REDWOODS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Meeting of the Academic Senate
 Eureka: 7351 Tompkins Hill Road, SS 202 (Board Room)
 Fort Bragg: 227 North Harold Street

Friday, October 4, 2013, 1 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Introductions and Public Comment: Members of the audience are invited to make comments regarding any subject appropriate to the Academic Senate.

3. Approve the September 20, 2013 Meeting Minutes (Attachment)

4. Action Items
   4.1 Approve Academic Senate Proposed Appointments, Bob Brown (Attachment)

5. Discussion Items
   5.1 Revised Language for AP 7217 Faculty Prioritization Process, Bob Brown (Attachment)
   5.2 Distance Education Substantive Change Proposal, Jeff Cummings
   5.3 AP 3900 Speech: Time, Place & Manner, Bob Brown (Attachment)

6. Reports
   6.1 Budget Planning Committee September 27 Meeting Update, Michael Dennis
   6.2 Basic Skills Initiative Update, Harry Pyke
   6.3 Distance Education Committee Update, Mark Winter
   6.4 A STEM Idea to Increase FTES, Kintay Johnson (Attachment)
   6.5 College Update, Keith Snow-Flamer
   6.6 ASCR Update, Raul Romero
   6.7 College Council September 30 Meeting Update, Bob Brown & Mark Renner (please refer to the College Council Web Site to Access Documents out for Constituent Review)
   6.8 Board of Trustees October 1 Meeting Update, Bob Brown

7. Announcements and Open Forum

8. Adjournment
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Next Meeting:
Friday, October 18, 2013
MINUTES

Members Present: Bob Brown, Mark Renner, Dave Bazard, Peter Blakemore, Steve Brown, Dan Calderwood, Mike Cox, Kady Dunleavy, Marcy Foster, Garth Johnson, Philip Mancus, Laura Mays, Sandra Rowan, Richard Ries (for Kevin Yokoyama), Dr. Keith Snow-Flamer and Raul Romero.

Members Absent: Kevin Yokoyama

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1:04 pm

2. Introductions and Public Comment: Copresident Brown welcomed new Senators to the meeting; there were no public comments.

3. Approve the September 6, 2013 Meeting Minutes: On a motion by Kady Dunleavy, seconded by Sandra Rowan, the minutes were approved without objection.

4. Action Items
   4.1 Approve the Curriculum Committee Recommendations from September 13, George Potamianos: on a motion by Steve Brown, seconded by Dave Bazard, the recommendations were approved by roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; Brown, S. – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Dunleavy – y; Foster – y; Johnson – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Rowan – y.

   4.2 Approve the Faculty Qualifications Committee Recommendations from September 13, Michelle Haggerty on a motion by Kady Dunleavy, seconded by Garth Johnson, the recommendations were approved by roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; Brown, S. – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Dunleavy – y; Foster – y; Johnson – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Rowan – y.

   4.3 Approve Senate Constitution Amendments on a motion by Philip Mancus, seconded by Dave Bazard, discussion ensued. Off-site participation ruling was brought into question. Suggestions included looking into the Brown Act language. Steve Brown proposed an amendment to the Constitution, and Dave Bazard seconded. Garth Johnson found and read the actual Brown Act language and the Senator withdrew the proposed amendment. Senator Johnson then made another amendment to simply remove “publicly”, which Senator Blakemore seconded. A further amendment “and desires to vote” after “Senator participates remotely” was proposed and seconded. After discussion, the suggested amendments were approved by roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; Brown, S. – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Dunleavy – y; Foster – y; Johnson – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Rowan – y.

   4.4 Approve Senate Bylaws Amendments: on a motion by Peter Blakemore, seconded by Steve Brown, discussion ensued regarding the highlighted items under Faculty
Development and it was decided that A.4. would be considered a strikethrough, and B.5. would remain for the Faculty Development Committee to discuss. The amendments were approved with these changes by roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; Brown, S. – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Dunleavy – y; Foster – y; Johnson – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Rowan – y.

4.5 Approve Academic Senate Proposed Appointments: on a motion by Kady Dunleavy, seconded by Sandra Rowan, the Appointments were approved by roll call vote: Bazard – y; Blakemore – y; Brown, S. – y; Calderwood – y; Cox – y; Dunleavy – y; Foster – y; Johnson – y; Mancus – y; Mays – y; Rowan – y.

