

College Council Minutes

April 17, 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 Pres. Stephen Rose (need replacement), ASMPC Rep (vacant)

Absent: Mark Clements, Jonathan Osburg, Stephanie Perkins, Kali Viker, Adria Gerard, ASMPC Pres. (vacant), ASMPC Rep. (vacant).

Campus Community Comments:

- The Cal Poly Arab Music Ensemble will be performing on April 19th at 5:30 in the Music Hall.
- Jane Smiley, novelist, will be speaking as part of the Guest Author Series, Thursday, at 7pm, LF 103.
- “The Musical of Musicals, the Musical” continues at the Wharf Theater through the end of the month. A tour of the Theatre was held last Friday with the Foundation and it is progressing with the layout remaining mostly the same, except for the box office.
- The MPC Softball team is having a successful year. It plays Cabrillo today, and the Division Championship will be determined on how we do this week.
- Nick Pfeiffer is competing in the NorCal Championships decathlon at Shasta (yesterday and today), and is favored to win. Having won the decathlon a few weeks ago, and we are hoping he will win the state championship.
- Celina reported that we have held our First Forum for the Educational Master Plan Update. There will be additional forums with information coming forward eventually to College Council.

1) **Minutes –April 3, 2012:** Approved with minor editing.

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

- a) **Academic Affairs – Reorganization (*second reading*) (Celine Pinet):** Since the last College Council meeting, a few things have transpired. Celine indicated she has met with members of Academic Affairs staff, and the DOMs and the reorganization issue has been shared and approved at AAAG. She again reiterated the stress points of the system changes and mandated audits to respond to. A recent ACCJC workshop revealed more areas to address, creating increased levels of responsibilities impacting the scheduler position. In most institutions the area of responsibility is carried by two persons, sometimes three. This scheduler position is needed at a critical time to address both the system changes and to alleviate the mounting pressure on the existing person carrying the responsibility. Estimated costs of \$70,000 to \$72,000 are anticipated to be funded through attrition from vacant management positions (college wide).

Comments shared from the group included the following:

- There is a concern that this position would impact the DOMS with a workload reduction. It was explained that curriculum and reporting changes are stressing the need for a scheduler position. Where some DOMS do have a heavy workload, some members think there may exist redundancy in the activities (CuriCUNET).
- The CSEA membership tends to oppose approving new positions given potential or looming budget cuts which could result in layoffs. Would it be possible to work within existing resources to fill the position responsibilities?
- In order for this to be filled internally, this position needs to be approved as a new position. The District intends to evaluate existing resources and see if the position can be filled internally.

In summary, an efficient solution must be found to allow this position to be filled so that classes can be properly input, deadlines met and the District is not hindered in its ability to earn FTES and meet legal requirements. A final call for discussion was made and invitation to move/approve.

“College Council recommends the Academic Affairs Reorganization Plan, and that it be forwarded to the Board for approval.”

The motion was made, seconded with 10 in favor, 1 opposed and 1 abstention. The motion carried.

3) Information Items (see available handouts):

a) **Student Health Fee (Carsbia Anderson):** Each year we receive information from the State according to the Implicit Price Deflator Index, as to the option of increasing the student health services fee. Last September, this information supported the increase by \$1 however, we chose not to implement the increase in the same year that enrollment fees increased to \$36 per unit. At this time we are advocating increases as follow:

- Summer 2012 – increase from \$14 to \$15,
- Fall 2012 and spring 2013 – increase from \$17 to \$19,
- Summer 2012 – increase to \$16.

This proposal will go to the April 25th board meeting for approval. This will put us in line with the current levels allowed by the State. This has been shared with ASMPC.

b) **Instructional Specialist, Adaptive PE p/t (Carsbia Anderson):** The position information was shared with the group. This categorically funded position is a conversion from a temporary to a permanent position.

c) **Planning and Resource Allocation Process – Model:** Dr. Garrison gave a recap on the examination taken of the current PRAP model, timing, and processes especially those compressed into spring. This came in response to a discussion held at College Council’s discussion a few weeks ago. The questions which arose from that discussion included:

- How does the Education Master Plan fit into this process?
- The Planning Assumptions put forth in the fall-- where do they fit into the PRAP?
- When do divisions prioritize (not designated in the chart, rather it is assumed)? In this last fall, there were delays in making data available for Program Reviews.
- Does the budget development process occur at a point where it is reasonable to receive all input and in general is there time for all the preparation steps in spring.

