

Proposed Academic Affairs Re-Organization

Introduction

The proposed reorganization of Academic Affairs shown on the attached pages takes the three current dean positions and distributes a set of responsibilities across them, creating three positions, each with a distinct focus. One – the Dean of Instruction for Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs – is devoted to career technical education, connections with the economic drivers in the district, and the oversight of programs at sites other than the Monterey campus, including distance education. A second – the Dean of Instructional Planning – manages grants and attends to administrative processes that support the educational enterprise (e.g. curriculum and facilities planning and utilization). The third – the Dean of Instruction, Liberal Arts – oversees the divisions in the liberal arts and the learning and technology center and puts an administrative face on initiatives to enhance student and faculty success.

The major goals of the proposed reorganization are threefold:

- to rationalize the structure of Academic Affairs so that the support to faculty members, programs and divisions is strengthened.
- to encourage the development of new synergies that will lead to programs to better serve the needs of our students.
- to increase the relative visibility of and attention to career technical education so as to better serve the educational needs of the local business and industry.

There is no ‘perfect’ organization for an institution with as many different demands on it as MPC. The best such organization would group related areas and, by assigning them an organizational location, provide an indication of the institution’s priorities. The proposed reorganization accomplishes both of these objectives. It extracts programs in two areas – those having to do with administrative processes and those pertaining to career and technical education – that are now scattered across various units and collects each of them under a dean. This raises their visibility. Equally important, it allows the ‘remainder,’ the liberal arts programs, to emerge as a coherent unit in its own right.

The academic programs in both CTE and the liberal arts would benefit from the reorganization, because each would have a dean to advocate for them and for their place in the college. The benefit to CTE in particular should be noted here. There is a sense in some quarters that CTE faculty feel disenfranchised. The reorganization sends a clear message to campus constituencies and the business community that MPC is serious about supporting its mission to provide workforce and economic development training to strengthen the local and state economies. The liberal arts faculty do not feel like step children, but that does not mean they do not have shared needs that require

sustained attention. One example is the development of robust transfer programs. Yet another example is the support and implementation of more robust initiatives in support of student success, retention and persistence.

The college as a whole would benefit from the attention to administrative processes that the reorganization plan affords. Anyone who has tried to create a course, find a room to schedule a class, or track their MPC budget will know that the administrative processes that support our fundamental educational mission are cumbersome at best. This situation is, in part, a consequence of the fact that no one has been assigned the responsibility of making these processes work. The addition of a third dean to Academic Affairs makes it possible for this responsibility to have a home.

Questions and Answers

What is/are the intended outcome (s) of making these changes?

The goals of the proposed reorganization include the following:

- Strengthen the support provided to faculty with administrative processes including curriculum and program development.
- Develop a robust systems approach that enhances administrative processes to facilitate building the College's capacity. Such processes include schedule planning, space utilization, budget tracking, FTES projections and analysis, etc.
- Provide an opportunity for faculty in various like-disciplines to share best practices that are already in place in support of student achievement, and promote collaboration.
- Explore grant writing possibilities to support existing programs and develop new ones.
- Enhance communication and collaboration among CTE faculty.
- Facilitate curriculum and program development, particularly in CTE, which will ensure that MPC provides students with the training they need to become competitive in the job market, earn decent wages, and enable them to become productive citizens.
- Improve MPC's ability to respond to the educational needs of local business and industry.

What if the reorganization upsets some faculty members? We don't want faculty to be upset when the accreditation team is visiting. Any change that happens will create a lot of dialogue, often negative at first, and might negate all the really good things that are happening on campus.

Dialogue is actually a theme that the accrediting commission expects to take place on college campuses. Having dialogue is a sign of communication and of a continuous improvement model. The question is whether the dialogue is channeled in a constructive manner, one that recognizes the benefits reaped by adopting a structure that promotes communication, collaboration, respect, and the common good. A constructive dialogue also ensures a collegial approach to problem solving.

Can't we accomplish much of what the reorganization is intended to accomplish with ad hoc committees? If we can't, why don't we take small steps first, like encouraging more dialogue and projects between existing divisions? Once better relationships are built, opportunities for reorganization may be more readily accepted.

Yes, we need to build better relationships. The current structure inhibits relationships in both the liberal arts programs and CTE programs. Small steps might be sufficient in the liberal arts; they aren't sufficient to what needs to be accomplished in CTE.

MPC is committed to strengthening the economic development and CTE areas as witnessed by the reallocation of resources toward hiring of a dean whose primary focus is economic development and restructuring the COOP instructor/coordinator position from part-time to full-time. This institutional commitment to economic development and CTE sends a clear message to campus constituencies and the business community that MPC is serious about supporting its mission to provide workforce and economic development training to strengthen the local and state economies. The dean of economic development has made tremendous strides, in a short time, to connect with the business community and deliver the message that MPC is serious about meeting the educational needs of business and industry. Accomplishing this goal will require MPC to conduct needs assessments, develop curriculum and programs in a variety of delivery formats in response to input from the community, leverage existing programs and resources, form partnerships, secure selected strategic grants, and deliver a quality product. Having a direct connection between CTE faculty and programs, as well as a reporting line to the dean of economic development is critical. Having CTE programs report to a dean other than the dean of economic development adds a layer of bureaucracy and an obstacle to meeting the needs of business and industry in a timely manner. Ad hoc committees lack the reporting responsibilities and accountability that comes with a more formal reporting alignment. On the other hand, an organization that connects all CTE programs under one unit provides a seamless flow of information.

