College Council Minutes
February 25, 2014, 2:00 pm
Karas Room, LTC

College Council Members: Amelia Converse, Celine Pinet, Chris Marshall, Dan Fox, Diane Boynton, DJ Singh, Elizabeth Dilkes Mullins, Fred Hochstaedter, Gary Bolen, Earl Davis, Warren Gunter, Kali Viker, Loran Walsh, Lyndon Schutzler (non-voting), Mark Clements, Marty Johnson, Michael Gilmartin, Stephanie Perkins, Suzanne Ammons, Walter Tribley, ASMPC Rep.

Absent: Dan Fox, Warren Gunter, Lyndon Schutzler (non-voting), Chris Marshall (ASMPC), Mark Clements.
Guests: Grace Anongchanya, Chris Knolle, Rosaleen Ryan, Katherine Webb.

1. **Minutes from February 11, 2014.** Deferred to next meeting (March 11).

2. **Action items** *No action items presented.*
   -

3. **Information Items:**

   a) **2014-15, Budget Planning Timeline-Calendar** (**Earl Davis**): Earl reviewed the Budget Planning Timeline indicating that the packets would be delivered to the Vice Presidents early in the week of March 3rd, for distribution to their respective budget managers. Budget Committee meets next on February 28th. The Tentative Budget will go to the Board in June; this gives authorization to expend funds as of July 1. The adopted budget will then be presented to the Board in August.

   Diane then compared the Planning and Resource Allocation Process with the Budget Planning timeline. The suggestion was for the charts to be cross referenced so that processes could be parallel identified between the charts. Following today's meeting, the charts were reviewed and the timelines and dates were determined to be compatible.

   b) **Effective Strategies for Online Teaching Spring 2014** (**Jon Knolle**): The Effective Strategies for Quality Online Teaching & Learning are intended to help instructors incorporate high quality teaching and learning characteristics into the online environment (including both online and web-enhanced face-to-face courses). Jon gave a detailed review of the guideline categories and resource information essential in effective online teaching which are:
      1. Course Organization & Design
      2. Course Syllabus, Learning Objectives and Introductions,
      3. Course Content & Materials
      4. Communication and Collaboration
      5. Assessment & Evaluation
      6. Learner Support Resources

   Jon underscored the need to keep this tool as concise and simple as possible, while providing a menu of recommendations for faculty to select from as they develop and teach online courses. The intent is also to make sure this is useful and has application for instructors who teach face to face courses in addition to online courses. MPC's Institutional Committee on Distance Education has launched the MPC Online Teaching Certification program. The first @ONE Online Teaching Certification core course is available now and there are already twenty six faculty members going through the online certification process. This course should be helpful even for those who have taught online for years.

4. **Mission and 2011-14 Institutional Goals and Objectives**

- **Accomplishing the Mission (Catherine Webb):** The Accreditation Standards are currently being revised and the timeline is for the accrediting commission to approve the new standards by June 2014. Catherine Webb gave a presentation on how we could effectively revise our Mission and Institutional Goals to fulfill the expectations in the newly revised Accreditation Standards.

Our current *Planning and Resource Allocation Process* incorporates the goal and budget planning activities in place and being practiced now. At the February 11th meeting, Diane brought forward a new *MPC Planning Processes* model which aligns the review of the *Mission Statement*, *Institutional Goals* and the *Educational Master Plan* and reflects a parallel view of processes already in place for academic program review. The *MPC Planning Process* model proposed on Feb. 11 supports a way of reviewing the mission that parallels program review's six year cycle along with its annual updates. The current Mission statement was adopted in July 2008. In 2010, the mission statement was reviewed with no changes made and a new set of goals and objectives were adopted by the Board in May 2011. Catherine presented an overview of the revisions to the Standards explaining the reasons supporting the changes:

- Attempt to remove redundancies and streamline the Standards.
- Response to specific changes in the US Dept. of Ed requirements (compliance to the new USDE regulations is being embedded into the Standards as a means of ensuring accountability).
- Changes with regards to the Mission includes emphasis on Student Achievement in addition to Student Learning and emphasis on specific types of data and how used. The context for the word *achievement* is changing.
- Emphasis on student learning in the current Standard is now made more explicit in the expectations of the new Standard.
- Current Standard is that we align programs with mission and student needs; the proposed Standard is more prescriptive as to how this should be done. Programs and services must still be aligned with the mission, however the expectation is that analysis of data drives how we establish programs, evaluate their effectiveness and hold ourselves accountable to the mission.
- Demonstrating institutional effectiveness by providing evidence of achievement and student learning outcomes is not new, however, the new Standards are prescriptive as to the types of evidence to be used.

Catherine provided the original and the revised versions of the mission statement of Cerro Coso College as an example of how an implicit number of items have been revised to represent a more explicit series of expectations.

Discussion amongst members included that Cerro Coso as a rural college district, covers about 18,000 square miles east of the Sierras. It is evident that Cerro Coso is familiar with the demographics of its student body and its community's needs, and that this prevails through the institutional goals driven by the mission statement. This conversation then prompted discussion as to how familiar MPC is with its own student body and community.

- **Subcommittee Feedback** Comments were shared from several subcommittee members. Diane is gathering input as requested from each subcommittee and this will be brought back for review.

MPC will be held accountable to the same kind of metrics as seen in the Scorecard. Achievement in a measureable term will be the benchmark rather than efforts to support pursuit of such achievement as in the past. At the same time, we need to know how to manage data relative to our *Lifelong Learners*, that is, we need to define the student population and reapply disaggregating data to properly handle the Lifelong Learners as the different population that they represent.
a. Mission – Marty, Gary, Loran
b. Objectives 1.1 and 1.2 – Fred, Elizabeth
c. Objective 1.3 – Celine, Mark

d. Objective 1.4 – Kali, Diane
e. Goal 2 – Michael, Dan
f. Goal 3 – Laura, Amelia
g. Goal 4 – DJ, Stephanie

Consensus among members was that there was a need for a presentation from Institutional Research to review what we know about our communities' needs and our student population.

5. **Planning and Resource Allocation Process –** Review/Revise:

   a. **MPC Goal Setting Draft (chart):**

Diane asked for feedback on the chart MPC Planning Process (chart) as she plans to share this with the Advisory Groups to gather their feedback. A suggestion to include *"Student Achievement"* under the heading **"Influences such as:".** The MPC Planning Process chart could be used in the place of Area Component Goals in the PRAP chart. A review of the Education Master Plan will be essential in order to tie in planned goals for completion. The challenge in developing plans and processes is also to produce specific enough goals which are also actionable and able to produce measureable results.

Dr. Tribley reported on a recent bill introduced by Senator Leno which would allow San Francisco City College to what equates essentially to stability funding. Another proposed bill by Assemblyman Bonta (The Fair Accreditation for CA Comm. Colleges Act) would allow community colleges to choose an accrediting agency.

6. **Campus community comments:**

   - Loren reported on the March in March in Sacramento.

   - Celine reported on updates in partnerships and grans to include a proposal to Bank of America, the Song Brown RN Fund and the USDA grants.

Items requested for future agenda topics were:

   - South Bay Consortium—how are we a part of their operation?
   - Presentation (from the Foundation) as to how grants are handled, funds disseminated (Bullock and other donations).
   - Trust monies: What are the differences between grants and trusts and how does the Foundation handle?

Items for future meetings:
   - Flex Days
   - Board policy adoptions
   - Online student services
   - Online application/registration process
   - Policy/process for reorganization