

## College Council Minutes

March 6, 2012

2:30pm

Karas Room, LTC

College Council Members: Doug Garrison, Steve Ma, Celine Pinet, Michael Gilmartin, Julie Bailey, Gary Bolen, Adria Gerard, Alan Haffa, Amelia Hellam, Fred Hochstaedter, Loran Walsh, and Larry Walker for Carsbia Anderson.

Absent: Suzanne Ammons, Carsbia Anderson, Mark Clements, Kali Viker, Ruth Osorio (need replacement), Stephanie Perkins, Lyndon Schutzler, ASMPAC President Quincy Venter (need replacement), ASMPAC Rep. (vacant).

Guests: Carla Robinson, Eric Ogata, Vicki Nakamura, Rosaleen Ryan, and Students Allyson Davies and Bickruri Kim.

### Campus Community Comments:

- Larry announced the 21<sup>st</sup> annual Community Play “Ruined” would be held on March 10<sup>th</sup> at the Oldemeyer Center; UCSC’s African American Theater Arts Troupe, in collaboration with MPC, EOPS, TRiO, and CalWORKS, presents the powerful play; admission is free.
- Julie handed out flyers promoting the bone marrow registry drive on March 7<sup>th</sup>. A cheek swab is taken from potential donors to match bone marrow and blood transplants to patients with leukemia, lymphoma and blood disorders. The registry will be at the LTC, rooms 203/204.
- Rosaleen and Eric spoke on behalf of the United Way Campaign. The annual drive for contributions continues the tradition of funding services, crisis intervention, after school programs, and developing strong families and successful kids. United Way is now providing services to 1 out of every 3 citizens in Monterey County. They sold bake sale items and distributed donation forms.
- Alan on behalf of the Great Books program, shared that Mark Edmundson, visiting guest author from the University of Virginia was speaking today on “Can Rock and Roll Save Your Life?” on Wednesday, “Why Does Love Have To Be So Sad?”, and on Thursday, “Football: The Lure of the Game.”
- Alan announced for Carsbia that the subcommittee addressing smoking issues would be bringing forward their proposal at the next College Council meeting.

### 1) Minutes – February 7<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012: approved as amended.

(Feb. 7 motion Michael, second Julie, Larry abstained from vote, no changes)

(Feb. 21 motion Michael, second Amelia, add to United Way comments members Eric Ogata and Brian Streetman per Dr. Garrison.)

**2(a)i. Action Item BP 3040 – Community Service** is deferred indefinitely for the Community Education Task Force report.

**2(b) New Board Policies Review Procedure (first reading).** Dr. Garrison reviewed two documents distributed at today’s meeting: 1) Board Policies Review – A New Approach Needed, and 2) Comparison of Board Policies grid. The first document is duplicated below, with Dr. Garrison’s emphasized points underlined.

Document #1: Board Policies Review – A New Approach Needed:

#### Background

For the past five years, MPC has been actively engaged in a comprehensive review and update of the district’s Board policies to ensure compliance with state and federal laws and regulations and to reflect current practice. To accomplish this review:

- A Board Policy Review Process was developed to outline the steps, define roles, and provide for shared governance input.

- The Policy and Communication Committee (PACC) was created and assigned the role of disseminating proposed updates and new policies to constituent groups for review and comment.
- The college subscribed to the board policies and procedures service offered by the Community College League of California to have access to sample policies with legally recommended language.
- Board policies were posted to the college's website and updated with revisions and additions after Board adoption to ensure the campus and the community had access to these public documents. (The posted policies are now the official board policy manual.)

### Current Status and the Challenge

To date, the result of the Board policies review is that 17 policies have been revised and 6 new policies have been added during the past five years. Out of 182 Board adopted policies, 23 or 12% have been addressed. After a policy has been approved by the President/Vice President's Group for dissemination by PACC, the review process has taken an average of 7 months before the policy is adopted by the Board. Based on the time and effort involved, the review and revision of the remaining 159 policies will likely take several years, if the current process is followed. At a rate of five policies per year (based on 23 policies processed over 5 years), the Board policies review will not be completed for 30 years. Even doubling the rate to 10 policies per year would require 15 years for completion.

Meanwhile, the regulatory environment continues to change with laws and regulations being revised or added. As a majority of the existing Board policies were adopted over 20 years ago, in 1988 or 1989, the District's policies represent a different time. Many are out of date. This review is critical to complete to implement the many regulatory changes that have and are occurring and to provide assurance to the campus and the public that MPC's policies are up-to-date, compliant, and accessible. A more efficient system is needed to complete the update expeditiously and to make more effective use of valuable professional time.

### Proposal for a New Approach

MPC is not alone in needing current, up-to-date policies to govern college operations. The other 111 colleges in the California community college system are subject to the same laws and regulations. To meet the need for governing policies, the Community College League of California (CCLC) developed a subscription service to provide districts with a set of policies and procedures that are required by state and federal law or regulation. Sixty-seven (67) of the seventy-two (72) California community college districts currently subscribe to the service.

