

College Council Minutes

Tuesday, March 17, 2009

2:30 p.m.

Karas Room

College Council Members: Doug Garrison, Carsbia Anderson, John Gonzalez, Michael Gilmartin, Joe Bissell, Julie Bailey, Gary Bolen, Steve Morgan, Mark Clements, Bill Jones, Brenda Lee Kalina, Stephanie Perkins, Alfred Hochstaedter, A.J. Farrar, Bernie Abbott, Lyndon Schutzler, Susan Villa, Suzanne Ammons, ASMPAC Pres. Mike Dickey, ASMPAC Chief Justice William Manel

Absent: Bill Jones, John Gonzalez, Stephanie Perkins, Susan Villa, Mark Clements, Steve Morgan, Mike Dickey, William Manel
Guests: Susan Steele, Rosaleen Ryan

Campus Community Comments:

1) Minutes – March 3, 2009:

2) Accreditation Update/Reports:

a) Standard (report from Chairs/co-chairs): at

<http://www.mpcfakulty.net/accreditation/home.htm>

i) Standard I- Fred & Rosaleen

a) Standard IB -Mission: Rosaleen reported that she had also given this update to Academic Senate. She provided the following key points:

- We need to address whether we have a mission that describes who our students are, as well as our commitment to student learning.
- We need to describe how our learning programs and services are aligned with our mission.
- We need to address whether we review and revise (if necessary) the mission statement on a regular basis.
- We need to discuss whether the mission statement is central to planning and decision-making and if it is approved by the Board, how widely is it or should it be published.

Rosaleen indicated that we are doing well in meeting the standards in these areas. There are two areas that while they are not problematic, they do warrant some discussion.

- We have not formally assessed the process by which we reviewed and revised the mission statement.
- Our mission statement is *implicitly* referenced during planning and decision-making, but it is not always *explicitly* stated.

Additional comments shared from members suggest that anecdotal evidence exists to attest to the effectiveness of our current mission statement when compared to previous statements.

b) Standard IB: Improving Institutional Effectiveness: (see link above): Fred reported that the fall Flex will include an accreditation oriented program. Input from the campus is being sought to help define whether the flex sessions should be organized by themes, rubric, or by standards. Currently, the final report is scheduled to come to College Council in fall 2009.

Fred recapped the Standard IB Summary to include the following key points:

- Processes are in place for Planning and Resource Allocation and Program Review, and the district follows them, although with respect to program reviews, they are not always followed on a timely manner with follow through in bringing them to College Council. The Library maintains program review documents on file.
- MPC is entering a proficiency stage with respect to using student learning outcomes to assess student learning and using the results to make improvements.
- MPC shared governance committees are structured to facilitate planning and resource allocation decisions. Evidence exists that the planning process is broad-based and offers input opportunities from appropriate areas. College Council is the principle

shared governance committee that recommends resource allocation and policy decisions to the Superintendent/President for presentation to the Board.

- College Council also receives program reviews from various instructional divisions and areas and component goals from the three vice presidents as endorsed by their respective advisory groups (ASAG, SSAG and AAAG).
- Documented assessments results - While MPC meets this standard, program review results need to be more consistently and regularly reported to a wider college audience through College Council. With regard to “assessment”, MPC does not report any SLO assessment to a wide audience.

3) Information Items (see available attachments):

Classified Position Requests:

- a) **Administrative Assistant III (replacement):** The position was presented and reviewed along with the attachment and is becoming vacant due to a retirement.

Faculty Position Requests:

- a) *None.*

Other:

4) Action Items (see available attachments):

a) **Recommendations from Facilities Committee (2nd Readings):**

i. **Use of Bond funds to renovate the BC building and to revise the FPP for the Math-Science project to only include the Physical and Life Science buildings.**

- Joe recapped the status of this project explaining that while the Facilities Committee did recommend we separate the BC building from the entire project in order to get started on it, they will need to re-evaluate it.
- Additional issues have come up for which the project will now be required to go through DSA and thus the lead time needed before we can begin construction will essentially be increased by at least 6 months.
- The BC project will be using the District’s 50% portion of the entire project, which is to be funded 50/50 using district/state funds.
- Facilities Committee will meet to re-evaluate the timeline and will provide an update to College Council.

“College Council recommends in concept, (in accordance with the Facilities Committee’s recommendation) that we proceed with the renovation of the BC Building project, separating the Physical and Life Science buildings from the FPP for the Match Science project.”

Lyndon motioned for approval, Gary Bolen seconded and the recommendation was approved.

ii. **Construction of a new Greenhouse and related structures to be located to the south of Life Sciences and renovate the J Lot.** This is anticipated to provide 18 more spaces to the J Lot. The tree removal is estimated to be between 3 and 6 trees, and this will be determined when the final plans are refined.

Michael motioned for approval of the new Greenhouse, related structure, and the Lot J renovation at Life Science, Julie seconded and the recommendation was approved.

- b) **Budget Committee recommendation (2nd reading):** *“The Budget Committee recommends the budget assumptions outlined in the 2009-10 Unrestricted General Fund Budget Projections, February 26 2009 be forwarded to College Council for use in preparing the District’s 2009-10 Preliminary Budget.”*

Joe reported that since the last College Council meeting, the Legislative Analyst’s Office completed its review of the Budget on March 13, and we are now dealing with the following issues as part of our budget building challenge:

- An additional \$8 billion revenue shortfall is projected.
- \$6 billion of the new state budget will rely on the outcome of the May 19 special election, and the passage or failure of tax increases on the ballot.
- The May revise will be available sometime after the May 19 election.
- FTES growth will be a big factor for the district’s financial health.
- \$8.5 billion of the stimulus package used by the state will be tied to short term vocational training.
- UC/CSU system will receive approximately \$250 million which is essentially replenishing funds already cut.
- Students re-directed from the UC/CSU system are still anticipated.

Joe invited College Council to play a role in addressing how the 2009-10 budget will be balanced by suggesting that the Vice Presidents work to bring back recommendations to College Council. Along with those recommendations, it was suggested that details also be provided as to what options were considered and how the decisions were arrived at.

College Council accepted the 2009-10 UGF Budget Projections of February 26 2009 which includes the \$612,643 to be balanced. College Council also recommends that the Presidents/Vice Presidents work together and return to College Council with their recommendations to balance the budget”. Michael motioned, Julie seconded and the motion carried.

- c) **BSI Expenditure package (Susan Steele):**

- Susan Steele indicated that the BSI committee met just last week, approving the three spending proposals included within the package which carries a deadline that the funds be spent by March 30.
- Due to the challenge with timing issues, the group agreed it was in the best interests of all involved to review and agree to take action on this expenditure recommendation within a single reading, and offered the following recommendation:

Joe motioned for College Council to accept the BSI Expenditure package in a single reading. Michael seconded and the group agreed by a 2/3 vote to take action in this single reading.

College Council recommended the BSI Expenditure Package be accepted and the \$7,400 in proposed expenditures be moved forward. Joe Bissell motioned for approval and Gary Bolen seconded and the motion carried.

5) **Other:**

a) **Committee Reports-**

b) **Next meeting (March 31)**---a quorum call will be made to meet for the primary purpose of receiving Area Component Goals