

## College Council Minutes-(approved as amended)

November 29, 2011

2:30 pm, Karas Room

College Council Members: Doug Garrison, Carsbia Anderson, Marty Johnson (Interim VP AA), Michael Gilmartin, Steve Ma, Julie Bailey, Gary Bolen, Mark Clements, Ruth Osorio (need replacement), Stephanie Perkins, Fred Hochstaedter, Adria Gerard, Alan Haffa, Lyndon Schutzler, Loren Walsh, Amelia Hellam, Kali Viker, Suzanne Ammons, ASMPAC Pres.(?) Stephen Rose, ASMPAC Rep (vacant)

Absent: Carsbia Anderson, Amelia Hellam, Kali Viker, ASMPAC rep. (vacant).

Guests: Penny Partch, Robynn smith, Laura Franklin

### Campus Community Comments:

- Dr. Garrison reported in follow up on the status of the BP 2240. The advisory groups have reviewed and discussed the proposed change and in accordance with College Council's opinion (Nov. 15), the BP will go to the Health & Safety Committee for its review and recommendation.

1) **Minutes – Nov. 15, 2011:** (*deferred to Dec. 6*)

2) **Action Items (see available handouts):** *None.*

3) **Board Policy Revisions:** <http://mympc.mpc.edu/Committees/PACC/default.aspx>.

4) **Information / Discussion:** (*See handouts: Recommendations Regarding Repeatability, and ASCCC Recommendations Regarding Repeatability (Summary):*

a) **Repeatability:** Fred presented the group with some background which has lead up to where the CCCs are now with regards to Repeatability:

- 2010—CCC BOG (Ca. Community Colleges Board of Governors) gave direction to the Chancellor's Office to begin calling for changes to Title 5 on repeatable courses.
- The System Advisory Committee (SACC) gave lengthy consideration as to how to respond and develop resolutions that were presented to the ASCCC (Acad. Senate for Ca Community Colleges' spring Plenary Session.
- Spring 2011 Plenary Session - most resolutions failed or lost impetus, but the resolution on repeatable courses which did pass was the recommendation to change title 5 regulations that eliminates the category of "activity" courses in Title 5 and defines repeatability for specific disciplines. (Each discipline would be looked at individually).
- As a result, the CCCCHO agreed to allow the AS additional time to develop new recommendations regarding repeatable courses to be brought forward to the Fall 2011 A.S. Plenary Session.
- A Repeatability Task Force organized jointly by the AS and the CCCCCO met and arrived at recommendations (*See Task Force Recommendations- handout*). The primary recommendation is to eliminate repeatable courses except under certain limited circumstances as outlined within the areas of *Visual and Performing Arts, CTE, PE, Intercollegiate Athletics, Adaptive PE and Other Repeatable Courses (Forensics, Journalism, Creative Writing...)*.

Fred gave a recap/ summary of actions taken by the CCC faculty at the Fall ASCCC Plenary of November 4. The Academic Senate had a "bottom-up" participation and vote in which MPC delegate Kathleen Clark attended. Kathleen was asked to vote on the Repeatability issue and urge that the BOG take a more relaxed stance. She attended the break-out sessions and learned more as to where the concept of restrictions on repeatability originated. It is understood that the "proliferation" and "repeatability" of some courses offered as some community colleges far exceeded what a student could complete in two years. Surprisingly, there was not great debate on the issue at the Fall ASCCC Plenary.

Marty presented the issue of Repeatability. The Board of Governor's has examined this issue in response to pressures similar to other state agencies' pressures. The BOG is not examining certain courses, but rather a population of students. The issue is currently in the hands of the Consultation Council. From there it will go to the BOG possibly for review at its January meeting. Several comments came forward from today's discussion to include the following:

- We must remain mindful of the ongoing directive from the CCCCO to focus on students seeking specific academic goals. The current economy will not allow us support repeatability in the same ways or to the degree that we have in the past such as serving the needs of lifelong learning and service to the community.
- The requirement for an Education Plan, for students was dropped---this is good news.
- 24% enrolled students register their goal as "personal Interest", which underscores the potential difficulty in being able to serve this population.
- Though specific data is not available, it is believed that potentially 30% of the FTES funding is at stake, especially given the number of lifelong learners. Given the unknown budgetary impact, the system should be able to accommodate a "phase in" approach to such change.
- From P.E. a decline of 20% in FTES would mean other areas would need to grow to make up loss FTES. The question becomes as to whether those other areas can produce class offerings which could be filled.
- High school graduating classes (7 area high schools) are shrinking. This adds to the complexity of growing enrollments to make up for lost FTES if repeatability restrictions are enacted.
- What about effects on Room Utilization figures.
- At great risk is the "Studio Arts"—CAC will need to work with Creative Arts on its "existing curricular options".

In closing discussions, the looming question is "What is the overall fiscal impact?" The group was reminded of the uncertainty of the impact MPC or other respondents will have on the Student Success Task Force. Coupled with an already difficult budget planning calendar, there is growing consensus that phase-in approach on Repeatability is a clearly reasonable expectation. The District should separate what is being handed down from the State and what its own mission and direction is. In doing so, MPC may be able to serve its community while also working with what the State provides. If repeatability recommendations are adopted, how would MPC respond in order to preserve programs which serve its community? Could MPC garner the support of its community through the implementation of a parcel tax in order to save the arts? How do we assess the true overall fiscal impact of the above anticipated pressures?

A comment was shared that asked whether we could direct our Institutional Research office to capture data regarding Repeatability in order to get an assessment on the overall impact on our fiscal condition. (How many students could be potentially affected by the repeatability issue.)

(As of 2/7/2012- the first half of the report has been shared with the Senate and the report in its entirety is anticipated to be complete by February 16.)

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

- a) Update on Ft. Ord Education Center- Dec 6<sup>th</sup>-at Education Ctr at Marina.**
- b) Year End Funds—(following audit /LAO update, trigger cuts, Gov.'s proposed budget of Mid-January) Late January??
- c) Equipment Refreshment needs campus-wide:

**6) Other:**

**a) Committee Reports-**

***Next meeting is December 6<sup>th</sup> ---at the Education Center in Marina, room MA 104.***