

**CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION
GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

University of California Center Sacramento
1130 K Street, Suite LL3
Sacramento, CA 95814

**MINUTES
October 9, 2008**

A meeting of the Grant Advisory Committee was held on Thursday, October 9, 2008, at the University of California Center, Conference Room LL3, in Sacramento, California.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Susan Gutierrez, Chair, CSU
Mary Lindsey, Vice Chair, PI
Chris Shultz, UC (Alternate)
Kate Jeffery, UC
Andrew Grant, UC
Dean Kulju, CSU
Lisa Douglass, AICCU
Catherine Graham, AICCU
Frederick Holland, PI
Adrian Griffin, CPEC
Coleetta McElroy, CASFAA
Sally Pace, K-12
Sharon Bowles, HS
Richard Quintana, CCC (Alternate)

STAFF:

Diana Fuentes-Michel, Executive Director,
Catalina Mistler, Chief, PASD
Debi Jackson, Manager, Information Technology
Bryan Dickason, Manager, Cal Grant Operations
Thea Pot-Van Atta, Manager, Student Support
Services
Charles Wood, Program Compliance
Ruben Romero, Manager, Research
Michael Barbour, Research
Gloria Falcon, Manager, PPD
Suzan Donald, PPD
Kristen Trimarche, PPD
Patsy Chavez, PPD
Lori Nezhura, Governmental Relations

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC:

Olgalilia Ramirez, CSU

AICCU	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
CASFAA	California Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators
CCC	California Community College
CPEC	California Postsecondary Education Commission
CSU	California State University
HS	High School
K-12	Kindergarten – 12 th grade
PASD	Program Administration and Services Division
PI	Proprietary Institution
PPD	Program Policy and Development Branch
UC	University of California

1 Roll Call was taken, a quorum was recognized, and Chair Lindsey called the meeting to
2 order. Chair Lindsey identified that there was a member from the public present, Olgalilia
3 Ramirez from the California State Student Association.

4 **TAB 1 – COMMITTEE CHAIR’S REPORT**

5 Chair Lindsey reported on the September 4-5, 2008 Commission Meeting that she
6 attended. The Commission Meeting Agenda was devoted to EdFund related topics. The Cal
7 Grant Programs were not on the agenda so Chair Lindsey did not report on At-Risk Institutions.
8 Chair Lindsey reported that the Commissioners had concerns about EdFund and voted to
9 replace the EdFund Board of Directors with Commissioners. The Commission had moved in
10 that direction; however, that decision was reversed by the Administration. In addition, the Chair
11 of the Commission, Peter Hankowitz, was requested to resign from the Commission. In the
12 interim, the acting Chair of the Commission is Lorena Hernandez until a new chair is elected.
13 Since Chair Hernandez had been the Commission Liaison for GAC, Commissioner Murillo was
14 assigned as the new Commission Liaison to GAC.

15 Chair Lindsey announced that GAC members would be electing a new chair and vice
16 chair for GAC during this meeting. She discussed the roles and responsibilities of the GAC
17 Chair. In summary, the GAC Chair is responsible for assisting CSAC staff with creating the
18 GAC Agenda; presenting reports at Commission Meetings, and on occasion, giving
19 presentations during the update; reviewing the attendance of GAC Members; and if needed,
20 contacting members who are not attending on a regular basis to ascertain their commitment to
21 the Committee. Chair Lindsey indicated that this Committee does not have an attendance
22 problem with most members, but mainly with students since their time and resources are
23 limited. Chair Lindsey reiterated the importance of having students present at meetings, which
24 is why it is so important for students to have at least two alternate representatives.

25 Vice Chair Bowles thanked Chair Lindsey for her commitment to GAC. Vice Chair
26 Bowles indicated she was responsible for ensuring the motion sheets are accounted for and

1 given to Commission staff at the end of each meeting. Vice Chair Bowles added that she
2 helped Chair Lindsey when meeting with Commission staff in developing agendas. Chair
3 Lindsey thanked Vice Chair Bowles and acknowledged her support.

4 Chair Lindsey addressed the estimated times on the agendas next to each agenda item.
5 Chair Lindsey wanted to clarify that these estimated times were not meant to limit discussion,
6 but to pace the meeting so discussion on agenda topics run in a timely manner. Chair Lindsey
7 also reminded everyone to speak once on a topic, wait for others to make their comments, and
8 if someone has another comment, to signal so they can make their next comment. Chair
9 Lindsey also asked everyone, in the interest of time, to not repeat themselves.