Dr. Garrison shared his thoughts with PVP and how the above questions could be answered. It was noted that while this is the 6th revision, such reviews reflect our responsiveness to a process which must remain responsive to the college’s needs and the changing economic climate. A review of the planning calendar reveals several adjustments to activities and timelines including:

- Multi-Year Mission/Goals and EMP –Replaces the first cloud labeled as Ideas...
- #1 box- Accountability Review in fall for previous year.
- #2 box- Area Component Goals for current year presented in September.
- #3 box – Program Review or Action Plans – Data disseminated to divisions in fall, allowing them time to develop annual Action Plans between Sept. to Dec. Previous timeline was too compressed.
- #4 box- In October - Planning Assumptions (**from the President / Superintendent**) put forward to help shape budget planning.

- #5 box – February - Divisions put forward priorities with Feb. as a target timeline.
- #6 box – Mid-March, the advisory groups review priorities.
- #7 box – Early April – budget development process begins (packages sent out).
- #8 box – Mid May - Budget Committee identified funding after May Revise.
- #9 box – May – VPs receive and refine priorities from their areas.
- #10 box – Last two meetings of the year – College Council makes allocation recommendations (1st/2nd reading of the Tentative Budget).

This revision to the PRAP will allow for data to be distributed to the divisions for program review and spread out several activities from what is currently mostly occurring in a compressed time frame in spring. The revised chart will be verified with the budget development outline (Attachment A- as attached to the Final Budget book printing).

Additional comments included questions as to when College Council should become involved in the budget development process (March/April vs. May). It was noted that the priorities are established by the advisory groups around mid-March, and then posted for College Council to review. It is uncertain how much earlier these could be made available.

d) Smoking Policy Update (Carsbia Anderson): A handout depicting a glass sheltered structure was shared. Carsbia gave a recap of the Smoking Policy issue, indicating that the previous board membership had the eventual goal as a Phase IV- non-smoking, tobacco free campus. With the current board membership, a re-examination conducted last fall to include the advisory groups and ASMPC, concluded impracticalities associated with requiring students/employees to leave campus (break time, parking). The Health & Safety Committee provided the recommendation to the College Council Smoking subcommittee as follows:

Health and Safety Committee recommends to the College Council's subcommittee for the "Campus Smoking Policy" that the campus implement Phase IV of the Smoking Policy- Tobacco Free Campus; however if not approved by the Board, that smoking and the use of tobacco products be restricted to designated areas which would eliminate or reduce the effects of second-hand smoke.

In conjunction with the recommendation to the board for the use of shelters, it is believed that 1-2 parking spaces will be needed for each shelter and bond funds could be utilized. Areas other than parking spaces would present accessibility (ADA) issues. Price options were shared. The CC Smoking subcommittee plans to meet between now and the next CC meeting and will forward its recommendation.

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 (2nd reading— pending Community Ed Task Force).
- c) Action Plans (late spring?)
- d) Accreditation Response – Timeline from Academic Affairs

5) Other:

- a) Committee Reports-

Next meeting – May 1st

College Council Minutes

May 1, 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, ASMPAC Pres. Samantha Baldwin (ASMPAC Treasurer), ASMPAC Rep (vacant)

Absent: Mark Clements, Jonathan Osburg, Stephanie Perkins, ASMPAC Rep. (vacant).

Campus Community Comments:

- Gary reported that “Musical, the Musical” closed last weekend. The next production is the MPC Storybook Theatre production of “Little Women”, which opens at Carmel Middle School on May 4th through May 20th on Friday, Saturday and Sunday.
- Lyndon updated the group to say the women’s softball team is second in conference and has qualified for the Northern Cal playoffs. In tennis, two women have qualified for the Northern Cal this week at West Valley College, and in golf, we qualified for the Northern Cal in Stockton. Our decathlete (Nick Pfeiffer) qualified for number two in the State Finals.
- Fred introduced the AGS Scholarship recipient, Samantha Baldwin from MPC, who attended the all day conference two weeks ago in San Jose.
- Carsbia welcomed additional faculty and classified staff who may be interested, to participate in becoming AGS advisors.
- Carsbia reported on the High School Assessment event held two weeks ago. Over 400 students showed up (450 pre-registered) and were tested/assessed in English and Math. The students will return for orientation and by attending the activity, the students will be receive priority registration. Area high school staff and MPC staff are pleased with the turnout and how well the event was organized.
- Lyndon added that the dance concert at Monterey High School last week featured 28 pieces, was well received and a great testimony of our ability to support dance at the high school setting.
- Celine reported that Judee Timm has been asked to be one of the content leads for the National Education Association Academy Content and Review Board. The work will include reviewing online professional development programs/courses and related functions.

