



SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

3375 Camino del Rio South
San Diego, California 92108-3883
619-388-6500

CITY COLLEGE | MESA COLLEGE | MIRAMAR COLLEGE | CONTINUING EDUCATION

Board of Trustees Office

Trustee Advisory Council (TAC)

Thursday, June 2, 2016
3375 Camino del Rio South - Room 245
12:00 – 1:30 p.m.
Minutes

Convener: Laurie Coskey

Members present:

Nola Butler Byrd, Laurie Coskey, Ralph Dimarucut, Carol Kim, Jeff Marston, Alan Mobley, Alberto Ochoa, Martha Rañón, Gary Rotto, Evonne Seron Schulze, Mark Tran, David Valladolid, Sid Voorakkara

Board Members present: Mary Graham, Maria Nieto Senour, Peter Zschiesche

District officials, staff, and guests present: Constance Carroll, Jack Beresford, Amanda Ficken-Davis, and Margaret Lamb

Members absent: Willie Blair, Clint Carney, Dwayne Crenshaw, Ricardo Flores, Olivia Puentes-Reynolds, Cecil Steppe,

Board Members absent: Rich Grosch, Bernie Rhinerson

1. Group Photo

The Council briefly adjourned to take the group photo.

2. Welcome/Introductions

Laurie Coskey

Rabbi Laurie Coskey opened the meeting, followed by introductions. Chancellor Constance Carroll introduced Rabbi Laurie Coskey, who had just been announced by The United Way of San Diego County as its president and CEO, extending her congratulations.

3. Trustees' Update

Trustees

Trustee Maria Nieto Senour discussed the many District events she has attended as the academic year draws to a close, including scholarship awards, classified service awards, and commencements.

Trustee Peter Zschiesche also commented on the commencement ceremonies, particularly noting a student speaker at the Mesa College commencement who gave a moving presentation. He informed the Council that Trustee Rich Grosch is out of the country, but asked him (as the other member of the Board's Self-Evaluation Subcommittee) to provide an update on the Board's annual self-evaluation. He thanked those TAC members who took the time to participate in the feedback survey, explaining its importance to the Board. He also shared an excerpt from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges accreditation

standards. The excerpt included Standard IV, Leadership and Governance, which pertains to governing boards and to multi-college districts. He explained that these are the standards by which the Board judges itself, and also by which they are externally judged.

Trustee Mary Graham echoed her colleagues' comments about the recent commencement ceremonies, focusing on the diversity of the students' backgrounds and experiences, and the challenges that they have overcome to accomplish what they have. She also elaborated on Trustee Zschiesche's comments about accreditation standards, explaining that colleges in multi-college districts have historically been judged by the same standards as single-college districts, despite their lack of control over district-level functions. This has led to inconsistencies in the accreditation process, such as one college being reprimanded for something ignored at a sister college. Only recently have accreditation standards taken into consideration the roll of these governing bodies, following recommendations by statewide leaders such as Chancellor Carroll. This is particularly significant because the colleges with the highest-profile accreditation issues have been single-college districts whose violations were largely made by the governing board. Laurie Coskey thanked her for sharing these technicalities and providing perspective and context to the discussion.

4. **Approval of the March 3, 2016, minutes**

On a motion by Alberto Ochoa, and second by Nola Butler Byrd, the minutes of March 3, 2016, were unanimously approved, with Sid Voorakkara abstaining.

5. **Chancellor's Report**

Chancellor Constance Carroll

- SDCCD Budget Update

Chancellor Constance Carroll reviewed the highlights of the Governor's May Revision budget, including the impact that this budget will have for the District. She directed the Council to a handout of her May 16 Budget Message, which detailed the highlights of the Governor's proposal.

- The California Children's Education and Health Care Protection Act of 2016

Chancellor Carroll also reminded the Council that the passage of Proposition 30 in 2012 helped to stabilize the State's funding for education thanks to its dual tax provisions, which are set to start expiring this year. The California Children's Education and Health Care Protection Act of 2016, a proposed November 2016 ballot initiative, will extend the personal income tax provision of Proposition 30 and help maintain the stability of funding for education. A resolution in support of this measure has been placed on the Board's agenda for the June 9 meeting. It is possible that the Board may turn to the Council to consider advocating on behalf of this proposition.

