

**MPC Academic Senate
Meeting Minutes
3 October 2013**

I. Opening Business

A. Call to order and roll call

- Senate President Fred Hochstaedter (FH) called the meeting to order at 2:30.

Present:

- Brian Brady
- Kathleen Clark, Vice President
- Alexis Copeland
- Merry Dennehy
- Paola Gilbert
- Alfred Hochstaedter, President
- Elias Kary
- Robynn Smith
- Sandra Washington
- Catherine Webb, Secretary

Guests:

- Sunshine Giesler, CAC Chair
- Dr. Marty Johnson, Vice President of Student Services
- Dr. Céline Pinet, Vice President of Academic Affairs
- Dr. Rosaleen Ryan, Office of Institutional Research
- Dr. Walt Tribley, Superintendent/President

Absent:

- Mark Clements
- Lauren Handley
- Sue Hanna
- Eric Ogata
- Kevin Raskoff
- Mike Torres

B. Approval of Draft Minutes from 9/19/2013 Meeting

- Merry Dennehy (MD) moved to approve the minutes. Elias Kary (EK) seconded.
Motion carried.

II. Reports

A. President/SLO Committee Report, Fred Hochstaedter (FH)

- ASCCC
 - FH reported that Paola Gilbert (PG) has agreed to be our ASCCC delegate to the Fall 2013 Plenary.

- College Council (met 9/24 & 10/1)
 - College Council has produced a draft document for prioritizing budget decisions. The document covers three areas: Enrollment growth, cutting costs, and revenue generation.
 - FH noted that the Academic Senate will discuss this document later on today's agenda.
- AAAG (met 10/2)
 - AAAG will begin its annual discussion of prioritized faculty hires at its next meeting. The current guess for the number of new faculty to be hired is five.
- Board of Trustees (met 9/??)
 - FH presented the 2012-2013 SLO Assessment report to the Board of Trustees.

B. COC (Possible ACTION item)

- The following committee vacancies were discussed:
 - Equivalency Committee:
 - We need an Academic Senate representative to replace Janine Wilson, who is moving out of the area.
 - Robynn Smith (RS) indicated that she would consider this role.
 - Institutional Committee on Distance Education (ICDE)
 - Joel Pickering has agreed to be nominated to replace Elizabeth Bishop as Physical Sciences representative.
 - MD moved to approve the nomination. Catherine Webb (CW) seconded. Motion carried.
- FH gave an update on the status of the Basic Skills committee.
 - No coordinator has been found to date. FH and MD are working on writing up an internal announcement that will go out to the campus. The announcement will describe the essential functions of the role and emphasize that it might be ideal to split the job between one person from Instructional Services and one from Student Services.

C. Accreditation Report (Catherine Webb)

- CW reported on the ACCJC workshop for ALOs that she attended with Celine Pinet (CP).
- During the first half of the workshop, the presenters (John Nixon and Krista Johns, both from ACCJC) discussed new (or newish) federal regulations that accrediting agencies are being asked to address through the accreditation process. CW reported on some broad themes that seemed to emerge from the presentation.
 - Federal Accountability Requirements were a big topic.
 - ACCJC's view is that the point of accreditation is twofold: (1) provide quality assurance to the public – i.e., show that institutions are meeting quality

- standards and achieving their stated educational mission; (2) stimulate and support institutional improvements.
- For better or worse, accreditation agencies are becoming gatekeepers for federal financial aid and grant funds. USDE is concerned with “quality” in the sense of “is this institution of sufficient quality for its students to qualify for financial aid,” and are taxpayers getting a good return on the investment of public funds.
- Completion, success, “quality of a degree” –national conversations about these things are leading to changing federal regulations, and new requirements from accrediting agencies.
 - For example, we are seeing more of a focus on student learning outcomes and data about how outcomes achieved.
 - Institutions have been asked to define “institution-set standards” for student achievement and learning, based on data such as course completion, persistence, job placement rates, etc. Per ACCJC, these should be operational standards, rather than aspirational. In other words, they should be realistic targets based on what is actually happening with our students now.
 - More and more, the Commission will be looking at our data – how we analyze it, how we talk about the analysis, and how we use the results of the analysis to make decisions about improvement.
 - We were also given some additional information about the fiscal review letters that were sent to colleges.
 - Accrediting bodies have been ask to demonstrate to the USDE that they are monitoring institutions and that they are following up on data indicators of concern in a timely fashion. Fiscal review processes are one of the ways that ACCJC complies with this requirement.
 - This is the second year that fiscal review letters have gone out. The first year 30 letters went out; this year there were 40.
 - The workshop presenters also noted that several of the letters that went out this year were sent because of incorrect data entry – in other words, when the annual financial reports were filed, the data wasn’t accurate.
 - PG: Were the 40 letters just in the California community college system?
 - CW: They did not specify whether this was 40 community colleges or 40 institutions – but they do accredit schools outside of the CCC system.
 - Dr. Tribely (WT) commented that when he called the ACCJC to find out more about our letter, he was told that 14 schools had received letters.
 - Kathleen Clark (KC): Were there errors in the way our data was reported that led to our Fiscal Review status?
 - WT clarified that while there may have been things in our financial report that did not tell the whole story, the continued low enrollment is

concerning; this is not something that we have misinterpreted, and something that we need to improve on even without a Fiscal Review letter.

