

## College Council Minutes- DRAFT

August 7, 2012

2:30 pm

Karas Room, LTC

College Council Members: Doug Garrison, Carsbia Anderson, Celine Pinet, Steve Ma, Michael Gilmartin, Julie Bailey, Gary Bolen, Mark Clements, Jonathan Osburg, Stephanie Perkins, Fred Hochstaedter, Adria Gerard, Alan Haffa, Lyndon Schutzler, Loren Walsh, Amelia Hellam, Kali Viker, Suzanne Ammons, ASMPCC Rep. Steve Alavi (Pres. position vacant), ASMPCC Rep. Samantha Baldwin)

Absent: Gary Bolen, Mark Clements, Jonathan Osburg, ASMPCC Pres., ASMPCC Rep.

Guests: Laura Franklin, Art St. Laurent, Robin Venuti

**Campus Community Comments:** None.

1) **Minutes – June 12, and June 19, 2012.** Approved as recorded with one abstention.

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

a) **Final Budget 2012-13 (1<sup>st</sup> reading – Steve):** The first reading was presented in a ppt presentation which included the following key points:

- Assumes passage of the Governor's tax initiative (Prop 30) on the November ballot; additional revenues will be used to buy down the system-wide deferral of \$1 B.
- Apportionment revenue and Categorical funding levels remain the same as 2011-12.
- Mandated reimbursement process converted back to a block grant which is based on FTES (\$28 per FTES). The District could otherwise file claims using old method.
- If the Brown tax initiative fails, there would be a \$5.5 B trigger cut to K-14 and the CCC would lose \$213 M in deferral buy down and a \$338 M in workload reductions. **MPC's cut would be \$2.28M in midyear cut to apportionment (2workload reduction of 515 FTES or 7.3%).**

Steve recapped the Tentative Budget Assumptions folded into the Final Budget:

- 5<sup>th</sup> year of no funded COLA (statutory estimate of 3.24%).
- Fee increased to \$46 per unit beginning with summer.
- Categorical funding remains same as 2011-12.
- We are using a hybrid estimate of apportionment revenue which assumes \$750K cut in revenue (could be in the form of a deficit coefficient or workload reduction or other).
- Assumption that MPC will earn back stability funding.
- Will reapply for the \$2M in TRAN borrowing in mid-year; we were advised by bond counsel that we had sufficient funds to conduct internal borrowing and as such could not qualify for a TRAN, however we may reapply in mid-year.
- Assumed fulltime faculty replacements per agreement with CTA.
- CDC will require less GF support as a result of changes made in the CDC operation.
- Use of \$1.3 M of Reserves and one time funds to balance.

Changes in the Final Budget:

- Revenues: District Reserves and use of one-time funds have increased by \$511,700 to close the budget gap (\$1.3M + \$.5M= \$1.8M).
- Expenses: Increased in instructional contracts of \$476K (Fire courses and additional South Bay)
- Increase in hourly adjunct-counseling \$31,700
- Increase in HR Budget by \$4K for applicant tracking software purchase
- OPEB (Other Post-Employment Benefits)– set aside \$3.7M towards this long term liability of \$10.8M

- Increase in Capital Outlay Fund by \$114,353 for technology/infrastructure emergencies (funds came from return of P&L and WC equity).

Steve reminded the group that we are on stability funding, indicating that in the final report for 2011-12, we reported 6,804 FTES which is 289 FTES (\$1.39M) below cap. We must earn back the 289 FTES or we will be cut by this unearned amount and the 6,804 FTES will become our new cap. Any workload reduction in the state budget will not excuse us from the requirement to earn back the 1.39M. The PVP group has held discussions on how to best generate additional FTEs by using existing resources while increasing efficiencies, offering more class sections in growth areas and purchasing additional instructional contracts (Fire courses). Steve reviewed class size efficiency information and efficiency trends revealing that fall 2009 represented a high mark of 26.7 students per class as compared to 24.6 in fall 2011. *Simply stated, adding only 2 students to our current average class (size) would be the equivalent of a 10% increase in numbers and the return to our 2009 average class size.*

Several efforts are in place to direct the district's path to earn back the FTES to include:

- Fall 2012 reflects an additional 40 FTES as compared to 2011-12
- Marketing efforts are being directed to growing online offerings
- Restoration of some past outreach efforts.

Class offerings for 2011-12 included a workload reduction. This was conducted with the belief and assumption that efficiencies (average class size) would remain intact. Several factors, however, point to reasons for the drop in enrollments including loss of some full time faculty, downturn in the economy and reasons still unknown.

The approved state budget assumes that Prop. 30 will pass, raising \$6B in annual state revenues, however if it doesn't pass, MPC's will need a contingency plan in place to address its \$2.3M cut.

Comments from the group included the college's position on retention which was strongly emphasized in previous years. In conjunction with retention, "pretention" should be a key approach. Pretention would include efforts to reach out to students, encouraging their involvement in a more proactive rather than reactive mode.

**b) Additional links to MPC's homepage (1<sup>st</sup> readings/ 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading):**

- Security/Parking (Steve/Art): Information on Parking is buried in the web site and each semester start, a large number of inquiries must be redirected to where information on parking and the citation appeal process lives. This could be easily mitigated if the information was instead posted on the main page navigation bar.
- Continuing Education (Laura Franklin): Laura announced the new website page for Continuing Education and the need for a highly visible tab to link to the site, suggesting this link be placed on the main page navigation bar.

Given the short lead time until school starts, the suggestion was to waive the typical requirement for a second reading. The group voted with 9 in favor and 2 opposed to waiving a 2<sup>nd</sup> reading. The members opposed voiced preference to following the process of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> readings. Recognition was given that the web site needs to be revised and made easier to navigate, perhaps utilizing gateways labeled for new, continuing and returning students. This task will undoubtedly be taken up by the new Information Services leadership position.

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

- a) ACCJC Mid-Term Report – due March 2013 (update--Celine): The *Planning Agendas (to be submitted to the President at PVP for the first meeting of each month)*, was circulated and Celine indicated that the ACCJC timeline for the Mid Term report was posted. The Report consists of two main portions:
  - 1) Response to Recommendations, and
  - 2) Planning Agendas

The **Planning Agendas** (document) addresses the responses to the plan standards, which division is responsible, the status (complete, not started, in process) of each.

**4) Discussion items for future meeting:** *(See updates as marked for a thru f).*

- a) **MPC Technology Vision/Challenges:** *(Awaiting new I.S. leadership in place.)*
- b) **Board Policy Revisions:** <http://mympc.mpc.edu/Committees/PACC/default.aspx>. *New process for implementing BP Revisions reviewed with PVP and assistants. Includes identifying chapters and their respective areas of association.*
- c) **Action Plans (late spring?)** *To Review. Have used a modified process.*
- d) **SIS – How well is it working (input from DOMS, end users, A&R etc.** *(Awaiting new I.S. leadership in place.)*
- e) **Prioritizing filling of classified position (process):** *CC raised question on process. Over the summer, the VPs have worked to put together material to outline the process, and it should come forward shortly.*
- f) **College Council membership updates:**
- g) *Thin client/Sharepoint – CC request a comprehensive review once new I.S. position filled. Meanwhile, over the summer, extensive testing was conducted on each Thin Client work stations, as well as work to identify applications needed to run in the different areas.*
- h) *CC bylaws should be reviewed to include the reporting activity which should come forward from its subcommittees.*

**5) Other:**

- a) **Committee Reports-**