

**Modesto Junior College
Planning & Budget Committee
Meeting Minutes
September 16, 2011**

Present:

Adrienne Peek, Co-Chair, Academic Senate President (non-voting)
Kevin Alavezos, Academic Senate appointee
Iris Carroll, Learning Resources Liaison, Academic Senate appointee
Jane Chawinga, YCCD Internal Auditor and Budget Analyst (ex-officio)
Paul Cripe, Academic Senate appointee
Carmen Fernandez, Vice President of College Administrative Services
Rosanne Faughn, CSEA appointee
Rose LaMont, YFA Budget Analyst
Don Low, Vice President of Student Services
Maurice McKinnon, Instructional Dean
Jim Sahlman, Technology/Distance Education Liaison, Academic Senate appointee
Nancy Sill, YFA appointee
Joan Van Kuren, CSEA appointee
Karen Walters Dunlap, Vice President of Instruction
Robin Jones, ASMJC Student Rep

Absent:

Larry Calderon, Co-Chair, MJC President (non-voting)
Jenni Abbott, Director Grants & Resource Development
Martha Robles, Student Services Administrator

Vacant:

Director of Research and Planning (ex-officio)
Faculty Career Technical Education Liaison (Academic Senate appointee)

Guest:

Ken Hart

Check In – What are you Hearing? (not recorded)

Business

1. Review of Minutes

Action Item

Carmen Fernandez moved to approve the minutes of May 16, 2011. Iris Carroll seconded. The minutes were approved by aye vote.

Iris Carroll moved to approve the minutes of June 23, 2011. Maurice McKinnon seconded. The minutes were approved by aye vote.

There were several insertions/deletions requested by members to be reflected in the final version of the minutes of September 2, 2011. Carmen Fernandez moved to approve the minutes of September 2, 2011 with corrections. Iris Carroll seconded. The minutes of September 2, 2011 were approved as amended.

2. Institutional Effectiveness 2011 Report

Ken Hart, College Research Analyst, informed members that this is kind of a heads up as this is the time of year he presents to planning groups. This is MJC's fourth Institutional Effectiveness report. The report continues to grow in length each year due to more requirements being included and additional items PBC wants included. Ken reviewed the table of contents. The report alternates between the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and the climate survey each year. Chapter 8 has highlights from the CCSSE 2011 report. New this year, is the information broken down by chapters on the web site, instead of having to scroll down. A brief description is given for each chapter. In the Executive Summary, the economy continues to be the most popular theme.

Stanislaus County poverty status is another 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. For families with children under 18 years of age, the percent below poverty level increased from 16% to 17.6%. Educational attainment in Stanislaus County for the population 25 and older is about half of what it is in California and is broken down in seven categories from less than 9th grade to graduate or professional degree (p. 4). Earnings and poverty rate correlations are also charted on this page. Ken referred to the 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%. Over 1/3 of that age group continues to live in a male or female (no spouse) householder family household or non-family household. Of teenagers 16 to 19 years old, the percentage in the labor force decreased from 42.9% in 2008 to 39.2% in 2009. Of the 16 to 19 year old group in 2009, 6.5% were neither enrolled in school nor in the labor force.

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). DE 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.

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.

Ken Hart pointed out that it is important to consider why non-DE courses have a higher success rate than DE. Both are being offered, but students are failing miserably in some DE courses.

Allied Health graduates and licensure exam pass rates are indicated on page 131. Although the number of registered nursing graduates decreased slightly from 2008-09 to 2009-10, 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 charter broken down by division and department which PBC requested (p. 147). Enrollment and FTES are also broken down by division/department and begin on page 151.

3. Splitting the Planning & Budget Committee - Discussion

Adrienne Peek started the discussion by informing members that the president has suggested that it might be a good idea to split the Planning & Budget Committee and have a larger group that would be the college planning for institutional development. Dr. Calderon has talked to College Council regarding this and envisions this would be a much expanded version of College Council. He has asked the Senate and other constituents groups to also consider the possibility of adding 1 or 2 representatives from each academic division and the Student Services unit. College Council would be the planning body and the budget committee would be the operational body and take the advice of planning.

Jim Sahlman asked if this change would go back to the Senate. Adrienne responded that today PBC is a Senate committee and if we come to some consensus of how we want to go forward, she would ask this committee to send a resolution to the Senate. She added that there is discussion at the college regarding how a college-wide committee can also be a Senate committee. The president has stated that the Academic Senate does not have the right to appoint him to committees?

Paul Cripe felt that there are some things broken around here and he would like to fix them. He has been on this committee since its inception and there seems to him to be sweeping changes taking place and it tends to feel like we are spinning our wheels. He stated he would view success as how much of what we do does not get swept. He added that if it gets changed again in six months, he would like to start measuring success by what we do that lasts.