5. Discussion Items

5.1 Writing Across the Curriculum, Peter Blakemore: The Senate has been ruminating WAC for years. No program has existed. Senator Blakemore remarked that at the Assessment Summit it was a very high priority discussion item. He asked the Senate to promote ways to begin the procedures to implement a real program at CR. His attachment presented many links to resources that are available to Faculty. He would like to know how the Senate feels about participating in and encouraging their constituents to bring about this program. A Senator asked what it would look like and Senator Blakemore gave some examples of different ways to go about it, and that part of the discussion would be how best to implement it for CR. A Senator asked how it would be applied once it’s started, how we would move it into the courses. Different departments would have different needs. We could build huge resource areas with examples. College-wide discussion would facilitate finding the best practice for the school. Carrots and sticks to increase the amount of writing? Students need critical thinking. The Senate could request and compile existing practices that general Faculty already implement in their classes. Where would we place that material so it is available to the most people? Possibly start with an Ad-Hoc committee to set the guidelines and then take the proposals to the Senate and gather information to see what people are already doing. Also find out what this core group felt they would need in order to initiate a real committee/program. Restore Pedagogy. Copresident Brown affirmed that the Senate agrees we need to start WAC. A Senator offered that it would be helpful to put out an email to all Faculty. There may be departments that have ideas about writing that we haven’t even thought of, yet. There needs to be a “clearing house” somewhere to keep all these ideas/practices/notes where everyone can reach them.

5.2 Draft Faculty Prioritization Process, Keith Snow-Flamer: The Administration wrote up the proposed changes, and the Senate Copresidents were asked to join in the discussion. Dr. Snow-Flamer reported that they started looking at the process last spring and did some of the work over the summer. They looked at changing it due to administrative structure changes, and then looked at current processes and what worked and what was lacking. Mendocino, Del Norte and Klamath/Trinity would work through the Deans of the departments on their campuses with needs. However, there are Senators who feel they would like site-specific requests to be more direct. Areas of concern: Faculty and SITE representation should be reconsidered; the timeline is still a little behind; how do we alleviate the soft enrollment problem?; and striking language in the Rubric. Next steps will be to utilize these suggested revisions and return the draft as a discussion item at the next full Senate meeting.

5.3 Faculty Development Committee Request Form Revisions, Kerry Mayer: Correction to #
7; use the word “Accreditation” instead of “education” requirements. Every year we need to clarify guidelines to codify past practices, especially in light of decreased funding. After today’s discussion, the committee will consider the suggested changes (grant language in line #9) and bring it back as an action item. Chair Mayer added a plea from the Committee to the Senate and Administration for more money; due to the rising costs of travel, more is needed in order to support faculty development funding.

5.4 Draft AP 5050 Matriculation, Bob Brown: This AP is an upcoming policy to be considered by College Council that is of importance to the faculty, and he is asking for feedback to take back to the Council. Questions included whether this is mandated for students: only if they have a SEP in place and in order to get the funding that is based on the number of SEPs. Another suggestion was to change the formatting of a list.

6. Reports

6.1 College Update, Keith Snow-Flamer: Dr. Snow-Flamer stated that he is gratified to be working with AS/CRFO and it’s been exciting to make things happen both in the short and long term; we have established a good foundation. There has been an email request for comments regarding the accreditation report by Tuesday, September 24. Two counselor offers have been accepted.

6.2 ASCR Update, Raul Romero: Some of the discussion items that were covered in the last ASCR meeting, September 13th 2013, were:

- The development of an Ad Hoc committee for a “Club Sign-Up” day, as proposed by Senator Wendy Choate.
  - This committee will focus on trying to establish a set date for prospective clubs and/or activities groups, so we can get students that are looking to get involved with their school an easier time with the intricacies of developing a club/activities group.
  - It may also entail a workshop-type endeavor to take place as well.

- Also, the development of an Ad Hoc committee for an “Associate Senator” program, as proposed by President Daniel Potts.
  - This committee will focus on trying to establish a working program (under ASCR) that will allow incoming Freshmen—because not having an established GPA, according to the bylaws, prevents consideration into AS—to serve as a sort of “apprentice” under AS members, so they may gain knowledge of parliamentary duties and language, and network with like-minded individuals.

