

College Council Minutes- DRAFT

September 22, 2015

2:00 pm, Rm 216, LTC

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

Absent: Larry Walker, Kevin Haskin

Guests: Catherine Webb, Jon Mikkelsen, David Clements, John Spivak (Collaborative Brain Trust)

1. Minutes:

- a. **September 8, 2015:** Fred motioned to approve the minutes and Elizabeth seconded; the minutes were approved as amended with none opposed and no abstentions.
- b. **September 15, 2015:** Deferred to future meeting.

2. Board Policies:

3. Action Items:

- a. **BSI Report – Second Reading (Laura Franklin):** Laura presented the BSI Report for today's second reading. She reviewed the expenditure portion which was not available at the last meeting and is being reviewed at Fiscal Services and due October 1, 2015.

Kiran motioned to approve the report. Scott seconded. The motion carried with all but one in favor. Fred abstained pending approval by Fiscal Services.

4. Information Items:

- a. **Request for Proposal: Collaborative Brain Trust (Walt):** Dr. Tribley introduced John Spivak of CBT and invited members to introduce themselves and their roles at the College. Mr. Spivak gave an overview of his background in education and career over the last seven years with CBT. CBT is a group consisting of approximately fifty consultants, primarily retired faculty and administrators, with varied background and expertise. He explained that CBT strives to make good colleges better and that he has worked with twelve colleges in California and outside of the State. He reported that he had worked with FCMAT when they were working with Imperial Valley College, indicating that the FCMAT overseer (Michelle Plumtree) at the time relied extensively on the conclusions drawn by CBT's expertise during the time in which Imperial Valley was under review by FCMAT. He explained that the process emerges from a series of drafts and invited questions which included the following along with comments:

- **Fiscal Health Management Checklist (CCCCO)** - *The question was asked as to what else CBT could offer in terms of value in the realm of our fiscal stability and supporting trust between faculty and administrators.* Mr. Spivak took note of the question.
- **Format** – *Is the intent for CBT to present to the group what CBT will do, with questions from the group, or if the process is for the group to express concerns for CBT to review, then can this be done individually rather in the group setting?* Mr. Spivak explained he has worked with questions submitted confidentially and stated that CBT could provide analysis in nearly any area and listed some of the

services they provided for Imperial Valley College while working with FCMAT who then hired expertise from CBT for the work done at Imperial Valley:

- ✓ Internal and external stakeholder collaboration,
- ✓ Conducted organizational structure review,
- ✓ Conducted review of employee bargaining unit contracts,
- ✓ Reviewed fitness of curricular, non-curricula, co-curricular programs,
- ✓ Facilitate creation of a vision that results in program prioritization,
- ✓ Review existing plan to determine relevancy, coordination
- ✓ Assist the College in planning a comprehensive FTES plan for next three years,
- ✓ In Fiscal Management- review bench mark comparisons, multi-year financial projections, 50% law, GF management of Categorical programs, create a financial model and options to illustrate models to implement,
- ✓ Examine institutional impediments, examine enrollment opportunities and role of College's foundation and grant development.

Dr. Tribley asked about obtaining a reliable, high-integrity evaluation of MPC's fiscal situation. Mr. Spivak reported that CBT has expertise among the team members who are familiar with the business side and could examine what a college our size could examine. This could include examination of the number of administrators, full time vs. part time faculty, average number of students per class, balance of general education vs. technical education, graduation rate, and success rates in filling jobs for employers.

Mr. Spivak took note of the following suggested inquiries.

