performance-based funding, leading to not funding courses taken outside of a student’s program of study. She said at issue are the ramifications for students who have not declared a program of study and defining what a program of study actually is.

Trustee Miljanich asked when the University of California and California State University Systems require students to declare majors. Chancellor Galatolo said it depends on the institution. Caitlin Buckley, a reporter with the San Mateo Daily Journal, said she attended the University of California at Davis, where students could wait
until their third year to declare a major. Ms. Buckley asked how attention would be given to students who need extra help in finding a major. Professor Bennett said this is one of the issues with the recommendations and needs to be discussed further.

Professor Bennett said the recommendations overlook career-technical education. She said student success is very different for these students. Professor Lilya Vorobey, who teaches drafting at College of San Mateo, said career-technical education is shrinking. She said this is an issue of equal access as these students are often of lower socio-economic status and/or minorities and cannot attend college full-time.

Executive Vice Chancellor Blackwood said no Chief Business Officials were on the Task Force and this was said to be an oversight. She said the Task Force claims there are no financial implications associated with the recommendations but this is not accurate. President Keller said funding is a major issue.

Trustee Holober asked what the next steps in the process will be, given that the Task Force recommendations have been approved by the Board of Governors. Chancellor Galatolo said changes in Title 5 regulations will go to the Board of Governors and other changes will go to the legislature. Trustee Holober said that if concerns are shared by others throughout the State, he believes people should express these concerns to the legislature as the next step.

President Mandelkern said he hopes the outcome of tonight’s discussion is to give the Board direction on what they can consider doing to help. Chancellor Galatolo said the purpose of the discussion is to inform the Board of constituents’ concerns; if the Board concurs with the concerns, staff will actively move forward on the issue, whether through contacts with the legislature or Board of Governors. President Mandelkern agreed with this goal. He underscored that Board members are the elected leaders of the District and it is appropriate for them to approach other elected leaders in the legislature.

President Mandelkern said he is concerned that the recommendations were driven by a kneejerk reaction to a system that has been crippled by a lack of funding, resulting in dissatisfaction with student outcomes. He said there are two approaches to addressing the issue:

1. Focus the system on those high-achieving students who are most able to succeed and will transfer to a UC or CSU, and measure the success rate and transfer rate of these students. This will result in a high measure of success for the system. President Mandelkern said he does not believe that this should be the goal of a community college.

2. Provide open access, recognizing that it takes money to help other types of students be successful. He said it is not realistic to develop a set of criteria to increase transfers and certificates without addressing the effect of funding issues which affect student success, e.g. cuts to support services, number of class sections and instructor to student ratio. President Mandelkern said he fears that the legislature will focus on the first approach and shrink the system down to become a streamlined pipeline for only two-year transfer degrees.

Vice President Hausman said she served on the Sequoia Union High School Board for 13 years and observed a wide range of need for remediation and help for students who don’t fit in for any number of reasons. She said this issue has never been addressed satisfactorily and the problem exists at all levels of education. She said she is concerned about turning complicated issues over to the legislature, whose members may not be well-informed.

Trustee Holober said that because tonight’s presenters have day-to-day experience, they have a better sense of whether the recommendations would work; therefore, he is inclined to support the objections being raised. He said that based on the many letters of concern, he does not believe the legislature will be eager to act quickly. He said that if there is an organized approach, he believes the legislature will hear the concerns.

Trustee Holober asked if the Community College of California (CCLC) supports the Task Force recommendations. Chancellor Galatolo said CCLC supports them fully. Trustee Holober asked whether governing boards of other districts have taken positions. President Stanback Stroud said responses have varied. The President/Superintendent of Long Beach City College has been supportive and has encouraged others to support the recommendations. Other boards have expressed concerns about certain aspects of the recommendations.
Chancellor Galatolo said that CCLC has stated that approval of the recommendations does nothing in terms of enforcement and people will have a chance to vent concerns in the next phase. Chancellor Galatolo said he believes this is a naïve position. He said that bringing forth the recommendations with the approval of the Board of Governors, State Chancellor’s Office and CCLC gives them a better chance of being received positively by the legislature.

President Mandelkern said the letter from the Council of Faculty Organizations, along with many other letters, fell on deaf ears as the Board of Governors approved the recommendations with only minor modifications. He questioned what the Board can do to influence a different outcome during the next phase, and asked if there is a patron or sponsor in the legislature who has taken this issue on as a project. President Stanback Stroud said an agreement was reached to pull Senate Bill 1143 (Liu) on performance-based funding and instead form a task force which will address the concerns.

Trustee Schwarz said some parts of the recommendations sound good but would require resources, such as more counselors, which are not funded. She also noted that the recommendations would grant more authority to the State Chancellor’s Office. President Stanback Stroud said the recommendations are based largely on previous deals that were made through the political process.