- Furthermore, about 4 members from ASCR will be attending (in 13 days’ time) the annual ASGA (Associated Student Government Association), held in Washington D.C.
  - Beneficial to ASCR, this trip will further enrich AS’s knowledge of parliamentary procedure and possibly establish networks.

6.3 College Council Update, Copresident Brown reiterated that constituent feedback regarding Board Policy out for review is very important. ASPC had their initial meeting so we will be seeing some new and revised policies soon.

6.4 Board of Trustees September 10 Meeting, Bob Brown: There is Audio available for Board Meetings; please listen; one should soon be able to watch video again.

✓ Final budget presented with projections: CBO Lindsey thanked constituent groups regarding concessions and balancing the budget.
✓ + 5% reserve and steady growth projected.
✓ Trustee Ross asked about the high number of stipends - a lot of things were going on that required certain personnel to be working over the summer outside of contract work.
✓ Dr. Hill presented the IEC report; copies can be attained in the President’s office.
✓ Jeff Cummings: the ACCJC draft is ready for review by next Tuesday (Sept. 24).

7. Announcements and Open Forum: Dave Bazard-Angelina Hill wrote about assessment activities-program level assessments and degrees and certificates. 74% of all outcomes in all courses have been assessed. He suggested everyone thank their colleagues for doing all that work. Copresident Brown thanked Dave Bazard for all his work and workshops and communication. Please watch the Football Game tomorrow (Sept. 21)! 1 PM

8. Adjournment: On a motion by Sandra Rowan, seconded by Garth Johnson, the meeting was adjourned at 2:55 pm.
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PROPOSED NOMINEES
FOR
ACADEMIC SENATE APPOINTMENTS

October 4, 2013

The Copresidents of the Academic Senate forward for approval the following nominee as a replacement for a vacated Senate committee chair position that began September 1, 2012, and continues through June 30, 2014:

1. Associate Faculty – Sandra Rowan
    FACULTY PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

Process:

1. Each academic year, as part of Program Review, Deans/Area Coordinators/Associate Deans, Directors and faculty will have the opportunity to fill out a faculty position request form, providing relevant data and a narrative justifying the need for a fulltime position. All faculty request forms will be forwarded by the Program Review Committee (PRC) to the Academic Senate Copresidents and to the Deans’ Council.

2. Faculty requests for new programs (those not yet in existence) will be submitted by the appropriate dean or faculty member, directly to the PRC.

3. Faculty requests will include both teaching and non-teaching faculty positions.

   Replacement requests due to tenure track attrition are not part of this process and are filled automatically, unless there is mutual agreement to the contrary.

4. Replacement requests due to tenure track attrition are not part of this process and are filled automatically, unless there is mutual agreement to the contrary.

5. Requests shall be campus and site specific. In the case of a failed search, processes outlined in the “Contract Faculty Appointment Procedures” will be followed.

6. Temporary grant-funded positions will not be included in this process. Proposals to convert grant-funded to tenure-track faculty positions will be included in the process.

7. The data required on the Faculty Request forms and the criteria used for ranking on the Prioritization Rubric will be articulated and revised as necessary by joint agreement of the Program Review Committee, the Academic Senate; and the Deans’ Council/Administration.

8. Each year, prior to the evaluation of the faculty requests, members of the Faculty Prioritization Committee (FPC) will be trained (normed) in using the criteria on the rubric. Data will be used as much as possible in evaluating the requests, but as every program is different, many qualitative factors must be considered. Not all criteria are hierarchical in nature.

9. The FPC will review the data from the request forms and will evaluate each request on the basis of the specified criteria (See Prioritization Rubric and Directions).

10. The co-chairs of the Faculty Prioritization Committee are voting members.
11.10. In the event that the Faculty Prioritization Committee needs more information, the Co-Chairs of the committee may ask for a representative from the department in question to come forward to answer questions about the position; however, no presentations will be made.

12.11. All faculty requests will be ranked, regardless of how many positions may be available.

13.12. The initial ranking will be done by ballot as follows: each member will assign a score to each rubric category for each position request. The total of the average scores in each rubric category will determine the initial ranking. The initial ranking may be revised as described in (13) below.

14.13. Once the draft list has been completed, any member of the Faculty Prioritization Committee can suggest an override of a ranking where there is significant statistical discrepancy of 5 total points or more with any of the members initial ranking scores. Overrides are permitted when a supermajority-majority (7/107/13 of the committee members are required) votes to re-rank a single position. In positions 1-5, a position may be moved one slot up or down; in positions 6-10, a position may be moved two slots up or down; in positions 11-20, a position may be moved three slots up or down.

14. Once a prioritization list is completed, it will be presented to the President/Superintendent, the Academic Senate, Budget Planning Committee, and the Deans’ Council. Faculty position will be forwarded to the President/Superintendent and Academic Senate by the committee Co-Chairs as a recommendation for action. Should the president override any of the ranked positions, he or she must present a detailed written explanation of that decision to the Academic Senate and to the Deans’ Council within one week.

15. The President/Superintendent acts on the committee’s recommendations and forwards positions to the District as appropriate (timing may be affected by available funding or information regarding the fulltime faculty obligation [FTO]). Should the President/Superintendent override any of the ranked positions, he or she must present a written explanation of that decision to the Academic Senate and to the Deans’ Council.

16. The timeline shown below is for typical prioritization and faculty hiring cycle. The process will also apply to out-of-cycle faculty requests.

Membership of the Prioritization Committee:

- Academic Senate Co-Presidents or designees (2) (1 of whom is Co-Chair)
- Program Review Committee faculty representatives (2)
- At-large faculty representatives (at least one non-Eureka) selected by the Academic Senate Co-Presidents (2) (3)
- Vice President, Instruction and Student Development (Co-Chair)
- Executive Dean of Academic Affairs
Deans or Associate Deans with at least one non Eureka representative (54)
Director of Counseling

Leadership:
The senior Academic Senate Co-President and Vice President of Instruction will serve as co-Chairs of the Faculty Prioritization Committee.

Faculty Appointments:
The Academic Senate Co-Presidents are responsible for all faculty appointments to the Faculty Prioritization Committee.

Timeline:
Spring-Nov: Deans/Area Coordinators, Associate Deans/Directors fill out faculty request forms as part of Program Review.
Faculty Prioritization Committee evaluates and ranks the requests.
Ranked list is forwarded to the President/Superintendent, the Budget Planning Committee, the Deans’ Council, and to the Academic Senate.

Jan/Feb-Dec: President/Superintendent announces the number of positions to be funded for the next academic year. HR initiates the process for faculty hiring.
February: Faculty Prioritization Committee reconvenes, debriefs, and evaluates the process (in order to improve it).

March-Jan/Feb-Jan: Screening committees review applications.

April-May: March-Feb: Candidates interviewed; finalists selected.

May/June: April/May: March/April: Board of Trustees approves contracts

Directions for Using the Rubric:

1. Prior to the Faculty Prioritization Committee meeting, each Co-Chair will be tasked with determining three interests from the faculty and administrative groups they represent and then meeting to collectively bring forward a single shared interest.

2. During the Faculty Prioritization Committee meeting, the group will decide upon a single shared interest that will be scored under the category “Other.”

3. All faculty requests will fall into one of the first three blocks on the rubric: Faculty Replacement Positions (for programs/disciplines that have lost full-time faculty due to retirement or other reasons); Growth Positions (for established programs requesting additional full-time faculty); New Program/Discipline Position (for programs/disciplines not yet established or newly established with no full-time faculty).

4. Within the appropriate block, each request will be assigned 0-5 points based on the criteria listed.
5. All requests will be evaluated in blocks four, five and, if applicable, six. In each of these blocks, each request will be assigned 0-5 based on the criteria listed. NOTE: Not all criteria within a block are hierarchical in nature. Requests must be evaluated holistically within each block, based on a variety of factors.

6. The positions will then be ranked in order of the total points earned. In the case of ties, the committee will vote to rank the positions; a simple majority is all that is required for this procedure.