Won't the proposed structure ensure that equipment intensive programs are not appropriately funded? If all the programs in one division are equipment intensive and only the top priorities in the action plans from each division are funded, many needs in that division won't be met. The current structure balances programs that require more spending such as physical science (equipment intensive) and those that require less such as math (white board markers).

Action plans are approved based on the demonstrated needs of each program, not the division. For example, if an action item for Physical Science is approved for new telescopes for astronomy, the approved funds are spent on new telescopes for astronomy, not for telescopes for astronomy and chalk for math. If math has a

demonstrated need for additional funding to purchase chalk and the action item is approved, the funds go toward purchasing additional chalk for math, and not to purchase rocks for geology or telescopes for astronomy. Program review provides discipline faculty an opportunity to 1) engage in programmatic self assessment since the previous evaluation, and 2) identify programmatic needs and direction. Title 5 and the Accreditation Standards recognize the primacy of courses and programs. Thus, program review applies to curriculum and programs, not divisions—divisions are collections of programs that ideally have commonalities. In the current structure, there are some divisions that are made up of programs that have little if anything in common. Regardless of the administrative organization, the resource allocation process needs to recognize and take into account the difference in equipment needs between programs. CTE programs, by their very nature, require the constant upgrading of equipment in order for them to remain viable and current with technology so that students can be trained on equipment comparable to that which is used in industry. Only then can students receive proper training and be competitive in the marketplace.

Doesn't the reorganization mean that lots of faculty members are going to have to move?

The intent is to leave faculty members in their current locations. This will enable CTE programs and students to continue to have proximity and exposure to “academic” programs, thus, providing for programmatic linkages to both “academic” and CTE programs.

But if faculty members don't move, doesn't that create a reporting nightmare? Reporting to a division in one location when the physical location of a program is in another location can be challenging.

Even if we don't undertake a reorganization, we won't be able to ensure that all divisions are housed in single buildings or building clusters. Mathematics, for example, is likely to be partially housed in the current business building when fiscal services moves to its new location. More generally, the MPC Education Center at Marina has expanded the geographic reach of most division chairs.

Is the distribution of responsibilities across the three deans fair? In particular, aren't we expecting far too much of the Dean of Instruction for Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs?

The various tasks associated with implementing a streamlined, seamless economic development program that is responsive to the needs of business and industry are made more complex by operating in an organization that adds a superfluous layer of bureaucracy. Having direct responsibility for programs that can deliver courses and

programs that business and industry identify as desirable facilitates information sharing, communication, and administrative processes and reduces response time. Maintaining the current mélange of CTE and “academic” programs would require extra effort to bring CTE faculty together for dialogue, planning and development on a regular basis.

Furthermore, we believe that the reorganization need not be done in one fell swoop. It can be phased in over the next year and a half in a smooth transition. The time line allows the Dean of Instruction for Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs time to gradually build the various parts of her area of responsibility. This phase-in approach will also enable to the college to apply for and receive “full center” status for the MPC Education Center at Marina, which will generate additional state funding. This additional funding, will, in turn, enable the college to hire administrative support for the Dean of Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs. The projected growth of all programs under the sphere of influence of the Dean of Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs (i.e., the MPC Education Center, Distance Learning, etc.) is planned to be incremental. The rationale behind this approach is to enable the administrative support to keep pace with the growth.

CTE has only recently had some level of acceptance as a credible aspect of the function of community colleges. When data came out a few years ago that a very low percentage of our students actually transferred, it became apparent that our students are doing something else. One of those things is taking CTE courses. Won't creating a division of CTE programs wipe out all the progress towards acceptance?

In fact, one goal of the reorganization is to make CTE more visible.

This goal is entirely consistent with the history of CTE education. The link between community colleges and workforce preparation has been around since the 1930's. The website of the American Association of Community Colleges states, “No other segment of higher education is more responsive to its community and workforce needs than the community college.” (<http://www.aacc.nche.edu>) It goes on to state, “During the Depression of the 1930's, community colleges began offering job-training programs as a way of easing widespread unemployment. After World War II, the conversion of military industries to consumer goods created new, skilled jobs.” The number of individuals enrolling in workforce training courses at community colleges is staggering. “In the 1996-97 academic year, 9.3 million people took credit courses at community colleges. Another 5 million took noncredit classes, the majority of which were workforce training courses.” (<http://www.aacc.nche.edu>) More recently, Governor Schwarzenegger has recognized the critical role that community colleges play in workforce preparation

and has funded a number of initiatives to strengthen this aspect of community colleges in California.