10 Member Graham voiced her concern of not having the Commission Liaison present at
11 this meeting. Member Graham felt that, without proper representation by the Commission
12 Liaison, GAC members are unable to formulate a relationship with the Commissioners.

13 Chair Lindsey explained the demands on Commissioners' time as volunteers to GAC. In
14 addition to this commitment, Commissioners also have their full-time jobs and also serve on
15 various Commission subcommittees. Chair Lindsey relayed that possibly the future Chair could
16 attempt to develop a relationship with the Commissioners.

17 Executive Director Diana Fuentes-Michel explained further that when Commissioners
18 are asked to serve on the California Student Aid Commission, they are also asked to serve on
19 two subcommittees, which does not include the liaison role. In addition, the past two
20 Commission Liaisons, Lorena Hernandez and Louise McClain, made extraordinary efforts to
21 participate as liaisons to GAC. Commissioner Enrique Murillo, Commission Liaison to GAC,
22 had a family matter which prevented him from attending today's meeting. Commissioner Murillo
23 expressed his deep regret that he was unable to attend.

24 **TAB 2 – EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

25 Diana Fuentes-Michel, Executive Director, presented the Executive Director's Report.
26 Executive Director Fuentes-Michel discussed the reductions to the Commission's budget. In

1 terms of the future, the Commission is going to be very challenged due to budget reductions for
2 the current year and the next budget year. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel added that there
3 are Commissioners who have been on the Commission for a year or less. Many of them were
4 just confirmed on the senate floor a couple of weeks ago. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel
5 stated they spend a tremendous amount of time working as volunteers. To the extent most of
6 the members of the executive committee meet by telephone two or three times a week with
7 Commission staff, which takes anywhere from six to ten hours of their personal time. Executive
8 Director Fuentes-Michel wanted to recognize the Commissioners' commitments. She believes
9 the Commission as a whole sees that this committee needs to focus on policy issues, not
10 operations, and is concerned about the next two years and the issue of affordability in
11 California. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel feels the Commission is up for at least two to
12 three more challenging years from a financial perspective. The Commission's operations
13 budget was reduced by over \$2 million. The Commission has gone through three different sets
14 of layoff notices. There has been a reorganization at the Commission; however, when people
15 leave in areas where it is unexpected, the work shifts. The Commission has adjusted their
16 expectations of what they want GAC to do in the next couple of years because they see it is
17 going to be difficult for the colleges, universities, K-12 schools and community colleges. The
18 focus needs to shift to what students' needs are. Student fees have increased significantly in
19 recent years. The private institutions have not seen an increase in their maximum Cal Grant
20 coverage, which means fewer students are able to attend those colleges. Students are also
21 making choices to enroll in less affordable institutions, which means some students are opting
22 out of careers and other dreams they may have.

23 Executive Director Fuentes-Michel recounted a memorable moment over the last couple
24 of weeks. Lori Nezhura, CSAC Staff Member, talked to two students who had been waiting to
25 hear about the Competitive Cal Grant award and expressed their joy and delight when they
26 found out they were going to receive aid they thought had been cut. Executive Director

1 Fuentes-Michel thanked all the people who have worked so hard to make sure that the \$51
2 million program stayed in place. In regards to the budget, things were traded for that result in
3 the political process and that should not be taken lightly.

4 Executive Director Fuentes-Michel has been writing handwritten notes to various
5 members of the Legislature expressing her sincere appreciation that they maintained access to
6 those eligible, older, reentry students who need a second chance and who should be able to go
7 to college, particularly in this economy. None of the Commission's programs were cut. In fact,
8 the Commission received a new program, the Physicians Assistance Loan Repayment
9 Program. No funding was appropriated to administer the program, but Speaker Bass provided
10 the statutory authorization for that program with the goal that funding will be provided later. The
11 Commission's overall operations budget was cut from about \$14 million, to \$12 million. The
12 Commission lost an additional \$500,000 in the federal oversight program. In addition, the
13 Commission was forced to eliminate about 58 positions. The Commission has a budget of over
14 \$12 million to administer. The Commission will be hearing a report at a special meeting on
15 October 23, 2008.