Approved: 02/07/2012
Former Administrative Regulation 305.03 “Priorities for Tenure Track Faculty Positions” Approved: June 6, 1994, Revised: 11/15/96; 10/3/97; 2/4/03; 4/5/04
SPEECH: TIME, PLACE AND MANNER

The students and employees of the District and members of the public shall be permitted to exercise their rights of free expression subject to the time, place, and manner policies and procedures contained in Board Policy 3900 and these procedures.

The college is a non-public forum, except for in designated areas. A complete list of approved areas can be obtained by contacting the Chief Student Services Officer. These areas are chosen so as to provide visibility and allow communication to a large number of students, administrators, faculty, and others walking or traveling on campus but also so as not to disrupt educational and other activities of the District on behalf of students:

- These areas are designated public forums. The District reserves the right to revoke that designation and apply a non-public forum designation.
- The District reserves the right to designate areas as non-public forums as necessary to prevent the substantial disruption of the orderly operation of the college. Areas of the college that are non-public forums specifically include campus offices, classrooms, warehouses, maintenance yards, or locker rooms, and any other area not specified above.

The use of these areas reserved and open for expressive activities is subject to the following:

- Persons using and/or distributing material in the areas shall not impede the progress of passersby, nor shall they force passersby to take material.
- No person using the areas shall touch, strike or impede the progress of passersby, except for incidental or accidental contact or contact initiated by a passerby.
- Persons using areas shall not use any means of amplification that creates a noise or diversion that disturbs or tends to disturb the orderly conduct of the campus or classes.

Non-student, community groups wishing to engage in speech or expressive activities on campus, in the areas designated as public forums, must provide notification to the District through President/Superintendent or designee not more than three business days in advance of the activities and must describe the nature of the planned activities. No illegal activities will be permitted, no activities which violate District or campus rules, including rules and laws on illegal harassment and discrimination, and none that will substantially interfere with or disrupt activities already scheduled for that day and time in the designated areas.

All persons using the areas that are designated public forums shall be allowed to distribute petitions, circulars, leaflets, newspapers, and other printed matter. Such distribution shall take place only within those areas. Material distributed in the areas that is discarded or dropped in or around the areas other than in an appropriate receptacle must be retrieved and removed or properly discarded by those persons distributing the material prior to their departure from the areas that day.
**Posting**

Bulletin boards shall be provided for use in posting materials at campus locations convenient for use by students, staff, and members of the public. All materials displayed on a bulletin board shall clearly indicate the author or agency responsible for its production and shall be dated with the date of posting by the CSSO or designee. Materials displayed shall be removed after the passage of ten days.

References: Education Code Sections 76120 and 66301

No prior procedure (replaces BP 524 Free Expression by Students).
AN STEM IDEA TO INCREASE FTES AT COLLEGE OF THE REDWOODS

Using Existing STEM Programs To Stimulate Ideas
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INTRODUCTION

It is pretty much a given that community college administrators will complain about their budgets no matter what the circumstances. There never seems to be enough money to support the multiple missions pursued by these colleges (Romano, 2012). National data on community colleges reveal that enrollments in credit-bearing courses surged 11.4% from the fall of 2008 to the fall of 2009 and 16.9% from the fall of 2007 to the fall of 2009 (Mullin & Phillippe, 2009; Romano, 2012). However, state and local funding for higher education per full-time equivalent (FTE) student (in constant dollars) declined by 5.1% in 2009 and 7.1% in 2010 (“State Higher Education Finance (SHEF) Report” 2012).

In California, we have experienced budget cuts of catastrophic proportions with funding for California Community Colleges has been cut by $809 million, or 12 percent, since 2008-2009 (“CCCO, Key Facts,” n.d.). Funding from taxes has been an issue since the passage of Prop 13 in 1978 and by giving control to the people, the down side has been that it has limited property tax funding to education. A budget deficit of $16 billion dollars and several Props like 30, 32, and 38 on the ballot in the state of California for the 2012-2013 year, highlight the need in the state (Nagourney, 2012).