The goal is consistent as well with the student reality. Transfer numbers and rates from community college to four-year institutions do not represent a disconnect between “academic” and CTE programs. In some instances, students opt for a career certificate or an AA degree because they have to work in order to support themselves and/or their families. [Studies show that at least 50% to 60% of students work while attending college.] Instead, they are a reflection of the circumstances surrounding a student’s decision to transfer or become a stop-out statistic. [Stop-outs, in student success, retention and persistence literature are those students who discontinue their education temporarily to later return for completion or retraining.] Stop-outs often return to community college to complete their transfer requirements.

Most CTE faculty members have afternoon labs and, as a result, are unable to participate fully in campus governance. Also many CTE faculty members are part time and, among those that are full-time, they also run their programs. Won’t putting CTE into a separate division exacerbate these issues?

If CTE faculty members are not full partners in the governance process, it is not in the best interest of the programs or the institution. The 2002 Accreditation Standards emphasize that the quality of CTE programs is comparable to general education:

Standard II.A.2.b

“The institution relies on faculty expertise and the assistance of advisory committees when appropriate to identify competency levels and measurable student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, programs including general and vocational education, and degrees. The institution regularly assesses student progress towards achieving those outcomes.”

Standard II.A.3

“The institution requires of all academic and vocational degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy that is clearly stated in its catalogue...”

Standard II.A.5

“Students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment and

other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certification.”

It would also violate the accreditation theme on dialogue, which requires that “dialogue should purposely guide institutional change. **All members** [emphasis added] of the college community should participate in this reflection and exchange about student achievement, student learning, and the effectiveness of its processes, policies, **and organization.**” [emphasis added] (p. 8, *Guide to Evaluating Institutions*, ACCJC, 2008)

The bottom line is that we, as an institution, need to ensure that all faculty members have the opportunity to be involved in campus governance. If the reorganization plan points to a problem in this regard, we need to address it.

The college claims to want to make decisions based on data. But what data support this reorganization concept?

The very difficulty of collecting data is part of the rationale for the reorganization. As evidenced by justifications for faculty positions, data are very difficult to obtain due to the complex nature of our existing system (e.g., cross-listed courses, concurrent enrollment, etc.). This complexity is further exacerbated by the decentralized alignment of our CTE programs, which requires programmatic data to be extrapolated manually. Information and data on CTE programs would be much more easily collected, analyzed and distributed if they operate under one unit.

Reorganization Time Line

The first set of organizational charts shows the current responsibilities of each of the three Deans in Academic Affairs and the second set shows their responsibilities under the proposed reorganization.

The change from the first to the second occurs in three phases spread over a year and a half.

Phase 1 – February 1, 2009

Rename Dean of Instruction, Occupational and Economic Development to Dean of Instructional Planning

UNIT	FROM	TO	
		Division	Dean
Older Adult Program	Dean of Instruction, Liberal Arts	None	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs
COOP	Life Sciences Division	Business and Technology Division	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs
Business and Technology Division	Dean of Instructional Planning	Business and Technology Division	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs
Physical Education Division	Dean of Instructional Planning	Physical Education Division	Dean of Instruction, Arts and Sciences
Life Sciences Division	Dean of Instructional Planning	Life Sciences Division	Dean of Instruction, Arts and Sciences

This phase (1) consolidates liberal arts, (2) allows the Dean of Instructional Planning to begin to focus exclusively on administrative functions, and (3) begins to build career technical education under the Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs.

Phase 2 – July 1, 2009

UNIT	FROM	TO	
		Division	Dean
Maurine Church Coburn School of Nursing	Dean of Instructional Planning	None	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs

This phase continues the concentration of career technical education programs and completes the consolidation of administrative support

Phase 3 – July 1, 2010

Rename Business and Technology Division: Division of Business, Career and Technical Education

UNIT	FROM	TO	
		Division	Dean
Administration of Justice	Life Sciences Division	Division of Business, Career and Technical Education	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs
Aviation	Life Sciences Division	Division of Business, Career and Technical Education	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs
Dental Assisting	Life Sciences	Division of Business, Career and Technical Education	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs
Family and Consumer Science	Life Sciences Division	Division of Business, Career and Technical Education	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs
Fashion	Life Sciences Division	Division of Business, Career and Technical Education	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs
Hospitality	Life Sciences Division	Division of Business, Career and Technical Education	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs

Human Services	Life Sciences Division	Division of Business, Career and Technical Education	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs
Interior Design	Life Sciences Division	Division of Business, Career and Technical Education	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs
Massage Therapy	Physical Education Division	Division of Business, Career and Technical Education	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs
Medical Assisting	Life Sciences Division	Division of Business, Career and Technical Education	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs
Ornamental Horticulture	Life Sciences Division	Division of Business, Career and Technical Education	Dean of Instruction, Economic Development and Off-Campus Programs

This phase completes the consolidation of career technical education.

Phase 3 is by far the most complex piece of the proposed reorganization. Two pending questions are 1) the alignment of the programs remaining in the Life Sciences Division, and their relation to Physical Sciences; and 2) the configuration of the proposed Division of Business, Career and Technical Education. Implementing this piece of the reorganization in July 2010 gives all concerned the time to consider all options in addressing these questions. Items associated with these questions include administrative support and division chair assignments based on equitable division chair units.