16 In terms of operations, the Commission has a number of people in the communications
17 and outreach areas that have either been let go or reassigned. The Commission has also had
18 to reduce the Call Center's hours to afternoons only. In the layoff process, the Commission lost
19 all training staff. Positions have been consolidated and combined in terms of roles and
20 responsibilities. There is no longer a separate external affairs area. External affairs is now in
21 the Executive Office. So the Commission has had to make some very significant changes.
22 Chief Mistler has been asked to review operational processes on an ongoing basis in terms of
23 effective communications with schools and students; such as more use of WebGrants, more
24 e-mail communication, sending postcards instead of written correspondence, and creating
25 efficiencies in our specialized programs. Many of the programs the Commission administers
26 are very labor intensive and specialized, and require a lot of hands-on work with students.

1 The Department of Finance has asked all State agencies to look at how they run their
2 programs. Staff will look at tying what the Commission is required to do with all authorized
3 positions. The Legislature clearly believes there has to be a Student Aid Commission as a
4 State agency because they believe in the issue of choice. They believe that the State needs a
5 strong private sector, both in the proprietary sector and those colleges known as independents.
6 They believe that, in the public sector, poor students should have the same opportunities as
7 students who have resources. They want to be assured that funding goes as a priority to those
8 students who have the lowest income and have worked the hardest. In the Competitive
9 Program, the Legislature supports the ability to have processes by which students that are the
10 neediest and the most disadvantaged have an opportunity to attend college.

11 Executive Director Fuentes-Michel has asked Commission staff to come forward with
12 ideas about how the Commission can be more efficient. The Governor has proposed a
13 mid-year budget cut. This reduction allows the Governor to cut up to any percentage necessary
14 to balance the budget. It is rumored that the Commission is going to have to cut an additional
15 seven percent, which means another reduction to the operations budget. Executive Director
16 Fuentes-Michel is going to have to express this to the Commission by showing them the actual
17 line-by-line budgets. The cuts that come next are going to have to come across various areas
18 where business has been done a certain way. These cuts are going to be so significant that the
19 Commission is going to have to change the way business is done. The Commissioners met six
20 to eight times a year when Executive Director Fuentes-Michel first took this job. They are
21 meeting almost every month and the committee structure itself has been a structure where they
22 have had committee meetings every month on at least four or five committees. The
23 Commission is reviewing the structure from a cost savings point of view. The Commission is
24 researching the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act to ascertain the minimum requirements in
25 terms of recording meetings. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel relayed that what the
26 Commission is being forced to do is not being done with any intent to reduce or eliminate

1 consultation. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel is going to have to ask the Commission to
2 reduce expenditures in terms of their own means and try to think through how they can meet
3 quarterly, and use teleconferences to address other matters. At this point, Executive Director
4 Fuentes-Michel does not want to have to layoff any more staff. Losing 58 people has been
5 quite concerning and Commission staff have been working incredibly hard. The Commission is
6 now a General Fund agency.

7 In terms of the sale of EdFund, there have been many conversations over the last
8 several weeks with the Department of Finance. The budget provided for a two-year extension
9 to allow the department and the administration to develop a proposal. Last week, the
10 Department of Finance put out a request for offer for a sale advisor and that sale advisor can be
11 an individual or a firm.

12 The Commission has yet to finalize a Voluntary Flex Agreement (VFA) with the federal
13 government. The Department of Education has notified the Commission that they are holding a
14 decision on the VFA until such time that they complete an investigation on the federal
15 inducement issue the Commission brought to the attention of individuals at the last Commission
16 meeting. They also indicated they want changes in the VFA language which deals with
17 reporting that indicates the Commission, not the State of California, is responsible for any
18 actions that EdFund takes. They also asked for a provision that the VFA could be terminated
19 based on the management of the California Student Aid Commission. The Commission does
20 not believe the termination language of senior management is appropriate in the contract and
21 they have asked the Department to take that out. In regards to the issue of the Commission
22 versus the State of California being liable, the Commission believes, because of Senate Bill 89,
23 it is really the Director of Finance who has authority over the loan program and not the
24 Commission. So the Commission is asking them to move that language. In addition, the audit
25 by the Bureau of State Audits that occurred in 2005 criticized the Commission for not having a
26 VFA in place in a timely manner and saw the loss of \$24 million as a result, which was later

1 recovered. The current VFA is estimated to be worth, to the State of California, \$40 million, so
2 the Commission is very concerned about resolving that agreement with the Department as soon
3 as possible. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel sent a letter to the Director of Finance urgently
4 requesting that a meeting be held with the federal government.