- *Processes, Accountability and Follow up.*
- *Communication.*
- *Categorical Program examination to include matching funds,*
- *Average Class Size targets have been reviewed and discussed. Implementation is the challenge.*
- *Access, in terms of Application, Enrollment processes. How can enrollment barriers be met and overcome?*
- *Prioritization of resources; How do we determine what an efficient college looks like, how to get there. How do we know which programs to support and to what size? Reducing and/or redefining the FTES challenge. Overriding problem is how to restore the trust. One pathway may be better understanding of the budget.*
- *Review of how Facilities Department (Maintenance) is organized. Marketing Plan for MPC.*
- *How is the curriculum meeting the needs of the community?*
- *Satellite campuses- what curriculum and services should be offered?*
- *Review Student Financial Services for efficiencies.*
- *How do we resolve salary issues, especially part time?*
- *How do we attain efficiencies (fiscal) without compromise to academic excellence and teaching quality.*

Jon shared comments from a conversation with FCMAT's Deputy Executive Officer as to services and how FCMAT compares to CBT (see handout).

Mr. Spivak indicated that he would collect today's questions and comments and return a first draft "skeleton" proposal by Oct. 2nd, which will be the beginning of a discussion.

Group comments included the following concerns (1) timing, (2) cost, (3) independence, (4) objectivity, (5) expertise, and (6) scope. Comments included whether we need a proposal from FCMAT and CBT or whether we can elect which services are desired. Concerns were also shared as to how to deal with FCMAT in the public eye.

b. Recruitment to Completion (Walt Tribley, Kiran Kamath, R2C Planning Team)

report: Dr. Tribley reported that Larry Walker (VPSS) and Kiran Kamath (VPAA) joined forces to bring together a planning team to make actionable recommendations from College Council.

Kiran described the September 11, 4 hour retreat as engaging and energizing, indicating that the group entered into discussion with five broad areas of focus:

- 1) Develop and build a sustainable student centered dynamic schedule
- 2) Celebrate and encourage a culture of student success
- 3) Create strategic alliances that position MPC as the preferred highway for middle school to university or career
- 4) Define and communicate a vibrant, consistent student centered identity
- 5) Enhance the culture of success through customer service.

Each of these five action oriented plans have been assigned to specific areas.

c. Accreditation Update (Catherine) Catherine reminded all that we will be reviewing the draft of the Self Study; committees will review the posted drafts. College Council will primarily be reviewing Standard 1 and parts of Standard IV. The steering committee agreed to have all drafts posted on the web by October 5 and by October 13 College Council should have a draft for review. Catherine explained how feedback will be collected using a "mini-link" in the standard, and invited questions.

d. TracDat Status: Dr. Tribley reminded the group of conversations which began in the spring about the purchase of TracDat. TracDat's purchase will be presented to the Board on September 23 under New Business. Catherine will provide a recap of the high-level features TracDat will provide the institution.

1. Discussion Items:

a. Institutional Action Plan

i. Planning and Resource Allocation Model (CC 5-13-2014):

ii. Integrated Planning Model 2015 Draft:

iii. Institutional Action Plan template-Draft:

Diane reviewed how the existing PRAP was not followed completely as various action plans were not considered in the budget process, primarily due to the reduction in administrative personnel and the college's fiscal situation. .

Diane then shared a draft of the Integrated Planning Model. The primary revision had to do with referencing the Institutional Action Plan rather than the Education Master Plan. She explained that the wording was more in keeping with what the college actually wanted to do: clarify how each goal, objective, and initiative will be attained; track progress on goals and objectives; and revise goals and objectives as needed. Kiran Kamath and Steve Crow agreed to review the Institutional Action Plan template to see if it would work as desired and report back at our next meeting.

2. Next meeting: October 13, 2015

3. Campus community comments:

- Francisco (Student Financial Svc.) reported Seaside Middle School will be hosting a visit.
- Fred (Acad. Senate) reported that the Senate will be considering the 2nd reading of the BSI report, and will discuss at a second meeting the reinstatement of the Learning Assessment Committee on Oct. 1.
- Wendy Bates (Athletics) mentioned that a Chicken Drop for Booster Club is scheduled for Nov. 7. The Volleyball team plays at SJSU Sept. 23. A free Volleyball Coaching Clinic, in conjunction with CSUMB and UC Santa Cruz, is planned for Oct. 17 at 2 pm in the MPC Gym.
- Maria Lopez, ASMPC Pres., introduced herself. Ms. Lopez spoke at Flex Day.

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**