

College Council Minutes

May 26 2015

2:00 pm

Rm 216, LTC

College Council Members: Luz Aguirre, Diane Boynton, DJ Singh, Elizabeth Dilkes Mullins, Fred Hochstaedter, Wendy Bates, Scott Gunter, Francisco Tostado, Kevin Haskin (for Loran Walsh), Lyndon Schutzler (non-voting), Paola Gilbert, Larry Walker, Michael Gilmartin, Stephanie Perkins, Suzanne Ammons, Walter Tribley, ASMPC Rep.

Absent: Wendy Bates, Stephanie Perkins, ASMPC Rep.

Guests: Joe Bissell, Steve Bruemmer, Nicole Dunne, Robert Boardman, Rosaleen Ryan, Laura Franklin

1. Minutes:

- a. **May 12, 2015:** The minutes were approved. Scott motioned to approve the minutes and Fred seconded; the minutes were approved with none opposed and one abstention due to absence (Kevin Haskins).
- b. **May 19, 2015:** The minutes were approved. DJ motioned to approve the minutes and Elizabeth seconded; the minutes were approved with none opposed and three abstentions due to absence (Kevin Haskins, Paolo Gilbert and Mike Gilmartin).

2. Board Policies:

3. Action Items:

4. Information Items:

a. Classified Positions-Student Services (Replacement) Larry Walker:

- i. **Admissions and Records-Records Evaluator:** Larry reviewed the position as presented and as a straight replacement.
- ii. **TRiO Instructional Specialist:** Larry reviewed the position as presented and as a straight replacement.

Larry reviewed the positions below which are being brought back since Categorical programs were cut in 2009. These positions will be funded through grant funds now restored and will be revised from 12 to 18 hours (ARC Admin. Asst.) and from 18 to 25 hours and 34 to 42 weeks(ARC Instr. Specialist.). Larry invited the group to consider taking action today or in the interest of following process, to take action at the next meeting. The group reviewed and opted to take action at a second reading.

iii. ARC Administrative Assistant.:

iv. ARC Instructional Specialist

- b. **Google Campus-Contingency Fund Update (Technology Committee):** Mike recapped the Technology Committee's activities relevant to Google Campus Project Funding approved by College Council, and the Governing Board (see Tech Plan attachments):

- i. **May 15, 2013** -Technology Committee brought to College Council for first reading, **Technology Expenditures for 2013-14 -\$300K Contingency Fund.**
- ii. **May 28, 2013** – College Council took action and approved the Technology Expenditures 2013-14.

- iii. **June 5 2013** – Governing Board approved the 2013-16 Technology Plan; the plan included initiative 2.a.2 for implement hosted email, storage and collaboration solution and a survey supporting Google as the email preference of students.

Below is a recap of what was budgeted and actually spent:

- Website Improvements - \$100K (spent \$119K)
- Campus computer, Smart classroom and AV - \$80K (spent \$66K)
- Technology Infrastructure - \$80K (spent \$77K)
- Accessibility/ Communication / Training – Information gathered by Tech Committee indicates a need for an improved student email system -\$40K (\$37 remaining).

The proposal for Google Campus Implementation is for \$56,880. Funding sources:

- IT Professional Services/ Training - \$19,880
- Contingency Fund (remaining) - \$37,000

Members of the Technology Committee added supporting comments and anticipated outcomes for the Google Campus Project including the following:

- Robust email system with unlimited storage (Current limits are 1 GB)
- Unlimited (FRPA & HIPAA compliant) storage (Current limit is 1GB)
- Reduction in IT support overhead as e-mail system is hosted by Google, freeing IT to support other critical areas
- Focused professional training during implementation and ongoing support model developed by IT
- Ability to access stored documents anywhere
- Implementation costs incurred but ongoing costs are \$1000 per year.
- Addresses Multiple Technology Plan Initiatives such as hosted e-mail, Single Sign on and Active Directory redesign.
- E mails will still carry the "...@mpc.edu", but will be hosted by G mail and should alleviate the amount of phishing e-mails.
- The Microsoft Campus agreement will continue to support Microsoft dependent applications.
- Authentication will be easy, especially for students.
- Currently working on integrating documents for ease with online use (syllabus), eliminating the need for uploading and downloading.
- Anticipated implementation start is for August 2016 and completion in January 2016.

