

College Council Minutes

October 13, 2015

2:00 pm

Sam Karas Room, LTC

College Council Members: Luz Aguirre, Diane Boynton, DJ Singh, Elizabeth Dilkes Mullins, Fred Hochstaedter, Wendy Bates, Scott Gunter, Francisco Tostado, Kevin Haskin, Monika Bell, Paola Gilbert, Larry Walker, Kiran Kamath, Laura Franklin, Stephanie Perkins, Suzanne Ammons, Walter Tribley, Vice President-Admin. Svc., ASMPC Pres. Maria Lopez, ASMPC Rep.

Absent: Larry Walker, ASMPC Rep.

Visitors: Susan Kitagawa, Rosemary Barrios, Steve Crow, Catherine Webb.

1. Call to order:

- 2. Public comments (3 minutes):** Diane reminded members of the need to abide by the bylaws and Brown Act requirements. To honor this, we will open meetings with Public Comments. Agenda items must be submitted to the co-chairs, Diane Boynton, Stephanie Perkins, Supt./Pres. Dr. Tribley and recorder Suzanne Ammons in order to allow for review and posting of the agenda and supporting documents at the required 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

Diane requested that item 6b be moved to follow approval of the minutes.

Susan reported that two “Request to Fill” documents for two positions in Human Resources will be coming forward to CC as information items at the next meeting.

Dr. Tribley reported on the bomb threat for the BMC building of last week and the debriefing with faculty and staff. While this was a hoax, we are reminded of the need to make safety a priority. Dr. Tribley reported on his recent accreditation visit at Santa Barbara City College and encouraged everyone to participate in serving in this capacity if given the opportunity.

3. Approve minutes:

- a. September 15, 2015: Paola motioned to approve the minutes and Wendy seconded; the minutes were approved with none opposed and no abstentions.
 - b. September 22, 2015: Deferred to future meeting.
- 4. Board policies:** Dr. Tribley introduced this agenda item indicating that policies and procedures represent a source of evidence to show how the District conducts itself in various operational areas. He provided some background information on the California Community College League of California’s template policies as developed and vetted through Liebert Cassidy which we retain a subscription for access to current policies. Today’s policies are primarily in the Business and Financial Affairs. Language changes are minimal from the legally required or advised language from the templates, and should be reviewed regardless. Dr. Tribley recapped the process as (1) VP of area reviews/amends BP with his/her advisory group, then (2) College Council. If it is a “Ten plus One”, then the path is (1) Advisory group, (2) Academic Senate, then (3) College Council. He reminded the group that we can expedite the process of adopting the policies with confidence in knowing that the language has been legally vetted. Diane pointed out that as an example, the below policies will not need to go to Academic Senate as they are strictly operational.

- a. Chapter 3 –General Institution

- i. [3720 Computer and Network Use](#)
- b. Chapter 6 – Business and Financial Affairs:
 - i. [6100 Delegation of Authority](#)
 - ii. [6150 Designation of Authorized Signatures](#)
 - iii. [6200 Budget Preparation](#)
 - iv. [6210 General Fund Reserve](#)
 - v. [6250 Budget Management](#)
 - vi. [6300 Fiscal Management](#)
 - vii. [6320 Investments](#)
 - viii. [6330 Purchasing](#)
 - ix. [6340 Contracts](#)
 - x. [6400 Audits](#)
 - xi. [6450 Wireless/Cellular Telephone Use](#)
 - xii. [6500 Property Management](#)
 - xiii. [6520 Security of District Property](#)
 - xiv. [6540 Insurance](#)
 - xv. [6550 Disposal of Property](#)
 - xvi. [6600 Capital Construction](#)
 - xvii. [6700 Civic Center and Other Facilities Use](#)
 - xviii. [6750 Parking](#)
 - xix. [6800 Safety](#)
 - xx. [6900 Bookstore](#)

Steve reported that some policies have already come through the shared governance process as referenced in the [Chart-Matrix](#). Steve invited and answered questions and offered examples of where minor changes to the language have been made to address how MPC supports the policy. BP6300 Fiscal Management included on the matrix but not above will be included for review at the October 27th CC meeting as it relates to the entire fiscal area. Administrative Procedures for the most part, will come forward later after being vetted through the related advisory groups.

Diane asked how College Council should proceed. The board policies will be action items and will come to College Council for recommendation from the President to the Board. Today will represent a first reading for the above policies. Council members are asked to review the policies and ask for clarification if needed.

Dr. Tribley reminded all that policies are not procedures and verbiage most resembles statements. The policies adoption process is currently not planned to involve a committee for processing as done in the past.

5. Action Items:

- a. [Integrated Planning Model \(Diane\)](#): Diane presented the Integrated Planning Model – (DRAFT to CC 9-15-15) and asked for input and support in making this draft the final version. Following discussion, it was decided that **Reflections Process** as an annual function should be separate from the **Program Review** box (every six years), and should include “Assessment” so it reads “Reflections Process (Assessment)”. Also, under “Influences such as:” the first bullet point should add “assessment” to read “Student learning and assessment”.

Elizabeth motioned to approve the Integrated Planning Model –draft with changes as noted, and Fred seconded; the IPM was approved with all in favor, none opposed and no abstentions.

