

## College Council Minutes

May 15, 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, ASMPC Rep. Steve Alavi, ASMPC Rep. Samantha Baldwin

Absent: Mark Clements, Stephanie Perkins, Kali Viker, ASMPC Pres. (vacant)

Guests: Laura Franklin, Diane Boynton, Judee Timm, Denise Moss,

**Campus Community Comments:** Deferred to end of meeting or future due to time constraints.

1) **Minutes – May 1, 2012:** Approved as recorded with none opposed, and one abstention.

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

- a) **\*Smoking Policy BP 2240**, (2nd reading-Carsbia): All advisory groups have reviewed and the campus will take the direction of not becoming a non-smoking, tobacco-free campus at this time. The revised language was presented reflecting old/changed verbiage inclusive of “designated areas”.

ASMPC Rep. Steve Alavi shared the following comments for consideration which came forward from ASMPC:

- Consensus to allow smoking on campus, but restricted to perimeter areas,
- The expense (huts) seems excessive especially since bus stops do not all have shelters,
- Smokers have voiced aversion to smoking in the huts due to cleanliness issue,
- Better signage/directions may be part of the solution,
- Next year, ASMPC plans to initiate a positive reinforcement program to encourage smokers to use designated areas and offer rewards for those who follow the rules. The idea is to try something different such as this social experiment and see how it works.

General Campus Policies--2240 No Smoking Policy

In the interest of protecting the health of students, employees, and visitors to the campus, smoking is prohibited except in designated areas located in campus parking lots. Additionally the use of tobacco – to include smoking and/or chewing any form of tobacco – is not permitted except in designated areas in parking lots. Smoking is not allowed in campus-owned vehicles.

Students, staff, and visitors who violate the smoking policy are subject to disciplinary procedures as detailed in the appropriate sections of the Board Policy.

*College Council recommends that the above BP 2240 be forwarded to the Board for its approval. The motion was made, seconded, and approved with none opposed and one abstention.*

b) **Revised Planning and Resource Allocation Process**, (2<sup>nd</sup> reading – Dr. Garrison): The recap of last meeting’s amendments included the following:

- The EMP is included in the left cloud,
- Differentiation of ACG’s for prior year (box #1b), and current year (box #2),
- Designation of when preliminary priorities from the advisory groups would be shared (6b),

At the AAAG meeting, the following feedback was given:

- Box #3 – Program Review/Annual Action Plans (September to December,
- Box #5 – Division recommend priorities by late February,

- Box #6a – Advisory groups Review by late March,
- Box #9 – Institutional Administrative Review due by late May,

*College Council recommends that the Planning and Resource Allocation Process version 5/1/2012 incorporating the above changes, be forwarded to the Board for its approval. The motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously.*

**c) Distance Ed. Follow up Report #2 to Rec #4 from ACCJC, (1<sup>st</sup> reading-Judee Timm):** Judee recapped that this is a follow up report to the previous follow up report as requested by the ACCJC in their February 1 2012. Several areas within the plan were implemented and the plan of action was sound, however ACCJC requested wanted to know what we had in fact completed and implemented which meets the recommendations of the Accreditation Team. The two elements are:

- (1) Evaluation of teaching online instruction—This required students to utilize their MPC e-mail address, which was unsuccessful since 95% of students do not use their student e-mail. In working with IT, a solution was found to bridge this disconnect just in the last 2 ½ months.
- (2) Developing protocols and standards for on line courses—This required establishment of the MPC Online course development and approval process for online instruction using CurriCunet which was accomplished in this last year. Approximately 20 courses have been submitted and approved.

The MPC on-line website and on-line course site (log in site) has been streamlined, cleaned up with working links. The Faculty Handbook has also been updated, and regular workshops are being conducted to support on line instruction. The ICDE (Institutional Committee on Distance Education) is a standing committee with approved bylaws as a part of the reporting structure to the Academic Senate. Problems with online students accessing their financial Aid information have been remedied with installation of a portal. Lastly, the Strategic Initiative for Distance Education has been included in the EMP and outlines strategic goals for the development of quality distance education programs and certificate and certification offerings by MPC.

On line courses are growing in popularity and are the first to fill, by offering convenience and access to working populations who would otherwise be unable to enroll. The spring late start on line courses filled very quickly. The growing participation in online studies will rely upon support in the way of staffing and staff development in order to utilize this growth potential.

**d) SLO Response to ACCJC Recs #1-3 (1<sup>st</sup> reading-Fred Hochstaedter):** Fred recapped the responses formulated by the SLO Committee to Recommendations 1 – 3 in a report shared and approved by AS, the advisory groups, with the final step at College Council prior to board presentation/approval. A powerpoint presentation (not to be used as a stand-alone), was used to aid with today's presentation.

- i. *Complete the process of assessment to guide improvement of student learning (IIA.1 and IIA.2).* The institution and the ACCJC have each distinct goals as well as overlapping expectations. Those overlapping expectations are:
  - *Student Learning*
  - *Dialog about program quality*
  - *Effort to Improve*

The above areas of overlapping expectation are where the institution has concentrated its efforts while still meeting and addressing all the standards as well as those expressed by the ACCJC.

Fred reviewed the timeline for the SLO development at MPC:

- 2007 -- MPC's established its *Philosophy of SLOs for MPC*. This philosophy referenced SLOs as providing a formal framework for faculty to confer about teaching, learning, pedagogy and curricula for the purpose of supporting a vibrant institution that improves student learning at MPC.
- 2008 – Beginning of \*Program Reflections was when we began to ask instructors to record efforts to assess student attainment of SLOs and confer with their colleagues.
- 2008-09 – Academic Senate worked to align General Education Outcomes within their GE areas, which lead to instructors assessing these GEOs as part of the normal SLO evaluation process.
- 2009 – Accreditation Visit took place, at which time MPC had already developed its course and program SLOs, articulated the value of SLOs (inclusive of dialog amongst peers), recognized it wanted to avoid the SLO process (evaluation of faculty based on student performance and quantitative measures while minimizing individuality and uniqueness within assessment).
- 2010-11 -The institution was on its way toward connecting the SLO process with program review and its planning and resource allocation process (PRAP).
- 2011 – Connections between Program Reflections and Program Review were strengthened by amending the form – AA Annual Report and Action Plan to specifically refer to Program Reflections (incorporated within Flex Day events).
- SLO's incorporated into Faculty Handbook,
- 2011-12 – Language adjusted in all forms dealing with resource allocation to reflect Program Reflection and/or student learning.

MPC's comprehensive assessment report (assessment data) lives in our Program Reflections, as designed by MPC. Fred reminded us that an annual SLO report is required by the ACCJC. A comprehensive assessment report has just been compiled and signed by Dr. Garrison and Dr. Hochstaedter.

\*Program Reflections, a biannual event which occurs during flex days, allows for dialogue amongst faculty and staff relative to student attainment about student learning outcomes and plan for future improvements. All areas are participants in evaluating how their operations affect student success, including those operations directly tied to physical aspects such as functional classrooms, safe and accessible walkways, access to financial services and counseling.

- ii. *SLOs are described and that students receive syllabi reflective of the identified SLOs (IIA.2 and IIA.6).* Faculty will include SLOs in all syllabi. Reminders are sent to faculty to assure this is being done. This began about 2 years ago. This allows students to better understand what they can expect to learn and be able to do upon completion of the course.
- iii. *Ensure that faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes (IIIA.1c):* —AS has recommended to the faculty union that they negotiate language (when that time comes) into the contract the evaluation component which references participation in the program review process and/or the program reflections process. Faculty will be voting on the verbiage shortly.

Fred summarized to say that Program Reflections represent the dialogue and rationale for budget dependent and non-budget dependent Action Plans which are woven into Program

Reviews and their Annual Updates. The Program Reflections exercise of Spring Flex are being compiled and formatted into one comprehensive document which will be available for review. The intent is that the Program Reflections then find their way into Annual Updates to Program Reviews, and Action Plans.

- e) **Education Master Plan** – (1<sup>st</sup> reading Celine Pinet): Celine introduced the EMP as written by the committee's members. The last plan written in 1999, needs to be updated to guide the District with identifiable and clear goals, assessment of where changes are needed in response to changing economic conditions and opportunities. Celine recapped the District's Mission, Values and Goals (support transfer, career and basic skills education priorities) along with its environment (community data, demographics and areas of growth opportunity). After reviewing these aspects, several areas of challenges with the Community Data identified included:

- Growth limited to northern portion of the district, high school enrollments are shrinking except for in Marina,
- Two diverse populations on the peninsula (older-educated in the south, and younger, less educated, more ethnically diverse in the north).
- Economic characteristics of Monterey County.

Celine underscored the need to recognize/plan for budget decreases, state and federal mandates, a shrinking traditional student base, increased popularity in distance education, international student base increase potential and filling the still critical basic skills needs as important components of our planning. She invited input and ideas on potentially growing career areas. After evaluating the mission, goals, values, etc., the committee identified specific objectives for the next 5 years and explained the Strategic Goals handout.

MPC has been approached by CSUMB to partner in serving the international student population via consortial means in order to share costs. A global learning direction is emerging.

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

- a) **Instructional Technology Specialist – Replacement** (Celine): Diane Boynton presented the position as an integral function essential in the Humanities and Social Sciences division. This position provides technology support and help to new faculty members essential in this area's operations.
- b) **Director, Student Financial Services (Carsbia)**: Carsbia presented the information on this position to become vacant due to retirement.
- c) **Accreditation Reporting – Timeline from Academic Affairs** (Celine): The following timeline recapped our reporting to the ACCJC:
- **Fall 2012** – Distance Ed. and SLO follow up reports, and status on SLO implementation,
  - **Spring 2013** – Substantive Change Report on Distance Ed., Annual Report and Midterm Report.
  - **Spring 2016** – next comprehensive evaluation by the ACCJC.
- d) **May Revise info?** (Steve Ma): A brief synopsis of this morning's webinar on the May Revise was circulated with the following recap:
- State budget deficit of \$9.2 B has risen to \$15.7B,
  - Apportionment shortfall began as \$179 M now projected at \$129 M (improved), instead of a \$822,000 reduction we may instead see \$500,000 but need to await confirmation.
  - The Governor's budget proposes redevelopment monies coming back to schools, however, this may not come readily and shouldn't be counted on.

- Prop. 98 – the Governor is proposing to shift the GO Bond debt service previously paid outside of Prop. 98. The net effect of this shift is that there would be fewer Prop. 98 funds available for schools.
- Budget triggers- if the tax measure fails approximately \$5.49B in cuts would come to K-14.
- Two tax initiatives are on the ballot. The Brown tax initiative would serve K-14, however the Munger tax only serves K-12, and the one with the most votes passes.
- Scenario A – best case where \$313M comes to community colleges in the form of a deferral buy down. Some apportionment funds would come in the current fiscal year. Mandate reimbursement block grant of \$28/FTES to generate an additional \$196,000 for MPC.
- Scenario B- worst case would bring a \$300M trigger cut (1.76 M in cuts to MPC) would now increase to over \$2M for MPC (6.4% workload reduction or approximately 450 FTES). We could also see mandate block grants but this is unclear at this time.
- Budget Risks – there are many including the outcome of the tax measures, revenues likely unpredictable, workload reductions unknown, redevelopment funds unlikely to materialize soon, student fee increases pending along with likelihood of some effects on BOG waivers. More information may come forward following next week’s ACBO conference.

**4) Discussion items for *future* meeting:**

- a) MPC Technology Vision/Challenges:
- b) Board Policy Revisions: <http://mympc.mpc.edu/Committees/PACC/default.aspx>.
  - i) BP 3040 – Community Service (2<sup>nd</sup> reading— pending Community Ed Task Force).
- c) Action Plans (late spring?)
- e) SIS – How well is it working (input from DOMS, end users, A&R etc.

**5) Other:**

- a) Committee Reports-

**\*Smoking Policy-** presented 4-17 as information item, 5-1 as Action, however, CC now requesting revision as to the specific language in reference to the “designated areas”.

***Next meeting – Due to budget development news from the state and budget development timelines at the district level, suggested meeting dates for College Council are May 29<sup>th</sup> and June 12<sup>th</sup> for 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> readings of the Tentative Budget.***