CCLC's policy language has been developed and vetted by the League's attorneys. The policies contain the minimum required language and reflect the principle that policies should be broad statements, clear and concise. Policy updates, due to regulatory changes and other legal issues, are provided in February and August of each year.

MPC has subscribed to CCLC's policies and procedure service since 2005. The 23 policies processed to date have relied primarily on CCLC policy language.

MPC has conducted the current Board policies update on a policy-by-policy basis, and the process has proved to be time intensive. The new approach being proposed is to adopt CCLC's policy manual in its entirety, as a replacement for the District's existing policies. This approach will ensure the District has the essential policies in place and the deleting of out-of-date or noncompliant policies will be accomplished more efficiently. The acceptance of the CCLC policy

language without revision is advised to safeguard the District and avoid the need for review of language modifications by local legal counsel, saving District legal costs.

Implementation would consist of each of the vice presidents reviewing the policies for their areas with the appropriate advisory groups. Certain individual policies considered sensitive or where local elaboration or modification is permitted, may be pulled for specific review or analysis. There may also be instances where MPC has a policy not covered by the CCLC service that requires additional consideration. However, the bulk of the policies would be treated as a group, provided routine acceptance, and sent forward for adoption by the Board.

The existing Board Policy manual appears to have been updated in a similar way – the majority of the policies have adoption dates in 1988 and 1989, indicating policies were adopted as an aggregate.

The new approach is proposed to begin immediately.

Document # 2: Comparison of Board Policies grid:

Dr. Garrison asked the Council to review the grid comparing MPC Board policy titles and numbers versus the CCLC's policies. As noted by Dr. Garrison and Vicki Nakamura, many of the CCLC policies are similar in title and content to MPC policies. There are other policies that MPC has adopted which are already contained in CCLC policies, and other MPC policies unique to the College. It is proposed to adopt the CCLC's policies as numbered in a series, i.e., 2000 Series Board of Trustees or 5000 Series Student Services. Each series would be reviewed by the appropriate component advisory committee or Academic Senate, and if any policy required additional consideration, it would be pulled from the series for individual consideration. Vicki noted that by removing a specific policy from the set, an advisory group can devote their resources to that policy's review, rather than to the entire set of policies.

Comments and questions from College Council members:

- Fred – the CCLC policies represent the board of governors, but there are policies where faculty should have language authority; one example is in curriculum. There are places where it is important for a faculty group to review them. Since Academic Senate and CAC are in charge of these academic matters, would these groups ask to pull out an individual policy to review them individually? Doug stated that Academic Senate would continue to consider for adoption any board policy, and that CAC would provide updates thru the Academic Senate.
- Alan – what would the mechanism for adoption be? If a Vice President thought their group of policies was adequate or appropriate, would they go directly to the Board? Doug assured that each advisory group and the Academic Senate would have the opportunity to review the series and pull individual policies if warranted.
- Alan – would each policy continue to come to College Council? Doug stated all policies will continue to come to College Council, coming forward in a set. An individual policy could then be redirected back to advisory groups, if appropriate.
- Gary – would we use the CCLC's numbering system? And where there is slightly different wording in the titles, would we be changing our heading or retain ours? Doug says it is our determination; the recommendation is to ultimately adopt CCLC board numbers and titles.
- Alan – on the grid there are policies that MPC has and CCLC doesn't. Would we keep our policies? Doug's suggestion is we would want to review that policy independently and determine whether to keep it. Where there are instances where CCLC has a policy and we don't, a review is needed.

- Fred – could we clarify the role of College Council and Academic Senate? Doug will see to that.
- Steve – one observation he has is that in some cases our policy ends up as a hybrid board policy and administration procedure. We need to keep in mind the CCLC version is a broad policy and not an administrative policy. This distinction may not be clear in all advisory groups.
- Summary – Doug will bring back the proposal after review by all advisory groups.

### 3) **Information Items**

- a) Classified Replacement Position:
  - i. Accounting Specialist (Steve Ma): The position was presented and reviewed.
  - ii. Food Preparer, CDC (Larry Walker): The position was presented and reviewed.
- b) **Accreditation Update (Fred Hochstaedter):** Fred reported that we are currently writing the response to the three recommendations from the ACCJC, and recommending changes to various program review policies. Fred is taking the lead on the SLOs to write response to the three SLO recommendations. This report needs to be institutionalized and will need careful review by all to be an institutional response. It will be ready by April 1 for presentation.

### 4. **Discussion items for *future* meeting:**

- a) REVIEW Action Plans and planning process; (with new College Council Chair, opportunity to take a look at our process). Also look at the bylaws of the cc committee.
- b) AGENDIZE Budget Package and Calendar (Steve)
- c) Progress of 4.c? Yes per Steve, will be brought back to cc for discussion. Planning on wide review; technology vision and challenges; disconnect between end users and providers. Make sure we do vision in a way that is collaborative.
- d) AGENDIZE Accreditation Update—April? (Fred)

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40pm.

Next meeting – March 20

Submitted by substitute recorder Carla Robinson.