College Council Members: Luz Aguirre, Diane Boynton, DJ Singh, Elizabeth Dilkes Mullins, Fred Hochstaedter, Wendy Bates, Scott Gunter, Francisco Tostado, Kevin Haskin (for Loran Walsh), Monika Bell, Lyndon Schutzler (non-voting), Paola Gilbert, Larry Walker, Steve Crow, Kiran Kamath, Laura Franklin, Stephanie Perkins, Suzanne Ammons, Walter Tribley, ASMPC Rep.

Absent: Kevin Walsh, ASMPC Rep.
Guests: Rosemary Barrios, Catherine Webb, Steve Bruemmer.

Dr. Steven Crow was introduced as Professional Expert, Administrative Services. He will be working from the VP of Administrative Services office. Members introduced themselves.

1. **Minutes:**

    a. **August 25, 2015:** Fred motioned to approve the minutes and Scott seconded; the minutes were approved as recorded, none opposed and one abstention due to attendance (Steve Crow).

2. **Board Policies:** None presented.

3. **Action Items:**

    a. **BSI Report – First Reading (Laura Franklin):** Laura reviewed the very rough draft of the BSI Report indicating it would be more defined in about 2 weeks. She explained that until a few years ago, we would receive three-year allocations. We now receive two-year allocations and in 2014-15 we had two allocations expiring at the same time. She reviewed and explained the summary list of projects and activities funded in the two allocations expiring June 30, 2015; the minimum allocation is $90,000 (***Note: Summary lists not submitted to CCCCO)***. Laura reported that the Math Learning Center Coordinator and Digital Services Librarian played key roles in developing new ways to reach and serve new basic skills students. Larry explained that the model set up by utilizing BSI funds along with Student Equity funds to have a counselor partner with a categorical services coordinator have proven to be effective in providing support and follow-up services that are in the best interest of the student and we want to continue the momentum gained with this model into the spring. Laura reported that the CCCCO would like to see these programs move beyond being a pilot program and become more institutionalized. This will require more support and for Academic Affairs and Student Services to work together. These categorical funds cannot be utilized to generate FTES.

    Laura explained how we were asked to use the Basic Skills Cohort Tracking Tool Data in the first few years. This year the CCCCO has asked us to focus only on those students taking the specific courses in their first attempt. She reviewed cohort comparisons which indicate a slight decrease in the success rate in the English writing and English reading cohorts, a significant decrease in Math and a slight increase in ESL. Each department took responsibility for producing a written analysis of these findings. *See BSI 2014-15 Annual Rpt-1*st *Read.* Laura referenced the Action Plan Activity Grid portion of the report indicating that the BSI Committee will be meeting again to review prior to this report returning for a second reading at CC.

4. **Information Items:**

    a. **Classified Positions:**

        i. **Lead Custodian – replacement (Steve Crow):** This position was presented as a straight replacement; the last incumbent has moved into the position of Custodial Supervisor.

    b. **Google Campus update (Mike Midkiff, Tech Committee):** Mike reported on members of the MPC Project team and the Onix Networking Project team and explained the importance of having resources in place. Currently we are in pre-project planning through September prior to start of each phase as outlined here:

- Phase I – October 3 start date for use by Core IT members,

- Phase II – November for use by Early Adopters (early users),

- Phase III –January – Early in Flex Week for the rest of campus to go live.

Mike indicated that while plenty of volunteers are available, individuals and supervisors will be contacted in the next few weeks to participate and possibly serve as Google Guides. He explained some of the project outcomes including that the servers will no longer be housed on campus; instead, information will be in the cloud, increasing functionality and no limit to e-mail. This change will allow access from any location. There will be a single sign on/log in authentication process. For students it will be important to streamline the process by incorporating this initiating step within the enrollment process so as to eliminate the need for additional steps. The same domain "…@mpc.edu" will be used. Mike provided info on the Google Campus Project Website and MPC IT Webpage for additional information.

5. **Discussion Items:**

    a. **Addressing ACCJC Concerns – (Catherine Webb, Walt Tribley):** Dr. Tribley reintroduced Catherine's role as the Accreditation Liaison Officer and the importance of addressing concerns/recommendations outlined in the ACCJC letter of August 12, 2015. Dr. Tribley reminded all that the USDE sets eligibility requirements in order for us to receive federal dollars and this requires that we assess all programs and courses. In the August letter, we were asked to identify programs in which 40% or more of included courses have not been assessed. The expectation is that the District is assessing its SLOs in both qualitative and quantitative measures--the results for which must be integrated into institutional planning and resource allocation.

        i. **SLO Action Plan:** Catherine reviewed the SLO Assessment Action Plan Fall 2015, which outlines the actionable items identified, resources and timelines so that we can track progress and address concerns as put forth from the ACCJC in the letter. The District's SLO committee has devised this SLO Assessment Action Plan as an assessment tool which will track how concerns are being addressed. All courses must be assessed and Instructor Reflections plays a key role in this assessment.

ii. **Program Assessment Summary:** The chart reflects program areas and corresponding assessment numbers. Important to program assessment is the dialogue leading to changes made to improve outcomes.