- 6. **Information Items/Reports:** Dr. Tribley recapped the four potential consultants with a brief description. He reported that Cambridge West, although not discussed at length, is similar to CBT (Collaborative Brain Trust), however, not as broad or deep in the availability of consultant services. He invited Steve to provide a recap of his inquiry with FCMAT and invitation to submit a proposal. Steve provided the following:

- Completion of a FCMAT online survey for services prior to speaking with FCMAT representative. Additional information was requested a few days later. A FCMAT team reviewed the request for scope of services.
- A phone call was scheduled. Steve spoke with Anthony Bridges of FCMAT who had some follow up questions, indicating that what we are looking for is beyond the scope of the services they perform and provided this response:

After reviewing the College's consultant comparison and requirements that include academic and educational master planning, career and technical education, student services and accreditation issues, we will decline on submitting a cost proposal at this time.

For future reference regarding the services outlined in the attached comparison, we have done extensive work in facilities planning, human resources and information technology and a brochure regarding FCMAT's services is attached.

a. Operational audit:

- i. Update regarding RFP (Steve, Walt):** Dr. Tribley acknowledged that College Council members' voices have been heard. He endorsed that an audit should be performed and importantly that it must be as independent and impartial as possible, especially where the financial aspects are concerned. He reminded the group that we could also get on the waiting list to have the Chancellor's Office (IEPI) perform an independent review on finances and any other areas of concern. Kiran added that with the IEPI application, two to three items are usually examined over three visits; the IEPI was formed due to the significant number of colleges getting sanctioned.

Dr. Tribley was asked whether additional proposals should be sought, given that FCMAT has declined. Following discussion, it was agreed that the CBM Operational Audit-Proposal will be brought back to College Council for action, followed by the development of the scope of work.

ii. Scope of Work

- 1. Discuss/Further Refine Scope of Work (All):** Dr. Tribley presented the October 2, 2015 Proposal from CBT. This is the first draft in the process of defining the scope of work and encouraged members to review the proposal and provide feedback in defining the scope.

Members inquired about the development of the scope of work for CBT. Steve cited that the scope of work could include a number of areas and referenced the CBT Proposal of Oct. 2, from John Spevak. Comments from members with regards to scope of work included the following:

- Student Access: How do we make the application and registration process easier as well as schedule classes for greater access?
- Technology constraints: How do we move forward and support the ERP and technology refreshment?
- Budget and deficit issues.
- Scheduling and class size efficiencies.

- Staffing and needed positions: Are we staffing appropriately?
- Planning and Five Year projection.
- Marina Ed. Center: Are we offering appropriate level of services?

In response to comments, Dr. Tribley concurred that the scope of work should emphasize the importance of impartiality with broad inclusiveness; this is stated on page 1 of the Oct. 2 proposal from Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT) Operational Audit Proposal under Phase 1: “*Establish a relationship between the CBT team and the stakeholders*”.

Dr. Tribley indicated that the consultants will likely identify four colleges to compare against and review in terms of best practices and make recommendations.

- b. Accreditation Update (Catherine):** Catherine reported that all *Drafts (except 3b. and 3d.)* are posted on the website awaiting input. She indicated that each of the shared governance committees and subcommittees are being asked to review the standards within their area for quality of content (provide feedback if any suggested changes are needed) and to get better acquainted and prepared for the Accreditation visit itself. College Council is being asked to focus on Standard I and Standard 4a. She welcomed anyone to contact her with inquiries Catherine indicated that the form for feedback and suggested changes focusses on two broad questions and can be submitted anonymously:

- **Do you find any factual inaccuracies?**
- **Are the examples and evidence cited sufficient or are there others?**

Catherine reported that she also returned from an Accreditation site visit. She reported that the visit was an enriching and energizing experience and that the focus is for peer evaluation and finding ways to improve.

- c. Institutional Action Plan template feedback (Kiran, Larry, Steve):** Kiran reviewed changes since last meeting to include page formatting, reduction in number of levels and redundancy. A revised version will come forward at next meeting.

7. Discussion Items:

- a. Faculty position recommendations – College Council role:** Diane stated that according to College Council Bylaws, recommendations can be forwarded to the President without two readings contingent upon a two-thirds vote of its members. She indicated that AAAG will be forwarding a *Faculty Prioritization Summary (for 2016-17)* to College Council for the next meeting and asked whether it should be presented for one or two readings before being recommended. Kiran emphasized that timing is extremely critical due to competition across the State for candidates and holiday schedule. Historically, College Council has conducted two readings, however, as it was pointed out, AAAG has conducted extensive review and discussion in defining the rankings of positions. Following discussion, concurrence was reached that this process may be sufficient to support College Council to expedite the process in one meeting. College Council will look forward to receiving the *Faculty Prioritization Summary* at its next meeting, when the decision will be made to either conduct two readings or one reading with action/recommendation to the President unless there are issues.

- b. **College Council bylaws (Diane)**: The current bylaws need to be reviewed for accuracy.
- i. **College Council annual report (Diane)**: Diane indicated that she will begin working on the annual report for May.
 - ii. **Shared governance evaluation (Diane)**: Diane asked that the group discuss this at our next meeting.
- c. **College Council communication**
8. **Next meeting**: October 27, 2015: The group discussed and agreed to meet next on Oct. 27.

9. **Announcements**

10. **Adjournment**

Items for future meetings:

- Campus forums to discuss Ed Master Plan and Resource Allocation
- Technology Bond
- Auditing courses: exploration of opportunities/challenges
- Policy/process for reorganization