

Modesto Junior College
Planning & Budget Committee
Meeting Minutes
September 2, 2011

Present:

Larry Calderon, Co-Chair, MJC President (non-voting)
Adrienne Peek, Co-Chair, Academic Senate President (non-voting)
Jenni Abbott, Director of Grants & Resource Development
Iris Carroll, Learning Resources Liaison, Academic Senate appointee
Jim Clarke, Technology/Distance Education Liaison, Academic Senate appointee
Paul Cripe, Academic Senate appointee
Carmen Fernandez, Vice President of College Administrative Services
Rose LaMont, YFA Budget Analyst
Maurice McKinnon, Instructional Dean
Martha Robles, Student Services Administrator
Karen Walters Dunlap, Vice President of Instruction
David Ward, YFA appointee
Robin Jones, ASMJC Student Rep

Absent:

Kevin Alavezos, Academic Senate appointee
Jane Chawinga, YCCD Internal Auditor and Budget Analyst (ex-officio)
Rosanne Faughn, CSEA appointee
Don Low, Vice President of Student Services
Nancy Sill, YFA appointee
Joan Van Kuren, CSEA appointee

Vacant:

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

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

Business

1. Review of Minutes

Action Item

The minutes of May 16, 2011 and June 23, 2011 were accepted as distributed with no objections.

2. Strategic Plan crosswalk with YCCD

Larry Calderon explained to members that he feels that strategic planning and budget should be separated and have a separation of charge.

Jim Clarke pointed out that we have a fairly good technology *draft* plan that needs to be approved in order to move forward. PBC needs to look at the strategic plan in order to allocate technology resources so we can institutionalize technology resources.

Larry stated that to be effective, the college needs a fully developed educational master plan, technology plan, institutional development plan, and a facilities master plan. Plans need to be in place then informed discussion can take place regarding gaps and then develop priorities. From the plans, there are a whole series of funding needs that can be taken to the budget committee. This is a dynamic process that is constantly being developed and taking place. He reiterated, that there would be a budget committee and a planning committee as two separate committees in lieu of the Planning & Budget Committee.

Jim Clarke responded that the Planning & Budget Committee did a pretty good job with the councils using program review, but no one knew exactly what the titles meant for some of the positions and that is why they came up with the technology plan that explains it. He felt that a Technology Council would explain more in detail what these positions will do.

Adrienne Peek stated that when we revised the strategic plan, we need assessment discussion so we know what works and what doesn't and therefore improving that process. Karen Walters Dunlap added that certainly the strategic plan needs to be redone and benchmarks incorporated.

Larry Calderon committed to facilitating it in the president's office and honoring it. He requested that members take this information back for discussion with your constituents and if it makes sense, we will be more proactive and formalize.

Action

There was general consensus to create a robust representative group to redo the strategic plan.

Larry Calderon stated that this institutional development group would be looking at everything, bringing information forward so we can become more informed. It would be an advisory body to the president and he is committed to taking the lead.

Jim Clarke reminded members of discussion for a disaster plan in the case of more cuts, as an example. Larry Calderon responded that the planning committee would develop this. He will

take this information back to the expanded President's Cabinet to hear once again and for recommendations from that group.

Action

There was general consensus around the idea of exploring the possibility of the Planning & Budget Committee splitting into a planning committee and a budget committee. Additional discussion will ensue at the next meeting.

3. Technology Plan

Jenni Abbott explained that she and others who are lay people do not necessarily see the technology needs that exist. This work plan includes outcome measures. Jim Clarke pointed out that there has never been a distance education plan. He added that one of the issues is retention and making sure those concerns are addressed.

Adrienne Peek stated that she would like to how this plan improves student learning. She cautioned that everything we do, we need to demonstrate how this is improving student learning and she is not seeing that here in the plan. Karen Walters Dunlap said that we do not have an assessment to see if we are improving. Jim Clarke suggested asking Ken Hart to tell us how to assess this plan.

Jim Clarke said currently, there is no plan for resourcing all the different technology items going on out there, and while there is no centralized planning for labs yet, IT is expected to support.

Jenni Abbott went over the five goal areas (listed below) which have objectives tied to them as well as an explanation of the current situation in the plan.

Goal 1: Ensure faculty and staff receive adequate training and professional development in order to assure successful implementation and utilization of technologies.

Goal 2: Establish procedures for the evaluation, adoption and proper resourcing of campus technologies.

Goal 3: Develop and maintain minimum technology standards for hardware, software and support.

Goal 4: Fully incorporate funding for technology into the college budget, following the State Chancellor's IT staffing recommendations, and establish a budgetary framework for sustaining existing technology and integrating new technologies.

Goal 5: Become a leader in the California Community College System in providing all MJC students with adequate access to training, support and current learning technologies; and the necessary skills required in a technology-based society.

Maurice McKinnon suggested that it should be clarified what an open lab is and verify the number of labs cited in the document. Jim Clarke suggested that an operational definition of what an open lab is could be stated.

Jenni Abbott informed members that students and faculty were surveyed last fall regarding technology. The group has talked about doing a software survey but it is very difficult to facilitate.

Iris Carroll added that the plan is a step toward consistency. Rose LaMont asked if 3.1b. refers to IT staff. Jenni responded, that it is and she will clarify that in the document.

Jim Clarke cautioned that he does not want to get mired down waiting until it is perfect as we need to have something in place. He suggested getting Ken Hart involved in measuring outcomes.

Adrienne Peek said that if resources are going to be directed to something you need to show that these resources improve student learning to justify resource allocation. She felt that is a real weakness that the student learning component is not in the document. Adrienne agreed to attend future meetings and help with developing reliable measures.

Paul Cripe stated that as time goes on, certain tools just become indispensable, like computers. It seems a waste of resources to repeatedly measure the activities of technology.

Jim Clarke responded that anything new, we really need to assess. He added that we do not have a group that can sit down and make decisions on the best path to go down.

Karen Walters Dunlap suggested sending the plan out with the caveat that there will be a method of assessing. She pointed out that Student Services is missing.

Jim Clarke stated that this is an attempt to bring all technology together for the campus. Karen Walters Dunlap stated that she would like to structure the committee where we have broad representation from all faculty areas.

Jim Clarke felt that the whole piece that is missing is training and assessment for distance education instruction. Iris Carroll pointed out that distance education has not been institutionalized at MJC.

4. Campus Technology Council (CTC)

Adrienne Peek suggested establishing staggering terms for membership with faculty on the council needing to be approved by the Senate. Karen Walters Dunlap suggested the permanent dean in the library or the Director of Media and Technology as a co-chair. As a committee, the VP of College Services needs to be on the membership. The Technology Committee will expand to a council to review technology needs from program review. The committee had some concerns about the charter.

Karen Walters Dunlap reminded members that criteria that will be used needs to be established by the end of September.

Action

There was general consensus to approve the Technology Plan and Council with suggestions for composition, terms, lab definition, and charter revision.

Jenni Abbott will make changes to the document and forward to College Council.

5. Budget

Larry Calderon informed members that he is still trying to clarify the budget in the whole process and positions that were rified. He reported taking steps to reinstate the Director of College Research position. He is also interested in bringing back, at some level, the Marketing and Public Relations Officer position. He would also like to consider advertising the vacated Instructional Support Technician position in Ag.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT