From: Alan Haffa
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2011 1:32 PM
To: Alan Haffa; Leslie Procive; Suzanne Ammons; Alfred Hochstaedter; Brenda Lee Kalina; Carolyn Hansen; Carsbia Anderson; Douglas Garrison; Gary Bolen; Michael Gilmartin; Julie Bailey; Loran Walsh; Lyndon Schutzler; Mark Clements; Michael Gilmartin; Nancy Goehring; Stephanie Perkins; Stephen Ma; Steve Morgan; Will Adams
Cc: Maggie Caballero; Carla Robinson; Sigrid Klein; Robin Clouse
Subject: RE: College Council Today

Doug sent me some feedback on the proposed Institutional Goals and Mission and I wanted to share my thoughts in response. His feedback is included on the website currently. I've asked that this be uploaded to the CC website, along with all of the other feedback that we have received to date. My hope is that sharing this with you now may expedite our conversation since you will be familiar with some of the issues that we need to discuss.

From: Alan Haffa
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2011 1:25 PM
To: Alan Haffa; Douglas Garrison
Cc: Suzanne Ammons; Brenda Lee Kalina
Subject: RE: Feedback on Institutional Goals

Dear Doug,

I have had a chance to read carefully your feedback and really appreciate the thought that went into it. Here are my thoughts.

Regarding **Goal 2** and "assess" diversity. The committee struggled with this goal. On the one hand, we have members of the community on the EEEOC who feel very strongly that MPC is not doing enough to promote diversity among its employees. On the other hand, we have the law and what we are allowed to do. Somewhere in between the minimum required by law and the ideal expected of the community was what we were shooting for here. As far as the rubric to be used, I don't think that level of detail is appropriate to an objective or a goal. If approved, this would be a task for HR and EEEOC to work out. Although there may not be a state approved methodology, there may be more, especially more in a data driven way, that we can do. Assess in this sense is meant to analyze—it doesn't imply that we would be comparing our numbers to some sort of target. We understand that we can't have a target, per se, and that one is not provided. But we can look at the diversity of our hiring pools and then compare them across campus to see if some searches are more successful at identifying a diverse pool, and why. We can look at the different stages of the search to see if diversity is filtered out at one place in the process. It could be that we would find that we are doing everything we can, but right now we can only say that in an anecdotal way, not with the support of data.

On **Goal 3**: Thanks for identifying the typo!

On **Goal 4:** this is complex. Although state code requires one thing, we do have a culture at MPC. Our culture has been one of shared decision making when it comes to assigning classes and the schedule. Beyond our culture, there is the requirement that planning and resource allocation decisions be driven by institutional goals and objectives. Planning the schedule is a critical component because it is the single largest allocation of resources. Surely, we cannot plan the schedule without consideration of the Mission and Goals. So, the question is how do we institutionally make these decisions in a way that

ensures that there has been a proper consideration of Mission and Goals? While the final decision is the administration's, the shared governance process allows for the experts who know our classes and instructors best, division chairs, to give feedback, and to provide some oversight with respect to Mission and Goals compliance.

Goal 6: What can be "beyond institutional goals" in the operation of the college? Everything should be influenced by them and the Mission. But, while I question the categorical denial that this is appropriate as a goal and objective, I do acknowledge that in this economic environment the question of whether it is feasible or not is valid. Originally the committee eliminated this goal but put it back in after feedback from CC. Many segments of our work force are still underpaid compared to comparable colleges, in communities of comparable cost. Taking this off (it currently is a goal/objective) sends a signal that we no longer acknowledge this as a problem in attracting and retaining good staff and faculty.

If the college President says this is unrealistic at this time, I can live with eliminating it. But I think it would be helpful if someone from administration spoke to the unions representatives about this. And I don't accept the idea that it is completely inconsistent with Mission planning, as how else does a college set priorities? Without a goal and objective like this in the future, the likelihood is that salary will continue to decline compared to comparable colleges and we will have trouble attracting and retaining high quality faculty and staff. Including it sends a message that the college community and the Board acknowledge the need to make it a priority. Right now, I agree that maintaining programs and services should be our priority.

Goal 7: The committee originally did not include this Goal for the reason you mention. We put it back in when many on CC expressed concern that without it there would be the possibility that our maintenance would deteriorate and these beautiful facilities would decay and look bad again, as they once did. Honestly, I can see the validity of both points of view here.

Goal 8: You make good points. We should move the funding objective for technology, 8.1, to last, 8.4. And I like your language: "conduct a broad based review of the long-term funding plan to meet technology needs."

Thanks,

Alan