5 **TAB 3 – COMMISSION STAFF LIAISON REPORT**

6 Catalina Mistler, Chief of Program Administration and Services Division, provided the
7 Commission Staff Liaison Report. Commission staff have completed the award cycles for the
8 2008-09 academic year. The last cycle was run for the Competitive Program, the September
9 2nd competition, and those awards are available on the Grant Delivery System. All the
10 institutions should have the students who have been awarded on their rosters as eligible to pay.

11 The Chafee awards are processed differently because they are manual checks. The Cal
12 Grant advance went out a week after the budget was signed. The manual checks have to be
13 processed by the State Controller's Office and then returned to the Commission for packaging
14 and distribution. Commission staff finished packaging all the checks for Chafee and they should
15 be arriving to campuses. Commission staff will continue to run weekly cycles for Chafee with
16 the same process.

17 Now that the award cycle has been partially completed and as students continue to
18 correct their ISIRs or FAFSA information, Commission staff will continue to award Entitlement
19 awards through the remainder of the year. In terms of the coming year, Commission staff will
20 also begin the application process and will update the grade point average verification form for
21 the 2009-10 academic year. Commission staff will prepare the grade point average verification
22 form and post it on the Commission's web site for schools to download. In terms of the budget,
23 the Commission is looking at printing and postage costs, and determining what items will be
24 mailed and what will not. Any changes in these processes will be communicated with
25 institutions and stakeholders.

26

1 Ruben Romero, Research Manager, provided an update of the Income and Asset
2 Ceilings for the 2009-10 Award Year. This update reflects the 2009-10 Grant Program Income
3 and Asset Ceilings mandated by statute.

4 Chief Mistler pointed out changes in the 2009-10 FAFSA. There is a change to the
5 questions regarding veteran's benefits. In the past, the ISIR included the amount of veteran's
6 benefits that an applicant was receiving. The Commission used that to determine the Cal Grant
7 need. Since the 2009-10 ISIR will not include an amount for veteran's benefits, the Commission
8 will be changing the need formula and will not include veteran's benefits to determine the Cal
9 Grant need. This change will be communicated with the institutions.

10 Chief Mistler updated GAC with the annual interest calculation issue. Commission staff
11 submitted this issue to the Commission's legal staff, so this issue is still under review. Gloria
12 Falcon, Manager of Program Policy and Development, indicated that a question was asked of
13 the Department of Finance in calculating the daily average balance, which includes a negative
14 balance. The Department of Finance has requested that the Commission's legal counsel review
15 this issue before they make a determination. Once the Commission's Legal Counsel has
16 reviewed this issue, a determination on what is acceptable will be made in conjunction with the
17 Department of Finance.

18 Charles Wood, Manager of Program Compliance, reported that there are eight
19 institutions whose reviews are open and awaiting a determination on the negative interest
20 calculation; four CSUs and four UCs.

21 Chief Mistler addressed the underutilization of APLE awards in prior years as requested
22 by Member Jeffery. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel added that the awards were one of the
23 budget item changes and were reduced to 7,200 awards. There have also been changes to the
24 APLE program in Senate Bill 1158. Chief Mistler relayed updated numbers have been given to
25 Joan Bissell, of the CSU Chancellor's Office, who is reviewing this underutilization. In addition,
26 Commission staff can also put an update, possibly a weekly document on the CSAC web site,

1 so the institutions can review this information. Member Shultz indicated this would be helpful so
2 campuses can review this information.

3 Member Graham requested clarification on posting supporting documentation on
4 Commission meeting agendas. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel indicated Commission
5 agendas, based on the Bagley-Keene Meeting Notice Act, have to be noticed ten days in
6 advance of the meeting date. There is also an internal process with managers and senior
7 management for the Commission meeting agenda items. Commission staff make
8 recommendations to the Commission Chair of what should be on the agenda. The Commission
9 Chair ultimately determines what remains on the agenda. In terms of documentation, there is
10 an internal schedule approved by the Commission where documentation is gathered and
11 submitted seven days prior to the Commission meeting. The Commission's Legal Counsel
12 approves all agenda materials as well and ensures all deadlines are met and issues are
13 described appropriately. Subsequent documents can be posted from ten days prior to up to the
14 meeting date. Member Graham felt the timing of items being posted was a disservice to the
15 community.