1) **Minutes – April 17, 2012:** Approved as recorded, with 2 abstentions.

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

- a) **Revised Board Policy Review Process [2nd reading] – Dr. Garrison:** This was presented March 6 for information/first reading at which time questions were asked and suggestions shared. The board policy review process will be amended to reflect the agreed upon revisions to the 2nd page, 3rd paragraph as indicated in bold italics and will read as follows:

*Implementation would consist of each of the vice presidents reviewing the policies for their areas with the appropriate advisory groups **and the Academic Senate, prior to presentation to College Council.** 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 **after approval by College Council.***

“College Council recommends the Board Policies Review Process as presented in “Board Policies Review—A New Approach Needed—and that it be forwarded to the Board for approval.”

The motion was made, seconded with all in favor. The motion carried.

- b) **Revised Planning and Resource Allocation Process – [2nd reading] – Dr. Garrison:** Dr. Garrison recapped changes which came forward from the April 17th meeting as presented on the current handout to be (1) Box 4 – Planning Assumptions for the next fiscal year, originate from the Superintendent, and (2) Box 6 –Preliminary Priorities reviewed by the Advisory Groups also be shared in College Council.

Consensus was reached to conduct a 2nd reading on the Revised Planning and Resource Allocation Process at the next College Council meeting (May 15). AAAG has agendized this item for review on May 2nd.

- c) **Tentative Budget 2012-13 [1st reading] (Steve):** Steve reviewed the “Very Tentative Budget” handout underscoring the fact that we are dealing with many uncertainties. Budget Assumptions discussed included:

- No restoration of prior year cuts (cut \$3.3 M in 09-10, \$2.9 M in 11-12). These ongoing revenue cuts if/when restored will likely require that we earn it back. The workload reductions represent a re-benching of our cap.
- Unfunded Cola of 3.24%
- No growth funds
- Enrollment fee increase to \$46 in fall---how will it affect enrollment?
- Mid-year trigger cut of \$1.76 M if Nov tax initiative does not pass (if it passes, deferral is reduced rather than new monies being provided).

Several unknowns and uncertainties include:

- April revenues are below earlier estimates,
- November tax initiative (will it make the ballot)?
- Current medical savings for 2011-12---will it continue and how will the renewal year projections be affected,
- FTES projections are approximately 200 below cap for 2011-12,
- FTES production for 2012-13, how impacted by the fee increase?
- Student Success Task Force Recommendations- impacts?
- Repeatability legislation – impacts?

Steve continued with a review of Tentative Increases for 2012 to include:

- TRAN cost (Tax Revenue Anticipation Note),
- SIS fee,
- PERS increase,
- Employee related expenses (step/column/longevity/reclass),
- Search consultant for President,
- FTES purchase, if needed,
- Other costs- related to production of additional FTES.

Possible savings, unknown at this time, may materialize to include:

- Collective bargaining agreements (wage concession, freezing or postponement of step/column increases, postponing reclass-equity study, etc.),
- Attrition, vacancy, retirement, and reorganization,
- Medical savings possible but cannot verify until audited--likely September,

- Reduction to General Fund support of the CDC,
- Reduced adjunct budget if workload trigger cuts occur.

Use of District one-time funds is problematic with a structural imbalance between revenues and expenses. Given the budget consists of 85% in salary and benefits, not enough options exist to balance the budget by addressing the remaining 15% solely. Most of the reductions imposed by the state are ongoing. With the exception of some permanent reductions in positions, the District's response to these ongoing reductions has largely been with temporary solutions including temporary compensation reductions and use of one-time funds. Temporary compensation reductions and use of one-time funds do not address the structural problem. Instead, they represent a response consisting of deferrals, thus renewing the problem each year. The multiple year deficit and structural imbalance will need to be addressed by some methodology that permanently reduces the expenditures to match the permanently reduced revenue.