- c. **2015- 16 Tentative Budget - Update on May Revise (Joe Bissell):** Dr. Tribley reported that plans are to bring the Tentative Budget to College Council (June 9th) as information, then to College Council (June 23) for action before Board approval of June 24. Calendar adjustments included reschedule of the BAC meeting from May 21st to May 28th. Joe shared the **5 Year Comparison – UGF and SIF** handout in response to recent questions on transfers. There are three unrestricted funds (1) Unrestricted General Fund (UGF), (2) Capital Outlay Fund (COF) and (3) Self Insurance Fund (SIF). The SIF is supported some restricted funds (categoricals), however the UGF is the largest contributor to SIF. Both Restricted, designated and undesignated funds have been placed in Capital Outlay. Funds received from the state for Scheduled

Maintenance is one example of Restricted Funds in the Capital Outlay and Prop. 39 Funds, whereas, rental income from facilities is held as designated (not restricted) funds intended for facilities improvements. Past practice has been to place year end UGF into Capital Outlay to support Technology Refreshment. Joe reviewed the **transfers in** and **transfers out** of years from 2009-10 forward as itemized on back of the spreadsheet.

Joe reminded all of the accounting formula which states: ***Assets – Liabilities = Fund Balance***. The fund balance is not equal to cash. Over the last several years, the state has not always paid the District all the cash it is owed so liabilities (receivables) were set up to record the amount owed from the state. While assets may be cash, receivables, and inventories, the College needs cash to operate and pay bills thus requiring the transfer of cash (from the Self Insurance Fund, for example) to the General Fund. In 2013-14, following discussion over the SIF, the decision was to separate out the OPEB (\$3.9M) and Workers Comp (\$770K), leaving approximately \$2.8M in the SIF; approximately \$400K is restricted and cannot be moved. Joe explained how GASB and the CCCCCO's rules differ. The 311 and the audited financial statements also differ in content/requirement. GASB is moving public agencies into a full accrual accounting system, requiring that we record all assets and depreciation of assets (facilities) and that all liabilities (including OPEB) be recognized and recorded when incurred. The district began funding the OPEB liability years ago (since 2003-04) and currently has approximately \$3.9M funded for this approximate \$11M total OPEB liability; the audited financial statements will recognize this liability over a period of time. The 311 reports required by the CCCCCO do not require recording of OPEB liabilities and most public entities are not fully funded for OPEB liabilities. The CCCCCO website maintains a self-check list of questions relative to enrollment decline, financial resources, deficit spending and how covered, as well as OPEB obligations. The ACCJC Accreditation team will also be looking at these criteria.

Discussion followed regarding how and where year end funds should be recorded; capital outlay could perhaps have restricted and unrestricted accounts and OPEB funds could be kept in an irrevocable trust, earning interest. The funding obligation applies to employees of past, current and future service. The SIF, because of OPEB had a large balance not intended to be spent.

The District has experienced three years of deficit and spent \$4.5M in one time funds in an attempt to solve ongoing problems while many one time needs go unfulfilled.

Governor's May Revise: Joe reported good news with the following highlights indicating more information will be available at the BAC of May 28th:

- \$626M is available to community colleges as one time funds with anticipation of some one time funds in future years as a means to help offset the sunset of Prop 30 funding. MPC's portion will be formula driven based on FTES, approximately \$3.5M-details forthcoming. Caution is critical in its use.
- COLA of \$2.5M (1.02%) in ongoing funds, equal to \$339K for MPC.
- Restoration to fund enrollment declines of last 3 years would give MPC \$1.2M if it grew.
- Growth of 3% systemwide; MPC would get \$330K if it grew 1%.

Joe indicated that timing is critical for MPC to direct the one time resources in the most effective means, including increasing apportionment revenue in order to meet expenses. In the discussion that followed, suggestions included that a closer look be given to salaries (too low?) health benefits (too rich?), class sizes (too low), which are referenced in one or both of the Long Term Financial Plan and the Fiscal Stability reports generated several years ago. Other efficiencies might be found in the formation of an Enrollment Management Team.

- d. Theatre Technical Director and Operations Manager (Michael Gilmartin):** This key manager position will become vacant in July with the retirement of Dan Beck. The job description has been updated to reflect changes in the production activities and varied community functions. Michael explained the process of gaining access to this venue for use, establishing set costs for various potential uses.
- e. Education Master Plan (Diane Boynton):** Integrated Planning Process: Diane reminded the group that we need to get back on course with the Integrated Planning Process. College Council met May 19th and identified what might still be missing from the Education Master Plan. The group agreed that a subcommittee consisting of Mike Gilmartin, Larry Walker, Paola Gilbert and Diane Boynton would meet about four times over the summer in order to prepare for the planned campus forums in fall. Diane will compile documents to forward to the group.

5. Meeting Calendar:

- a. Next meetings: June 9 and June 23 (Board meets June 24). BAC meets May 28.**

6. Campus community comments

Items for future meetings:

- **TracDat**-next meeting?
- **Technology Bond**
- **Planning and Resource Allocation Process (more discussion)**
- **Auditing courses: exploration of opportunities/challenges**
- **Policy/process for reorganization**