16 Member Graham wanted clarification on communication between GAC Members and
17 how this is affected by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. Chief Mistler relayed that a
18 concern was raised on distributing communication that could potentially negatively impact
19 institutions. Chief Mistler did not intend on contacting individual GAC Members; the intent was
20 to receive feedback from institutions. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel indicated that if this
21 was a Staff Committee and not a Commission Committee, all the concerns of Bagley-Keene
22 would not be an issue. The role of this advisory committee is to focus on policy issues. If there
23 is a topic of discussion for GAC, discussion between more than three members is a serial
24 meeting outside of a GAC Meeting. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel can communicate
25 directly with all members, but they cannot discuss it amongst themselves.

26

1 Chief Mistler indicated she has barriers in trying to not violate Bagley-Keene and
2 attempting to gather information to get the job done. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel
3 indicated that GAC is not in statute as a mandated committee.

4 Member Pace asked how a change would be made if this were a staff advisory
5 committee and not a Commission committee. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel indicated a
6 relationship between segmental representatives and Commissioners is important. A staff
7 committee in terms of workgroups makes more sense. This does not preclude the segments
8 from addressing issues at Commission Meetings. Commission staff are looking at doing more
9 telecommunication-type meetings.

10 Member Jeffery indicated it is important to have a vehicle in communicating with staff.
11 Member Jeffery thought what Chief Mistler had done had more to do with operational issues
12 versus policy issues and felt it was very effective. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel reiterated
13 that the focus is policy issues for GAC, not operational issues. Member Kulju also thought Chief
14 Mistler was doing a good job. A differentiation needs to be made on when GAC is to review an
15 issue versus when staff can review an issue.

16 Member Jeffery asked what Commission staff sees as policy issues. Executive Director
17 Fuentes-Michel indicated Commission staff is looking at what policy changes the Commission
18 should be seeking. Commissioners have been clear that they believe an important role for the
19 Student Aid Commission is communication, outreach, and public awareness to students and
20 that is a core function of the Student Aid Commission. Another issue is partnerships with
21 technical areas.

22 **TAB 4 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MAY 15, 2008 AND AUGUST 7, 2008**

23 On **MOTION** by Member Kulju, **SECONDED** by Member Pace, with one abstention, the
24 GAC approved the minutes of the May 15, 2008 GAC Meeting, as amended.

25 The August 7, 2008 Minutes were discussed. Chair Lindsey identified a correction to
26 Tab 3, Page 3, Line 9, to change “entitlements” to “competitive program.” Bryan Dickason,

1 Manager of Cal Grant Operations, was asked and agreed with the change. Chair Lindsey
2 requested a change throughout the minutes to address “Non-Term Based Schools” as “Non-
3 Term Based Programs.” On the last page of the minutes, Lines 7 and 8, Chair Lindsey asked
4 to change “limit the amount of discussion” to “focus the discussion.” On **MOTION** by Member
5 Holland, **SECONDED** by Member Graham, with two abstentions, the GAC approved the
6 minutes of the August 7, 2008 GAC Meeting, as amended.

7 **TAB 5 – REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS FROM THE AUGUST 7, 2008 MEETING**

8 Patsy Chavez, Staff Member of Program and Policy Development, summarized the
9 Action Items from the August 7, 2008 Meeting.

10 Items 1 – This item was completed. Corrections were made to the May 15, 2008
11 Minutes.

12 Item 2 – This item was completed. The May 15, 2008 Minutes and transcripts were
13 reviewed, but changes were not made to the minutes.

14 Item 3 – This item was completed. Member Jeffery requested and will be given a copy
15 of the Cal Grant Eligibility Requirements list.

16 Item 4 – This item was completed. Member Holland submitted three redesigned Cal
17 Grant Letters created by students at his institution.

18 Item 5 – The Cal Grant Account Maintenance and Annual Interest Calculation and
19 Negative Interest issue is still pending legal review. The Department of Finance has required
20 that the Commission’s Staff Counsel review this issue prior to their determination.

21 Item 6 – This item was completed. Member Holland forwarded a copy of his Pell Grant
22 payment example to Member Bonnel.

23 Item 7 – This item is in progress. Chair Gutierrez and Vice Chair Lindsey are in the
24 process of creating a questionnaire that will be sent to institutions regarding duplication of
25 efforts.

26

1 Item 8 – This item was completed. Enhancements to WebGrants were submitted to the
2 Commissions' Information Technology Division for the Cal Grant Eligibility Estimator.

3 Item 9 – This item was completed. An update will be provided to Commissioners at the
4 next Commission Meeting regarding at-risk institutions.