Peter Zschiesche discussed a recent editorial in the Union-Tribune criticizing proponents of this initiative, citing promises made during the 2012 campaign for Proposition 30 that it would be a temporary tax. He observed that in the case of this initiative, citizens are being asked whether they want to continue to tax themselves; if this is the case, than what is the basis for objecting? He also shared that this initiative, unlike Proposition 30, will also provide a stream of funding for healthcare (in the form of Medicare). In lean times, healthcare is often the first type of program to see cuts. In this case, it is great to

see healthcare and educational groups working together instead of being placed in competition with one another.

Evonne Seron Schulze recommended having someone from the District write an op-ed including arguments in support of the initiative, noting that the recent change in the paper's ownership may make the editorial staff more amenable to supporting the measure.

Martha Rañón asked whether there is a centralized campaign to support the Act, in order to find specific resources and statistics to share with others.

Gary Rotto recommended, since the next Council meeting will not take place until late September, a subcommittee of interested Council members be formed to provide additional support for this initiative. Ralph Dimarucut, Martha Rañón, Gary Rotto, Evonne Seron Schulze, and Peter Zschiesche indicated their interest. Laurie Coskey also stated she would be interested, if her schedule permitted.

Peter Zschiesche noted that the proposed proposition includes funding for Medi-Cal. Historically, healthcare funding is the first to get cut and the last to be restored. This alliance between education and healthcare groups is promising for the proposition's success. Mary Graham agreed, and added to Trustee Zschiesche's earlier criticism of the Union-Tribune's editorial. She noted that it was disingenuous of the editorial to claim that educational institutions have reneged on a promise not to campaign for an extension of Proposition 30. In fact, while Governor Brown made (and has kept) such a promise, no other groups did.

Sid Voorakkara expressed enthusiasm to see new monies for healthcare, and discussed two companion bills that will expand Medi-Cal coverage for undocumented immigrants.

6. Information

- Update on San Diego Promise Chancellor Constance Carroll

Chancellor Carroll explained that Trustee Bernie Rhinerson and Vice Chancellor of Student Services Lynn Neault were currently attending a national conference on College Promise programs at Princeton University. She referred the Council to their packets, which included a handout on Promise Programs. She explained that President Obama has called for community college to be tuition free. This makes sense given recent changes in the workforce. The reasons are similar to those for universal public K-12 education. Community colleges are in position to expand access to career technical education and training programs, as well as those for general education and transfer to four-year universities. Congress has not provided funding for "America's College Promise," so states, cities, and districts are having to find a ways to fill the gaps, leading to a broad collection of decentralized efforts.

The overarching objective of promise programs is to make it so that local students do not have to pay anything to attend community colleges. Because of this lack of a central authority, there are currently about 125 promise programs nationwide. She again referred to the handout, which includes a summary of some of these programs. On page 9 is a description of the San Diego Promise.

Two states, Tennessee and Oregon, have addressed this goal through legislation that has made their state community colleges free of tuition. In other states, however, various cities and community college districts have opted for a “last dollar” approach. They first determine how much funding students have already received toward their tuition costs from federal and state financial aid, and then provide scholarship assistance to close the gap between the funds students already have been granted and the total cost of tuition (in California, the term used is “enrollment fee”). In other words, the institutions provide the last dollar. California’s College Promise program is largely a collection of last-dollar initiatives instituted at local community college districts.

The San Diego Community College District has begun a pilot, the San Diego Promise Program, funded by an initial \$215,000 from the District’s endowment. Benefiting 201 high school graduates from both the San Diego Unified School District (175) and San Diego Continuing Education (26), the San Diego Promise provides for a last-dollar approach, and also a \$1,000 voucher for textbooks. The students will attend special orientations, successfully complete two consecutive semesters taking 12 units, and making academic progress. They are also obligated to perform 8 hours of community service per semester.

The Council was referred to a handout that provided a summary of the pilot program’s students, including their high school of origin and the college they have enrolled in. Chancellor Carroll emphasized that the students participating from San Diego Unified were selected by that District based on some proposed guidelines. The SDCCD’s intention was to make the SDUSD a full partner in this program and encourage involvement. The program will be tweaked based upon assessment of its first year, and expanded in future years until this opportunity can be offered to all deserving high school graduates in the San Diego Unified School District.