Steve continued with an analysis of the actual Revenues and Expenses going back to 2008-09, which represented the high mark in terms of revenues.

- 2008-09: \$42,121,497,
- 2009-10: 1st year of cuts, total revenue reduced by \$2.69 M and expenses by \$2.68M,
- 2010-11: Not cuts by State, however expenses exceeded revenue by \$400,000,
- 2011-12: The adopted budget of \$37.5 M represented \$2.57 M reduction in revenues from the previous year and included the use of \$1.1 M in one-time funds, transferred from Capital Outlay and the Self Insurance fund.
- Academic Salaries were at \$15.2 M in 2010-11 reduced to \$13.8 M, which includes the 15 full time faculty retirements, wage concessions and decrease in the adjunct budget.
 - 2011-12 Revised Budget: Mid year cuts (surprises) came in the form of a deficit coefficient, resulting in \$822 M less income than originally anticipated.
 - Academic salaries must be increased (approximately \$300,000) to try to catch up to our target FTES.
 - Increased operations expenses for ISAs and shortfall in departmental savings, plus the trustee election (\$544,000),
 - GF support for CDC at \$125,000

2011-12 reflects a current out of balance figure of \$1.79M.

Steve then outlined the 2012-13 budget scenario using “worst case” factors without the various budget solutions in place. The resulting deficit total is approximately \$3.5 M and includes assumption such as workload/trigger cuts, no use of one-time district funds, no wage concessions, retirement incentive payout used to fill 3 faculty positions, and no increase in renewal of medical. It was suggested that the information relative to savings which are structural and ongoing (Academic Salaries, election savings) be represented in this analysis as ongoing, or structural savings.

In summary, much work lies ahead in construction of the budget and it appears the May Revise may look much alike the January budget. Plans are to begin the application for a TRAN to address the deferral of payments due to MPC.

- d) ***Smoking Policy BP 2240 [2nd reading] (Carsbia):** A recap was given on the board policy, similar to last meeting. At this point in recognizing that while this is a 2nd reading, CC must decide to retain existing policy with enhanced language regarding “designated areas” in the

place of “parking lots”, before forwarding a recommendation to the board. Issues of safety for students in parking lots as well as support for enforcement in providing a specific area lead to the suggestion for such designated areas. The subcommittee has identified designated areas. Carsbia will return with amended language.

3) Information Items (see available handouts):

- a) **Adjunct Hiring Procedures (Fred):** The *Adjunct Faculty Hiring Procedures-Joint Agreement* between the District and Academic Senate was presented and explained. It will be presented to the Board for adoption. Fred explained that the full time hiring process agreement was completed two years ago, at which time we then began the effort to revise the adjunct hiring procedures. Various members of the community believe that a broader and more open process is needed to increase the diversity amongst the adjunct faculty pool while also maintaining a high quality instruction. Earlier this year, the policy was brought to advisory groups and Academic Senate, resulting in a need for clarification best described in flowchart format. He then offered further explanation to the definition of “a vacancy”, when a hiring can be done from a pool, and when “recruitment” is required. Comments shared included concerns as to the amount of effort that must be expended and how the flow chart should be interpreted, all conversations for which various groups have already discussed. It was underscored that diversity within the adjunct faculty will not be attained without a policy to drive the effort. Situations will vary and the policy will rely upon the participation of the division chair and reasonable interpretation through its administration.

The policy was shared at AAAG, SSAG, Academic Senate and will be reviewed by EEOAC. The policy will be forwarded to the board shortly. Initial discussions which prompted the creation of this policy originated in EEOAC.

- b) **Accreditation Response – Timeline from Academic Affairs (Celine):** (deferred to next mtg).

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** (2nd 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 (1st reading).**

Next meeting – May 15 is the last meeting of the year, scheduled for the 2nd reading of Tentative Budget. May 21-23 is the May Revise ACBO Conf. College Council will plan not to meet on May 29th, unless absolutely necessary.

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**, (2nd 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, (1st 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 (1st 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** – (1st 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:

- MPC Technology Vision/Challenges:**
- Board Policy Revisions:** <http://mympc.mpc.edu/Committees/PACC/default.aspx>.
 - BP 3040 – Community Service** (2nd reading— pending Community Ed Task Force).
- Action Plans** (late spring?)
- 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 29th and June 12th for 1st/2nd readings of the Tentative Budget.