Adrienne Peek said her concern is that we not do it fast, even if it takes a whole semester, she hopes we can get it right this time. If we do restructure, we need to be really clear about how it works so when someone new comes in, we can say *this is how we do it*. Adrienne added that when we did the current structure, it was done in a hurry and it was the year of *good enough*. It was decided that we would establish it, work with it, and go forth. Now it is time for us to take a look at it.

Rose LaMont felt that there is merit to splitting because we have not been able to address planning. The very important thing is the relationship between the two groups. It took a good year to figure out the relationship between the Accreditation/Institutional Effectiveness Committee (AIE) and PBC.

Jim Sahlman suggested that it doesn't have to be either/or regardless of who houses the committee. It makes sense for the faculty to want to ratify the faculty hiring prioritization list and CSEA to ratify their list. He thinks initially that is the discussion that has to get through. It doesn't have to be one way or the other. Things that relate to faculty deserve to go back to faculty for review and classified for classified as well.

Nancy Sill asked if in separating the planning & budget functions, we could actually make a subcommittee of this body? She added that we want full integration of planning and budget, and if we separate now she doesn't feel it is going to help our effort. Even when you hire one of anything, it has to fit the whole puzzle. Everything would come to this body. A lot more disclosure has to come to this body. Iris Carroll suggested work groups. Nancy responded they could be focus groups, adding that culturally, reorganizing College Council is going to cause chaos.

Maurice McKinnon concurred that it was *good enough*. We have to look at conditions we have been working in. We have been under duress, and we should examine where we are and figure out where we go from here.

Adrienne Peek reminded members that there are some aspects of what we put in place that got us off probation. The college had to make some budget decisions last year in a hurry, and so our processes were bypassed because they take time. There's no way to establish processes that work that fast.

Karen Walters Dunlap clarified that the processes are in place, but because of financial exigency, they weren't used. What is not working needs to be clearly defined. We have had four presidents in three years, and a financial crisis hit and the focus changed campus wide and process wasn't followed.

Iris Carroll stated that there is really a lack of vision of ourselves. She is in favor of Nancy Sill's suggestion of expanding this committee to do institutional planning/development. She added that we seem to be concerned with integrating planning and budget and if we split, it won't be.

Rosanne Faughn informed members that MJC had a budget committee before PBC with a charge of lottery and resource allocation. Back then there were 59 committees and now we have work groups and task forces. When PBC was created, it had good merits and intentions to it. To her, the thought of splitting it back up again just seems like three steps back and we need to move forward, and honestly, we are still broken. We do need to put something in place and know what we are doing as a body to be able to move forward. She doesn't want to have to ask her group for an answer in two weeks, she wants to be able to take our time.

Paul Cripe stated that there is a tremendous lack of knowledge about what PBC actually did. We did things with hiring prioritization for things that needed to be done. We did a lot of things right, but folks think we did things last spring that we didn't do. There were some people who did some good things at this table. If six months from now someone comes in and says this isn't the way to do it, what are we going to say? He would like us to see what our current president thinks. It could be that we have finally gotten to the point where we are doing it right.

Kevin Alavezos added that without knowing what is not working, it is hard to know what to do. He is still not clear on what is not working. Paul Cripe responded that he doesn't think what happened last semester is what is wrong.

Iris Carroll stated that the major plan that should drive us doesn't exist or is outdated. She asked if we are using a master plan the consultants came up with for us? She thinks strategic planning should drive us. She also does not want to see another leader come in and tell us how we need to change. If we are part of the solution now, if we don't agree with him, when a new person comes in, we can defend our decision. She loves the idea of working with this committee, expanding it and making it work as it was envisioned.

Jim Sahlman said that somewhere along the list he would like to have a plan for the worst case scenario. A lot of us do not consider a disaster plan. He added that the worst part about last year was the tearing away of the fabric of who we are. He doesn't want to see that happen again.

Karen Walters Dunlap would like to see this committee be the planning body with a budget workgroup. We have used those processes in place and allotted resources. PBC did do program review resource allocation and made changes to the process. The committee is not just spinning its wheels; we are making real progress. She thinks the ideas need to come from this group, but she likes the idea of splitting the functions and delegating the budget piece to a workgroup of the P&B Committee. Sierra College had a Strategic Planning and Budget Committee instead of College Council. Karen stressed that we have to decide what we want. Dr. Calderon has experience in strategic planning, and Karen thinks he would be a good resource for helping us figure out if and how we want to restructure ourselves.

Action

There was general consensus to not split the Planning & Budget Committee. The committee wishes to keep PBC intact and address any challenges we may face. There was also consensus to employ Dr. Calderon's expertise to help PBC shape our future in a direction to help MJC.

Adrienne Peek will discuss today's meeting with Dr. Calderon.

4. Attendee for the Regional Accreditation Workshop

Rose LaMont will attend the all day regional accreditation workshop, sponsored by MJC on Nov 4 at MSR.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT