

Modesto Junior College
College Council Meeting Minutes
September 26, 2011

Present: Larry Calderon, Cece Hudelson-Putnam, Bill Kaiser, Don Low, Allan McKissick, Adrienne Peek, Joan Van Kuren, Karen Walters Dunlap, John Zamora,

Absent: Jillian Daly, Rosanne Faughn, Carmen Fernandez, Sam Pierstorff (Faculty Consultant to the Board), Doug Dyrssen (ASMJC)

Vacant: CSEA representative

Guests: Jenni Abbott, George Boodrookas, Ken Hart, Antoinette Herrera, Maurice McKinnon

Business

1. Review of Minutes

Action Item

The minutes of September 12, 2011 were approved by thumbs up vote.

2. Review of Agenda

Additions to the agenda:

1. Tobacco Free College (future)
2. Asthma Flag

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

3. Institutional Effectiveness 2011 Report

Ken Hart stated that he would be reviewing the report briefly with members. This is the fourth year that the Institutional Effectiveness report has been done at the college. The report has increased in length each year because there are more data requests. The first year the report was only 63 pages, second year 77 pages, third year 107 pages and this year it is 177 pages. Ken reported that he has had faculty respond to *Just the Facts* he puts out at the beginning of each week. Some faculty really like it and use it in their classes. Chapter 8 is the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) analysis for this year. Each year the report alternates between the CCSSE survey and the climate survey. New this year, is the information broken down by chapters on the web site, instead of scrolling down to the information (mjc.edu/facultyinformation/research). A brief description is given for each chapter.

The Executive Summary is online in a new way. The suggestion was made to approach the summary thematically with the following themes: Economic Conditions, Population Changes, Preparedness for College and College Participation, Student Access to MJC, MJC Student Success, and Internal Assessment.

Stanislaus County poverty status is an economic indicator and is shown from two perspectives: families and individuals (p. 15). From 2008-2009, the percentage of all families below poverty level increased

from 10.7 to 12.1 percent. Ken referred to characteristics of teenagers as being another family economic indicator (p. 17). From 2008-2009, the percentage of teenagers 15-19 years of age not enrolled in school remained about the same, at 15%. Of the 16 to 19 year old group in 2009, 6.5% were neither enrolled in school nor in the labor force.

The percentage of MJC students receiving Board of Governors' (BOG) Fee Waivers increased from 36.6% of total annual unduplicated MJC students in 2006-2007 to 49.5% of total annual MJC students in 2009-2010. This equals a 35.2 percent increase in four years.

MJC enrollment by FTES in Distance Ed (DE) by Taxonomy of Program (TOP) code are indicated by breakdown of division/department from fall 2008 to spring 2010 (p. 43-47). Distance Ed FTES, as a percentage of total MJC FTES increased slightly from 14.3% in fall 2008 to 14.9% in fall 2010. DE FTES decreased from 16.1% in spring 2008 to 14.9% in spring 2010. DE FTES declined in most divisions except the Technical Education and Business, Behavioral & Social Science divisions. Ken pointed out that it is important to consider why non-DE courses have a higher success rate than DE. Students are failing miserably in some DE courses.

Student Success is measured by retention rate and success rate (p. 51). Course retention rates have gradually increased from 80.3% in fall 2005 to 83.5% in fall 2010. California Community College's rates have remained slightly higher than MJC's rates from fall 2004 to fall 2010. Course success rates for MJC students have fluctuated slightly but have increased from 60.5% in fall 2005 to 63.7% in fall 2010. California Community Colleges have remained higher than MJC over the seven fall semesters indicated in the report. Success and retention rates broken down by department and course can be found starting on page 53.

Allied Health graduates and licensure exam pass rates are indicated on page 131. Although the number of registered nursing graduates decreased slightly from 2008-2009, the number of graduates taking the exam and the percentage of graduates passing the exam increased. The majority of pass rates for other programs fluctuated during this time period.

Ken brought attention to the WSCH/FTEF information broken down by division and department which Planning & Budget requested (p. 147). Enrollment and FTES are also broken down by division/department and begin on page 151.

Cece Hudelson-Putnam added that she is hearing that our students have no information on how to use Blackboard or whatever is needed for Distance Ed courses.

4. Technology Plan - Revisited

Karen Walters Dunlap reported that the Technology Plan has been provided to the Senate electronically and there is a meeting tomorrow for the Senate to give feedback. John Zamora responded that suggestions are being taken and incorporated into the document. Jenni Abbott added that the link went out to the Senate and she made all the changes suggested by College Council and Planning & Budget.

Joan Van Kuren reported that she has not heard of any feedback from CSEA members. Adrienne Peek reported hearing nothing from the Senate.

Action

The Technology Plan will be revisited by College Council at the October 10 meeting for final approval.

INSTRUCTION

5. Accreditation/Institutional Effectiveness Committee (AIE)

Karen Walters Dunlap reminded members that program review is due October 14th. On November 4th, requests go to appropriate planning groups. Deans and unit managers have until November 4th to complete prioritization. Karen reported that the program review trainings have been well attended. On December 9th, AIE will read everyone's program review and recommend areas of improvement. If members have an interest in participating, let Adrienne Peek know. This will be a good across the board of program review and a collegial dialogue where the group looks at what everyone is doing.

6. Institutional Development/Planning

Larry Calderon stated that the discussion we have on anything is going to require us to have a full membership. Recommendations from the Senate and classified are needed to identify how many people we need. He would like to use College Council to do some deep diving into issues facing colleges and affecting this institution. People involved in these things across the campus really need to be at the table and it is going to require all of us having discussion collectively. Before we can put anything in place for staff development and resource management, we need to have discussion. This group would be an advisory to the president's office. Anything coming out would go to the smaller group, the President's Cabinet. Larry added that it is important to begin to understand who should be around the table to begin a robust discussion.

Allan McKissick asked how does this relate to share governance? He also sees it as a venue for communication. Allan quoted, in part, from 10 + 1 as follows: *The Board of Trustees shall "rely Primarily" upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate in selected areas.*

Larry Calderon clarified that he is seeking collaborative input before a decision is made.

Adrienne Peek stated that right now, there is not consensus about expanding College Council and the Planning & Budget Committee opposes it.

Larry Calderon restated that he would like representatives from college stakeholders to participate. Others could be invited if members would like.

John Zamora, speaking for himself, expressed the sentiment that he would like College Council to return where it once was. He agrees with having a larger group, but they have to discuss at the Senate to flush things out. He wants to bring people together to discuss.

Larry Calderon responded that the last thing he wants to do is cause more disruption to the college.

Allan McKissick stated that he would like to see College Council preeminent instead of a reporting out body. Cece Hudelson-Putnam suggested maybe trying it for a couple of times and bring in PBC and AIE.

Larry Calderon proposed that the VP of Administrative Services will be representing him on the Planning & Budget Committee. Larry Calderon suggested that the Facilities Master Plan, Educational Master Plan, and Strategic Plan discussion should be discussed outside and as advisory to resource management.

Allan McKissick responded that he doesn't think the president is hearing direct disagreement except for maybe regarding shared governance. He added that what you are hearing is members' frustration and

confusion on how PBC has gone through a couple of incarnations. He stated that as long as it (concept) is open to mutual 10 + 1, he is all in agreement.

Larry Calderon clarified that he is proposing, *can we agree to start the conversation and can we agree to discuss what the challenges are*, because they are huge. He added that we have to start some place.

Adrienne Peek added that she also has the fear that the new president will come aboard and change everything again.

Allan McKissick said that he would like College Council to return to a more centralized place. He doesn't feel it is a problem expanding the group. Larry Calderon responded that anybody who should have a vested interest in planning should participate.

Adrienne Peek asked about reassigned time. Larry Calderon responded to schedule late enough in the afternoon that it wouldn't interfere with classes and names could be gathered and fiscal implications could be determined. He added to find out who is willing and interested and go from there.

Allan McKissick pointed out that reps report to a cross section of employees. Larry Calderon responded that there are people that work inside buildings and outside buildings and he feels it is important to have their input. Allan stated that delegates to the Senate vary by division and what if every delegate from divisions came to College Council? He added that there has to be a concrete proposal for the Senate to discuss.

John Zamora suggested that this could be a discussion item as a general concept.

7. Policy & Procedures Review

Adrienne Peek informed members that the Policy & Procedures are under review right now and they need feedback comments. Policy & Procedures are posted on the Senate web site. If members are interested, they can look at them and if there are any issues, please tell her and she will take the issues back to the Policy & Procedures committee. Adrienne Peek, Brian Sinclair and Jeff Swank are MJC members of the committee. The policy and procedures are reviewed on an ongoing cycle. Joan Van Kuren added that Rosanne Faughn is still looking for a Classified Staff Advisory Council (CSAC) rep for the committee.

8. Measure E Task Force

Larry Calderon reported that the task force got to a point where the deficit was reduced to \$250,000 but we are not out of the woods yet. There are people who don't have a place to go to and the task force hasn't been able to address that yet. The next meeting is going to look at secondary requests. A lot of work still needs to be done. The task force reached closure on simply agreement of process. A plan was made for reconciliation deficit.

STUDENT SERVICES

No report.

COLLEGE ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

9. Budget

No report.

10. Facilities/Capital Construction

No report.

CONSTITUENT REPORTS

Due to the meeting running past 5:30 p.m., constituent reports were not given.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

FUTURE AGENDA

1. Tobacco Free College
2. Asthma Flag
3. Technology Plan – Final approval

ADJOURNMENT