5 Item 10 – This item was completed. Member Pace and Member McElroy discussed their
6 review of Alternate Selection Methods.

7 Item 11 – This item was completed. Agendas will include estimated times next to
8 agenda items.

9 Item 12 – This item was completed. Reference materials will be available as a resource
10 for agenda items.

11 Item 13 – This item was completed. A form was requested to be developed for future
12 agenda topics and the new Chair and Vice Chair will determine action on this item.

13 Item 14 - This item was completed. Future Agenda Topics will be included in every
14 agenda.

15 Item 15 - This item was completed. An update was provided by Chief Mistler on APLE
16 underutilization and how updates will be given to staff.

17 **TAB 6 – ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**

18 Chair Lindsey moved on to electing a new Chair and Vice Chair. Chair Lindsey
19 explained that the Chair typically attends Commission Meetings and either presents a written
20 Chair Report for the last GAC Meeting or gives an oral presentation. On occasion, if the Chair
21 is not available to attend a Commission Meeting, the Vice Chair can attend in the absence of
22 the Chair. Nominations were requested and Member Gutierrez was nominated by two
23 members. Chair Lindsey moved on to electing a new Vice Chair. Member Bowles nominated
24 Chair Lindsey as Vice Chair, who accepted the position.

25 Chair Gutierrez and Vice Chair Lindsey were announced as the new Chair and Vice
26 Chair of GAC.

1 **TAB 7 – REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED 2009 GAC WORKGROUP AND**
2 **MEETING SCHEDULE**

3 Kristen Trimarche, Staff Member of Program Policy and Development, discussed the
4 2009 Commission Meeting Calendar. This calendar displays standard meeting dates for GAC
5 meetings. Staff Member Trimarche indicated that in addition to GAC Meetings, Ad Hoc
6 meetings were held. Manager Falcon reiterated that future meetings will not be in-person
7 meetings. They will either be CC Confer-type or teleconference meetings due to budget
8 constraints.

9 GAC Members voted to keep all meeting dates on the calendar in order to be able to
10 either have or cancel a meeting. If teleconference meetings are held, instead of having a
11 four-hour meeting, GAC Members can meet in reference to the topic and hold shorter meetings.
12 Vice Chair Lindsey relayed that in the past, GAC Members used to meet in workgroups and
13 then have a short GAC Meeting that adopted recommendations and finished topics.

14 Member Shultz asked what costs were involved. Chief Mistler relayed that costs are a
15 factor. Recently, the court reporter was canceled due to budget concerns. The Commission's
16 Budget Office is reviewing costs line by line and reducing where necessary. In addition, a
17 meeting room is not available where charges are not incurred.

18 Vice Chair Lindsey suggested that GAC Members pay for their own costs with the
19 exception of students. Member Kulju recommended to worry about the meeting dates at a later
20 time and proceed with the calendar as it stands.

21 GAC Members approved the calendar that was presented by Commission staff.

22 **TAB 8 – CONSIDERATION OF CAL GRANT SELECTION CRITERIA FOR CAL**
23 **GRANT AWARD DETERMINATIONS FOR 2009-10**

24 Research Manager Romero and Michael Barbour, Research Analyst, presented the
25 proposed 2009-10 Cal Grant Selection Criteria for Cal Grant Award Determination. This chart
26 was updated for 2009-10 and presented to GAC for review and approval to go forward to the

1 Commission for approval. Member Graham asked if all of Past Member Mary Robinson's
2 issues were resolved last year from her selection criteria workgroup. GAC Members approved
3 the determination.

4 **TAB 9 – CONSIDERATION OF 2009-10 STUDENT EXPENSE BUDGETS**

5 Research Manager Romero presented the 2009-10 Student Expense Budgets. The
6 Commission annually adjusts student expense budgets to calculate financial need for grant
7 applications. The Commission uses the data from the latest SEARS.

8 Member Jeffery requested that the Expense Budget title is modified to 2009-10 Sample
9 State-wide Student Expense Budgets, since these expense budgets are only used as samples.
10 GAC Members moved to approve the motion with Member Jeffery's changes.

11 **TAB 10 – WORKGROUP UPDATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

12 **Tab 10.a – Payment Periods for Non-Traditional Term Based Programs**

13 Member Holland reported on the Workgroup discussion regarding Non-Traditional Term
14 Based Programs. At the last GAC meeting, Member Holland had recommended that changes
15 be made to have payments periods modeled the same as Pell Grants payments, which might
16 require a change in statute. Member Holland sent Member Bonnel his payment sample.
17 Member Holland is waiting to hear from Member Bonnel since he was not present at this
18 meeting. This workgroup is not yet concluded.