Trustee Schwarz said the responses to the recommendations seem to be overwhelmingly negative and she asked if there are any positive aspects to them. President Mandelkern said it is positive that everyone involved cares about student success and wants all students to succeed. However, there is uncertainty about the definition of student success and about which students are being addressed. He said another positive is that the recommendations take into account the reality of the decisions that districts have had to make because of the budget cutting process. He said this Board has made decisions that are similar to some of the recommendations. He said some of these decisions have made segments of the community unhappy because they cannot take the adult education or community education classes that they would like. President Mandelkern said he would prefer that the decisions be made at the local Board level, with input from the community, rather than coming from the State legislature as a “one size fits all” mandate. He said he would like to hear input from all constituencies and then focus on where the Board should be addressing its efforts.

Professor Clay said San Francisco City College submitted a one-page resolution rejecting the entire document. Other districts have expressed concerns about certain aspects of the recommendations. He said the Task Force listened and made some changes. He believes the legislature will listen as well and will want to hear input and analysis from people involved. He believes there is a strong possibility of being heard, particularly with input from the Board and Chancellor Galatolo.

Trustee Holober said the Board first began to learn about the Task Force approximately two months ago and he assumes other districts are in the same position. He said that CCLC does not always reflect the constituent community college boards’ views. On occasion, boards have gone to CCLC with opposing views and this can be an effective strategy. Regarding the legislative arena, Trustee Holober said that teacher organizations have more political influence than the Board of Governors, State Chancellor’s Office and CCLC. Chancellor Galatolo agreed that faculty organizations are influential with the legislature. He said he is concerned about the changes to Title 5 regulations which will go to the Board of Governors.

President Keller said staff needs to pay close attention to the status of the recommendations throughout the political process. He said the legislature will need to hear from the District about where it believes the recommendations are flawed. He added that the District and Colleges should take the opportunity to address student success the way they believe it should be addressed. President Claire said the Colleges know how to achieve student success and there is supporting research. He said the most successful students are those who are in special programs which require funding. He said the issue is how to provide something that works to the entire campus without adequate resources.

Trustee Miljanich said there is a segment of the community that is not sympathetic to the fact that the Board is not in favor of standardized testing. She said it is important to be able to demonstrate what does work.
Trustee Holober said the CCLC annual legislative conference will be held at the end of January. He suggested that the Board adopt a resolution at the next meeting regarding the recommendations and send the resolution to every community college board. Trustee Miljanich said each district board has a representative on the CCLC Board of Directors and said the Board could consider letting that person know of the resolution in advance of the legislative conference. There was discussion about whether the resolution should support rejecting the entire document, as did City College, or should list some of the Board’s concerns. After this discussion, it was agreed that the resolution will list the following concerns:

- Student success is measured through the lens of only one type of student:
  
  a. many of the District’s students come from academically and/or economically challenging circumstances and their needs differ from the type of student to which the recommendations are geared; the implementation of the recommendations, including uniform placement testing (which data suggests is not a true indicator of success), could result in unequal access to education for these students.

  b. many of the District’s students have achieved success outside of the narrow parameters of the recommendations, e.g. choosing a major early on or achieving their goals within a specified period of time.

- Implementing mandatory, early educational plans that are difficult to update will eliminate students’ ability to explore, forcing them into programs of study before they know what they want to do.

- Amid ongoing budget reductions, there is a lack of funding to implement the recommendations.

- The recommendations represent a fundamental change to the mission of community colleges.

- The recommendations deprive local Boards of Trustees of the right to make decisions that balance the individual needs of their students, resulting in a disconnection from the community; the San Mateo County Community College Board of Trustees has developed a “Statement of Core Values and Principles” which outlines priorities based on the needs of its students and the community.

- The lack of a strong Career/Technical Education component in the recommendations could have a negative economic impact on the State of California as training of a skilled workforce is neglected.

- Only one student member was appointed to the Task Force; no Chief Business Officers, who could have addressed the potential economic burdens associated with the recommendations, were appointed.

Chancellor Galatolo said staff will prepare the resolution. It was agreed that ongoing strategy would be discussed at the next Board meeting when the resolution is presented for discussion and Board action.

President Mandelkern suggested that the budget impacts of student success be added to the agenda for the Board Retreat as a line item under the discussion of the budget.

Vice Chancellor Luan thanked Professors Bennett, Carranza, Clay and Shaw, along with the vice presidents, administrators and students who participated in the planning and presentation.

RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION
President Mandelkern said that during Closed Session, the Board will consider the personnel items listed as 1A and 1B on the printed agenda. The Board will also hold a conference with legal counsel regarding one case of existing litigation as listed on the printed agenda.

The Board recessed to Closed Session at 8:10 p.m.
The Board reconvened to Open Session at 9:05 p.m.
CLOSED SESSION ACTIONS TAKEN
President Mandelkern reported that at the Closed Session just concluded, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the items listed as 1A and 1B on the printed agenda.

ADJOURNMENT
It was moved by Trustee Holober and seconded by Trustee Schwarz to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried, all members voting “Aye.” The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

Submitted by

Ron Galatolo
Secretary

Approved and entered into the proceedings of the January 25, 2012 meeting.