Questions were then raised about the program. Jeff Marston noted that at the recently-held Civility Conference, the majority of the high school students in the audience attended more affluent high schools. He questioned whether the schools weren’t doing enough to inform their students. Gary Rotto asked what the high schools are doing to promote the program, and whether there are ways to expand outreach to certain schools. Chancellor Carroll responded that SDUSD made 100% of the selections for the pilot program students. Information was sent to the schools, where principals handled the on-campus roll-out.

Martha Rañón asked whether the San Diego Promise will eventually apply to all students graduating from San Diego Unified School District. Chancellor Carroll indicated that the long-term goal is to make this program available to all students who meet the requirements.

In response to some of the earlier questions, Ralph Dimarucut asked whether there was evidence that the students attending the more affluent high schools actually live in those neighborhoods, as some students may be bussed to those areas. He also asked whether there has been a target outreach for those communities that are not allowed (e.g. for religious reasons) to take out loans.

Mary Graham commented that, based on the conversation, she is getting a sense that some people are upset by the students chosen for the pilot. She reassured the Council members that identification of these questions is one of the important outcomes of the pilot; based on this input, the District will be able to refine the program going forward to

make sure these issues are addressed. While it was hoped that partnering directly with SDUSD would be a good way to promote the program, the concerns being brought forward may change the nature of that partnership.

Mark Tran discussed his work in City Heights. This area has quite a few charter schools. Are there plans to involve them in the process?

Carol Kim shared that it is often incumbent upon individual schools to find someone to adopt and champion certain issues. Without a school-site champion, results aren't as good, whether the issue is apprenticeships, scholarships, or something else.

Chancellor Carroll informed the Council that the next step for the San Diego Promise is to determine how to afford the ongoing support and expansion of the program. Using the provided handout, she reviewed the math used to determine the desired size of the endowment. She discussed the Dallas County Community College District's Rising Star Program, which is similarly funded by an established endowment. The District's current goal for the San Diego Promise Program is to build the anticipated \$34 million endowment over a 5-10 year period. Chancellor Carroll is hoping that Council members will be able to advise the District as to potential funding sources. One source to help fund annual expenses while building to the total goal is the "One Card" program through the Community Link Foundation. A similar model is used by the Long Beach Promise program and the City of Los Angeles. Overall, there is a lot of excitement about the program. It is a great cause and a good statement regarding the District's belief in the importance of education. Partnerships with groups such as the United Way will be pursued going forward.

Laurie Coskey agreed with Chancellor Carroll's assessment of the program, but expressed concerns about how students were selected. Chancellor Carroll emphasized that SDUSD published the criteria for participation, and were responsible for determining those students selected. They feel that, based on the applications received, these are the most qualified students. Jack Beresford added that a waitlist is going to be established for students who meet the criteria but were not selected for the initial program, while the District looks at ways to address any gaps.

Sid Voorakkara suggested inviting the Board of Education of SDUSD to an SDCCD TAC meeting so that Council members could address the issue. Alberto Ochoa echoed the suggestion, adding that the students selected may also reflect a lack of student preparation by SDUSD high schools. High school graduation rates are a similar concern; there should be a push for increasing academic rigor of K-12 students earlier in the process, particularly when considering student demographics.

Evonne Seron Schulze asked how involved high school counselors were in the promotion of the program. Chancellor Carroll responded that each school implemented the program separately, and reiterated that SDUSD took the lead on selecting the pilot program students. SDCCD has already started learning from the pilot, and is shifting its focus towards the full rollout, specifically ways to fund the full-scale program.

Peter Zschesche summarized that this is what happens when agencies partner – there are some issues that each agency cannot control. The focus now is to address the other barriers.

7. Announcement of Upcoming SDCCD Events

- ECC 40th Anniversary Celebration – June 8, 2016, 10:00 a.m.
- Board Meeting – District Office, June 9, 2016, 4:00 p.m.
- Board Meeting – District Office, July 21, 2016, 4:00 p.m.
- Board Meeting – District Office, August 25, 2016, 4:00 p.m.

Proposed Future Meeting Dates: **Thursday, September 29, 2016**
 Thursday, December 15, 2016
 Thursday, February 23, 2017
 Thursday, May 18, 2017 – Group Photo at 12:00 p.m.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:33 p.m. Margaret Lamb informed those Council members who arrived later in the meeting that makeup photos would be taken in the lobby, to be added to the group photo.