19 **Tab 10.b – Cal Grant C Alternative Selection Methods**

20 Member Pace and Member McElroy reported on the Cal Grant C Alternative Selection
21 Methods. Member Pace indicated that a questionnaire can possibly be completed by students
22 on which they rate their own aptitude and experience as applicable to the program.
23 Approximately thirty-five questionnaires were distributed by Member Pace and Member
24 McElroy; however, they only received seven responses. Discussion ensued regarding Question
25 9 of the Supplement. Member Griffin asked if there was a way to come up with a percentage for
26 which Question 9 makes a difference to the totals. Member Pace reported that in some

1 schools, the number of students that responded and were awarded were a low number
2 compared to their student population. However, there was also a school at which there were
3 only 500 eligible students, but 100 students were awarded. Manager Dickason confirmed that
4 the program is not being underutilized. Member Holland asked if data is gathered and a small
5 percentage shows that the same number of students would have received an award regardless,
6 would that be a small enough percentage to eliminate Question 9 from the Supplement.
7 Commission staff agreed to run a query to this affect. Member Kulju suggested that if Question
8 9 were removed, a larger point value should be assigned to other areas on the Supplement.
9 Chair Gutierrez asked if data reflects less than a five percent difference, maybe Question 9
10 should be eliminated from the Supplement. Chief Mistler suggested to Member Pace that if
11 they decide they would like to send out a survey, the Commission has a listserv they could
12 utilize.

13 On **MOTION** by Member Kulju, **SECONDED** by Member Pace, with one abstention,
14 Commission staff is to review data to determine the affect or change in level of eligible students
15 if Question 9 on the Supplement is removed. If there is a small change, then Question 9 would
16 be removed from the Supplement for 2009-10.

17 **Tab 10.c – Institution and CSAC Duplication of Efforts**

18 Chair Gutierrez and Vice Chair Lindsey completed a draft survey for feedback from GAC
19 Members. Chair Gutierrez did not have any recommendation that GAC would make and
20 suggested to move this item as a workgroup or topic for next year.

21 **TAB 11 – SELECTION OF WORKGROUPS & WORKGROUP TOPICS FOR** 22 **UPCOMING YEAR**

23 Chair Gutierrez identified several workgroups to be continued for the coming year. GAC
24 Members discussed Cal Grant C Alternate Selection Methods, Payment Periods for Non-
25 Traditional Based Programs, and Institution and CSAC Duplicative Efforts.

26

1 Member Graham volunteered to review data from minutes or transcripts for open issues
2 that were not resolved from prior GAC Meetings when Mary Robinson, Former GAC Member,
3 discussed several issues. Member Jeffery suggested discussing Veteran's Benefits as a
4 workgroup. Chief Mistler suggested APLE underutilization as a workgroup as discussed before.
5 Chair Gutierrez identified the workgroups in the following order of priority:

- 6 1) Veteran's Benefits
- 7 2) Duplication of Efforts
- 8 3) Cal Grant C Workgroup
- 9 4) APLE Underutilization
- 10 5) Payment Periods for Non-Traditional Based Program

11 On **MOTION** by Member Kulju, **SECONDED** by Member Holland, and **CARRIED**, GAC
12 Members approved to forward these workgroups for Commission approval.

13 Chief Mistler brought up the list of APLE awards of allocations and awards for utilization.
14 This list will be posted to the web for the institutions' use. Chief Mistler requested segments to
15 look at the data for awards not being used. Member Douglass is attending a meeting in San
16 Diego and said that she could bring this up as a talking point. Member Graham suggested
17 attending the segmental meetings at CASFAA on Sunday of the opening session. It is a very
18 large segmental group and might be a good opportunity to talk about these issues.

19 **TAB 12 – CONSIDERATION OF FUTURE TOPICS**

20 Chair Gutierrez moved on to future topics of discussion. APLE Underutilization was
21 moved to the Future Agenda Topics for discussion. Chief Mistler brought up the need for
22 training on this area. Member Graham requested an update on Real-Time.

23 There being no further business, the meeting of the Grant Advisory Committee was
24 adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

25 _____
26 SUSAN GUTIERREZ
GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIR