

## College Council Minutes

Tuesday, April 19, 2011

2:30 p.m., Karas Room

College Council Members: Doug Garrison, Carsbia Anderson, VP Academic Svc (vacant), Michael Gilmartin, Steve Ma, Julie Bailey, Gary Bolen, Steve Morgan, Mark Clements, Nancy Goehring, Brenda Lee Kalina, Stephanie Perkins, Fred Hochstaedter, Adria Gerard, Alan Haffa, Lyndon Schutzler, Loren Walsh (CSEA Rep.) Suzanne Ammons, ASMPC Pres. (vacant), Will Adams, ASMPC

Absent: Julie Bailey, Mark Clements, VP Acad Svc (vacant), ASMPC Pres. (vacant), Will Adams (ASMPC)

Guests: Laura Franklin

### Campus Community Comments:

- Gary reported on the tremendously successful turnout for the Carmel High School-MPC presentation of *Grease* this last weekend. The last showing closed at 368 (capacity), turning away 160 persons.
- Steve Morgan reported on a successful bid for the Humanities project. Six responsive bids were received, with the award going to Otto Construction at approximately \$4.1 Million. The highly competitive bidding climate has allowed for some savings in construction costs. The Life Science project, just out of DSA is anticipated to go out to bid soon as well.
- Fred attended the grand opening of the Math Learning Center in the Business-Math-Computer Science building and encouraged all to take a look at this newly refurbished building.

1) **Minutes – April 5, 2011:** Approved as amended.

2) **Action Items (see available handouts):**

a) **Resolution on “Hiring Faculty in a climate of Economic Uncertainty”** (*additional discussion/2<sup>nd</sup> Reading?*) Alan indicated that following discussion amongst the division chairs, it was determined that the issue has been addressed and that College Council need not take further action. A motion was made to withdraw the “Resolution”, moved and seconded, with all voting in favor to withdraw the Resolution, and one opposed.

b) **Inst. Committee on Distance Ed – Budget Plan (Response to ACCJC recommendation):\***<sup>1</sup> Laura presented the “*Proposed Distance Education Cost Center and 2011-12 proposed budget*”. This proposal is in response to College Council’s request at its December 16<sup>th</sup> meeting as related to the ICDE proposal to address the ACCJC recommendation on Distance Education. She gave a recap with the following key points:

- The proposed budget establishes a framework through which priorities/recommendations can be communicated using the shared governance system.
- Specific resources can be identified and assigned in an organized manner,
- A structure to focus resources on a long-term vision is used instead of relying on short-term, ad-hoc solutions.
- In addition to the growth in FTES generated from distance education in the last 10 years, it is apparent that demands for online learning have increased. In response, we have an obligation to provide an online learning experience which is relevant and effective in supporting student success.
- FTES growth reflects that the percentage of total FTES earned through Distance Ed., grew from 4.2% in 2005-06 to 6.08% by 2009-10.
- In conjunction with the ICDE, the proposed center will work closely with the entire campus community to coordinate on campus and online offerings and services using the absolute minimum resources to support it at the onset due to the current severe budgetary

---

\*<sup>1</sup> CC had its 2<sup>nd</sup> read for the ICDE ‘s proposal to address the ACCJC recommendation at the Dec 16<sup>th</sup> meeting, inclusive of “the caveat that it does not represent a comprehensive plan for MPC...” This agenda item introduces the budget plan component referenced in the 2<sup>nd</sup> reading.

restrictions. As online programs grow, requiring additional services and resources, funding will also need to increase.

Laura also reviewed Funding Categories to include staffing, supplies and equipment, faculty development, and server operations. She indicated that the funding proposal is budget neutral and does not require additional funds. The ICDE is seeking approval of the redistribution of existing funds (see *Proposed Budget—Staffing, page 3*).

Discussion followed with comments and inquiries to include the following:

- The Faculty Coordinator as a full time faculty member (40% load) is currently funded within the division. The \$12,000 figure reflects the cost of adjunct faculty needed to backfill classes. (Load).
  - Would the Faculty Coordinator be responsible for the evaluation of the Instructional Technology Specialist? (Evaluation).
  - Have the job descriptions for the Instructional Technology Specialist and the Administrative Assistant been modified, if so how? (Job Description).
  - What is the reporting chain of command for the support positions? (Chain of Command).
- College Council will return May 3 for a second reading.

**3) Board Policy Revisions:** <http://mympc.mpc.edu/Committees/PACC/default.aspx>.

**a) BP 2130-Purchasing (2nd reading):**

*College Council recommends the approval of the BP 2130 Purchasing, and that it be forwarded to the Board for approval.*

**b) BP 2132-Bids and Contracts-(2nd reading):**

*College Council recommends the approval of the BP 2132 Bids and Contracts, and that it be forwarded to the Board for approval.*

**c) BP 2206-Non-motorized vehicles (2nd reading):** Comments shared included that this BP was inspired by the interest to encourage alternate forms of transportation to campus, to relieve travel and parking congestion. A suggestion was made that parabolic mirrors be installed at blind corners and that the Administrative Procedures which outlines the “do’s” and “don’t’s” be posted in the online Student Handbook.

*College Council recommends the approval of the BP 2206, Non-motorized vehicles, and that it be forwarded to the Board for approval.*

The motion was made, moved, seconded, and the group voted with 11 in favor, 1 opposed and 1 abstention. The motion carried.

**4) Information Items (see available handouts):**

**a) College Council membership terms:** A membership listing was shared reflecting term starts, and likely renewals based on information from the last few years of College Council. The CSEA, CTA, Academic Senate and Administrative areas will each evaluate the terms and provide new members where applicable for fall 2011.

**b) Shared Governance and Institutional Planning and Budgeting:** This item is brought forward as a result of the perception that the Shared Governance process is involved in all matters of major relevance to the District, even as they pertain to collective bargaining issues.

The question arose as to why College Council wasn't included at the discussion level (absent details of the actual positions) with regard to the issuance of the *reductions in force (pink slips)*. Several factors were cited in support of the course taken:

- Members of the negotiating team cannot bring aspects of the decision to impose layoffs to College Council and therefore cannot bring negotiation issues to areas outside of the negotiation function itself.
- Ed. Code defines the layoff decision as that of the administration, imposing deadlines for the dissemination of notifications of possible layoffs.
- Should we consider College Council's role to be not that of a decision making entity with regards to specific positions, but rather as an entity which should share in understanding the process that leads to reductions.
- Dr. Garrison presented his "Extraordinary Time, Extraordinary Measures", recognizing that dire condition of the state's budget deficit and potential impact to schools. This year's budget precipitated that immediate action had to be taken.
- Without the benefit of adequate lead time coupled with the multiple unknowns at hand, it is extremely difficult to prepare a formalized budget reduction process which can adequately address such circumstances. Our ability to close the deficit will undoubtedly have some material affect.

c) **Academic Senate for CA Community Colleges Accreditation Institute (Fred Hochstaedter):** [http://prezi.com/zjxqld\\_o3h/accreditationinstitutespring11/](http://prezi.com/zjxqld_o3h/accreditationinstitutespring11/) Fred reported on the conference sponsored by the ASCCCAI, indicating that the common theme reinforced the recommendation from the ACCJC regarding Student Learning Outcomes. He gave a recap of the presentation he shared at the Institute consisting of MPC's SLO—Program Reflections—Program Review—Planning and Resource Allocation Process which was very well received. MPC's emphasis on dialogue rather than quantitative data collection was especially appreciated.

Fred updated the SLO efforts at MPC which he considers as the last steps in creating an SLO process at MPC. They consisted of three recommendations from the Academic Senate as approved at the March 3, 2011 Academic Senate meeting:

- *"Quality"* of Program Reflections: The Academic Senate offers no definitions of quality, other than the focus of the dialog should clearly reflect student learning issues. If the administration encounters "concerns" with what is recorded on the program reflection forms, then they should confer with the Academic Senate or other faculty-led group on what to do.
- *"Enforcement"* of SLO-related issues: This should be entirely the Administration's responsibility. The Academic Senate encourages the Administration to ensure that all programs participate in a Program Reflections dialog by deeming the Program Review Annual Reports incomplete without them.
- *"Institutional SLOs"*: The Academic Senate recommends that MPC equate General Education Outcomes (GEOs) with Institutional Outcomes.

Fred reported that the Academic Senate would make the following recommendation to MPCTA with regard to SLOs in Faculty Evaluation:

*The Academic Senate recommends to the faculty union that when it comes time to negotiate or discuss faculty evaluation, that there be a clause or question about participating in program review. Since SLOs "live" in program review, and since program review means*

*evaluating the effectiveness of our programs and then using the results for improvement, then participating in program review means that we are participating in this SLO process. In this way, we incorporate SLOs into our evaluations without specifically using the “SLO” word and implying any student success metrics.*

Key points of today’s conversation included the following with regard to SLOs:

- Program Review Annual Reports will be considered incomplete without SLOs.
- The recommendation from the ACCJC was that we develop a plan. We have 17 months to obtain efficiency and develop SLOs. Speculation exists as to whether the ACCJC will expect colleges to specifically assess course, program and Institutional SLOs or rather a portion of these.
- In the last 2 years, programs have been using a new version/format to include Program Reflections, however not all programs have SLOs yet. It is difficult for some divisions, especially those with many part time instructors to produce SLOs.
- The Senate findings essentially identify the enforcement component as resting with Administration. This raises the question of how enforcement will be facilitated (incentivized with funding or denial of?).
- As College Council receives all Program Reviews, and oversees the Planning and Resource Allocation Process, this invites the logical possibility that College Council could be interpreted as fulfilling the role of the “SLO” police.

**5) Discussion items for *future*:**

- a) Equipment Refreshment needs campus-wide:

**6) Other:**

- a) **Committee Reports-**  
Next meeting—(May 3, 2011).