Participation, especially from part time faculty due in part to compensation issues, has been lacking in completing the Instructor Reflections form. Some members contended that the form be revised for ease of use; however, this will need to be addressed at another time. It is imperative that we adhere to the current form with all instructors participating. The form can be reviewed and revised later when time allows.

Fred, as SLO coordinator, reported on how he provides a tracking list to AAAG for the courses needing Instructor Reflections. Of those courses that have been offered at least once in the last four semesters (Fall 2013 to Spring 2015), approximately 50% have been assessed. For all courses, (CCCCO list), we are approximately 25% complete in this assessment. Unless the current participation rate improves, we will not meet our assessment goal.

Addressing the Assessment Backlog (see handout): Kiran indicated that after reading documents Fred prepared for assessed courses and Catherine prepared for the SLO Action Plan, it appears the District has a two step process:

1) Address the immediate crisis by March, and

2) Implement a cycle of assessing the large volume of courses. The District currently has approximately 1,585 courses, FTES of 6,605 and 109 fulltime faculty—about two and a half times that of a comparable college.

The three levels of assessment according to the Accreditation are:

1) Course Level Assessment "Instructor Reflections",

2) Program Level Assessment "Program Reflections" and,

3) Institutional Level Assessment.

Kiran explained Course Level Assessment and getting an accurate number and list of "active" MPC courses (from the courses we own). The District could establish the concept of a "Cycle of Assessment", a plan of assessing all our course SLOs within a cycle. This would require that we establish a master list of courses to be distributed over the years of the cycle with the goal of assessing the SLOs of each course at least once during the cycle.

Program Level Assessment – should also be established in a Cycle of Assessment similar as with Course Level Assessment above. The assessment results feed into Program Review and should be done by July 31, 2016.

Course Assessment feeds into Program Assessment which feeds into Program Review which feeds into the cycle of all the planning work of the College.

Kiran suggested we take a staggered approach in Course Level Assessment and Program Level Assessment and reviewed an example of a 5-Year Cycle of Assessment.

b. **Recruitment to Completion (R2C) (Walt Tribley, Kiran Kamath, Larry Walker, R2C Planning Team):** Dr. Tribley introduced this collaborative effort as a means of

operationalizing many of the College Council Recommendations to the President, Oct 2013. More collaboration is needed between Student Services and Academic Affairs to better ensure student recruitment and retention. Larry reported that work is being done to identify and remedy unintended barriers that students encounter and streamline processes. Kiran reported that a review of the Planning Assumptions from College Council was done and work is now taking place to create a list of recruitment to completions steps to improve declining enrollments. An activity is planned for Friday, Sept. 11 to include approximately 36 members.

c. **Operational Audit: Potential Auditors (Walt Tribley):** Diane invited the group to conduct their own research on the prospective groups and suggested that we establish criteria for determining which group would be best suited for the District's needs. Dr. Tribley reminded the group that the District would be best served by an audit that is broad and more comprehensive, rather than narrow in scope. He invited Steve to provide the group with insight on these groups based on his experiences with them. Steve indicated that this type of audit is the equivalent of an internal audit and provides opportunity for self-discovery.

   i. **Financial Crisis Management Assistance Team (FCMAT):** Deals primarily with K-12, focused on financial aspects and relies heavily on volunteers. The CCCCO is working on developing a relationship with them.
   ii. **Cambridge West:** Focused on financial aspects.
   iii. **Collaborative Brain Trust:** Broader scope of understanding of the academic component.
   iv. **School Services-**Legislative – oriented, focused on K-12.

   Larry reported that while our Financial Aid staff, as one of the most experienced on campus, could benefit from an independent audit to determine if any processes could be made more efficient,, the enrollment process could also be examined. We need to make sure our seasoned professionals have all resources available for efficiencies. Group members discussed the need to have a broader conversation such as an open forum prior to the decision on the operational audit. Members expressed interest in knowing that the decision made is unbiased and a good selection for serving our needs. Steve reported that he served on seven accreditation teams where he was asked to analyze the financial health of the institution in the same way that FCMAT would. He also received training from the Accreditation Commission to do an external analysis of community college finances using the same rubric that FCMAT uses.

d. **Education Master Plan Update/Review:** Diane suggested a meeting next week (9/15) to review Institutional Action Plans in accordance with the Planning and Resource Allocation Process. Members concurred with the suggestion.

6. **Next meeting: September 22**

7. **Campus community comments**

Items for future meetings:
- **Campus forums to discuss Ed Master Plan and Resource Allocation**
- **Technology Bond**
- **Auditing courses: exploration of opportunities/challenges**
- **Policy/process for reorganization**