The Redwoods Community College District (RCCD) Budget Planning Committee (BPC) has forecasted the of the 2013-2014 institutional budget being short between 1.7 to 2 million dollars (RCCD; BPC, 2013). Grand total expenditures and revenue generated/forecasted for RCCD at the time was:
PROBLEM STATEMENT

California colleges and universities are required to maintain a fund balance of at least five percent. The BPC budget shows a net deficit and a projected fund balance equity reserve of less than 5.00% for 2012-2014. The fund balance was 4.01 percent in 2012-2013 and the BPC is forecasting -3.42 percent fund balance in 2013-2014 (RCCD, BCP, 2013). The District must increase revenues and reduce expenditures on a temporary and permanent basis to close the budget gap, to remain fiscally solvent, and to meet Accreditation standard IIID (short-term and long-term fiscal solvency) (RCCD, BCP, 2013). Despite bearing over three million in general funds revenue loss, the College has not significantly reduced services and has covered cost increases. As a result, a structural fiscal imbalance has grown to a critical tipping point. The College has exhausted its fund balance reserves and must balance the budget (BPCBudgetRecommendations, 2013). A spokesperson for RCCD in (2013) stated,

“The primary factor in RCCD reallocation of resources has been the serious financial challenges facing the college. RCCD is trying to close a $2 million gap in its budget for the 2013-14 fiscal year. Over the past five years, RCCD has received 13 percent less in state funding to operate the college. That funding decrease is combined with the fact that RCCD operating costs have continued to climb with salary, health benefits and utility costs. This is causing a "structural deficit".”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$29,359,376</td>
<td>$27,520,052</td>
<td>$29,367,809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$28,467,005</td>
<td>$27,273,448</td>
<td>$27,273,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RCCD, BCP, 2013
Redwoods Community College District 2012-13 Final Budget

In order to address structural deficit at Redwoods Community College District (RCCD) and adhere to Accreditation Standard III (Resources) as well as Eligibility Requirements 17 (Financial Resources) and 18 (Fiscal Accountability), the District needs to make necessary adjustments to its 2012-13 Final Budget (“BPCBudgetRecommendations” n.d.). The 2012-13 unrestricted general fund budgets stood $2 million out of balance before concessions, and in order to address this, the college needs to increased revenues and reduced expenditures. Without any budget savings, the District’s ending fund balance will be negative four and a half percent (-4.56%) meaning the District is potentially financially insolvent (“BgtSummary201314CR” n.d.), and it is California’s fiscal problems, it is unlikely that an emergency funding would be provided. The recommendations that follow are not precise prescriptions for action, but rather suggestions for the direction of public and institutional policy that invite further reflection and research (Romano, 2012).

EXISTING STEM EXAMPLES

UCORE

Undergraduate research experiences for community college students can have second-order and multiplier effects on students and community college science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) departments, enabling them to build a STEM pipeline capacity (Strawn & Livelybrooks, 2012). Focus groups with the science faculty at five of the participating community college campuses, ranging from rural to large urban institutions located 5-120 miles from the university, document positive changes that include an improved sense of student-faculty community within departments and participants serving as inspirational role models for other students (Strawn & Livelybrooks, 2012). The University of Oregon’s UCORE program offers an
opportunities for community college students to participate in a research experience that transforms their frames of reference toward their own abilities and career prospects.

**Palomar/San Marcos STEM**

The Science Technology Engineering & Mathematics (STEM) program is funded by the Title V/HSI STEM Grant from the U.S. Department of Education, designed to assist Palomar College in increasing the number of STEM Bachelor's degrees awarded to low-income and underrepresented students (“Palomar Community College District,” n.d.). The STEM grant is a collaborative effort between Palomar College and CSU San Marcos to strengthen the STEM Transfer Pathway by achieving the following: increasing student participation in STEM programs by providing outreach, counseling, and guidance, improving student persistence by enhancing their engagement in the STEM learning process, strengthening STEM programs, curriculum, and equipment opening a STEM Center to provide a social and academic learning environment, and creating a seamless transfer process between Palomar College and CSUSM (“Palomar Community College District,” n.d.).

That partnership between CSU San Marcos, Palomar College, Mira Costa College, and BRIDGES is a program funded by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIH/NIGMS) intended to prepare students from underrepresented ethnic and racial groups at community colleges for seamless transition to four-year universities (“Bridges Program,” n.d.). The program is designed for students who attend Palomar College or MiraCosta College and who will likely transfer to CSU San Marcos for their junior and senior years…completing their undergraduate and graduate education and training and join the biomedical research workforce around the country (“Bridges Program,” n.d.). In order to be eligible for the program, students must be a freshman or sophomore in a science major, have a cumulative GPA of 3.0 of higher,
plan to pursue a PhD, and be a U.S. citizen or permanent resident include being a full time student (“Bridges Program,” n.d.).

**A 20-YEAR OLD STEM MODEL**

The Wright Science Technology and Engineering Preparatory Program (STEPP) was initiated in 1988 for under-represented, low-income, first-generation college students interested in pursuing higher education and serves as a STEM model for preparing students. The twenty-year-old pre-engineering program is aimed at improving both the recruitment and retention of under-represented students pursuing careers in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) (Yelamarthi & Mawasha, 2008).

**HSU Science Shortage**

Starting in the fall of 2014, science majors may find it more difficult to get into Humboldt State University (HSU). Administrators decided to implement more selective admissions requirements for freshmen and transfer students. “We received more applications this year than ever,” Interim Director of Admissions Steven Ladwig said. When a university receives more applications than it has capacity for, it is formally known as impaction (Upton, 2013). The need for tougher admission requirements stems from increased demand for HSU’s biology, botany, wildlife, zoology and environmental resource engineering majors. The wildlife program is considered among the best in the country and the botany program is the largest of its kind in the nation. Potential freshmen looking to major in the sciences will be admitted based on their high school grade point averages. Once admitted, freshmen will be enrolled into a pre-major and must complete chemistry 109, biology 105, botany 105, zoology 110 and statistics 109 before they can enroll in the major (Upton, 2013).
CONCLUSION

Enrollment Stability: $1.2 million potentially at risk in 2012-13

The District’s 2011-12 Apportionment Attendance Report showed 4,535 actual Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES), which is 276 FTES short of the 4,811 enrollment target. As a result, the District received stability funding in 2011-12, so 2011-12 funding was not reduced, despite missing the resident enrollment target. For 2012-13, if actual enrollments fall below the 4,465 FTES target, funding will be cut for up to 276 FTES (Note that 4,465 is a 346 FTES reduction from the 4,811 cap for 2011-12, due to a cut in State funding for community colleges and is not related to enrolment stability.) Therefore, as much as $1,260,000 could be cut from state funding if the FTES target is not reached in 2012-13. This at-risk reduction is in addition to the other budget cuts for 2012-13. The 276 FTES shortfall could be adjusted down further as the 2011-12 Revised (Recalculation) Principal Apportionment Report is due to the State Chancellor’s Office in October 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Funding Per FTES</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>4,117</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>4,564</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>4,564</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>4,564</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>4,564</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The California Community College system is the largest educational system in the state with 112 different academic institutions. Part of the funding for those 112 are based off the
number of Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) that the college is has enrolled. In turn, colleges are forced to forecast the expected number of FTES and they receive funding for those numbers. Hit the target number or go over the number forecasted, the schools do not receive any extra funding; miss the target number, and funding will be cut.

Being a rural academic two-year institution, obtaining and then being able to sustain grants and contracts is a challenge. However, opportunity lies close by with a four-year California State University no more than 10 miles away. Humboldt State University (HSU) is one of 23 CSU’s in the state and the only CSU within 300 miles between Oregon and San Francisco California. A school that specializes in science programs, it will be turning way students starting in 2014. Both RCCD and HSU have collaborated on projects in the past. Palomar, Mira Costa, UCORE, Wright, all provide the framework needed.

If the school can work with the university on aligning its science class to teach the curriculum, then the opportunity to raise RCCD FTES and help generate revenue through an outreach program, funded through the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Talent Expansion Program (STEP) initiative, that could target students 20-30 second year students from RCCD. Ideal candidates would be students “who don’t recognize their own potential as a future scientist or engineer, perhaps due to a lack of knowledge of potential careers” (Strawn & Livelybrooks, 2012). The cost of tuition at RCCD is significantly lower than the cost of attending at HSU. By enrolling potential students into the program that would at RCCD, it could be seen if they are receiving a tuition discount since the units are only $47 and students in the program would end up paying less the first two years (Hillman, 2012). Both colleges would be accomplishing goals and based on the artifacts researched as a framework, with confidence it can be done. It is working in Oregon; it can work here in rural California.
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