- During the second half of the workshop, attendees were giving a working draft of the proposed changes to the accreditation standards, and asked to provide feedback.
 - Feedback will also be gathered at the CIO workshop at the end of October. Since there are limited opportunities for faculty feedback into the standards, CW noted that we have an excellent opportunity to review the proposed changes and send feedback to the CIO conference with CP.
 - CW distributed copies of the proposed draft.
 - Senators agreed to review the draft standards and send comments to CW via email by the end of the day on Tuesday, 10/15, in preparation for a guided discussion at the 10/17 Academic Senate meeting.

D. CAC Report (Sunshine Giesler)

- Sushine Giesler (SG) joined the Academic Senate to discuss upcoming [CAC deadlines](#).
 - Although the CAC deadlines went out as an email, SG asked everyone to communicate the deadlines to divisions as they are coming up quickly.
 - For spring 2014 approval, last meeting is next Wednesday (10/9).
 - Last meeting for Fall 2014 courses will be Dec 11.
 - Feb/Mar meetings will be used for catalog clean-up.
- FH asked SG about a question that came up during our last Academic Senate meeting, specifically, whether it would be possible for CAC to help training for how to do SB1440 revisions. Per an email from Michael Gilmartin, this seems feasible.
 - SG: Yes, this is possible. Spanish and Philosophy going through SB1440 revisions now, and degrees with emphasis will be coming next. It's a bit of a moving target, but training shouldn't be difficult.
- RS noted that the Art department has a lot of courses in the pipeline. How the committee determine which courses are approved at what time, and how is this communicated to divisions?
 - SG: This is something that CAC has discussed in terms of sustainability –i.e., what's the sustainability of this class, and this program? How many many classes do we need in order to sustain the program? We do need to get back to the ART courses and see what is sustainable.
 - RS: Who will be having that discussion? Celine and CAC?
 - SG: We will bring the division in, too. It's good now that Gamble Madson [from the Art Department] is joining CAC, so Art will representation there.
 - RS noted that many new courses were created to address the repeatability limits, and expressed concern about having them in place when students need them. Additionally, it's important for people who have written classes to know

that writing a course automatically mean that it will be approved.

- CP pointed out that CAC also ensures that we are complying with Title 5 requirements. In particular, we are now beginning to think about the limits for families of related courses.
 - SG: Yes, we need to look at related content. We are talking to faculty to define these related courses, because we can only have 4 – and we need to justify this to the CCCC. If they seem *too* related, we can't justify approving them.
- FH suggested that we agendize the topic of how information about “related content” courses might be communicated for a future meeting.
 - RS commented that communication about this topic is important. CAC is doing the best they can with the requirements that they are receiving, but if we don't have a conversation about this topic, we won't understand why we don't have an art department, or a theater department, or a music department.

III. Old Business

A. Responding to Questions posed by the College Council

- Via [an email](#), the College Council co-chairs asked members of the Academic Senate and the three advisory groups to review the list of budget-balancing ideas and provide feedback, keeping the following questions in mind:
 - Do you think the following lists capture the best ideas?
 - Is the rank order under each area appropriate?
 - Many of the ideas listed will not help balance the budget this year. However, if they are implemented, could they be used to position us for the future?
 - Is there anything you would add or delete from the lists?
- To begin the conversation, FH asked about the issue of ranking each idea. There is no information on the list that tells us how much savings (or FTES) would be generated. It is difficult to rank them without knowing the details.
 - RS agreed that we need additional data on the effect the ideas are expected to have.
- EK commented that “cost-cutting” ideas are the first group on the list. By listing that first, it seems that we risk making a shift to a culture where cutting is our first priority rather than enrollment growth.
 - FH: that could be part of our feedback.
- CW noted that any explicit retention efforts seem to be missing from this list. If we are focused on growing enrollment at the expense of the retention of our current students, we will always be trying to recapture students that we are losing. In other words, we will constantly be trying to maintain enrollment levels rather than grow them.
 - RS, Sandra Washington (SW), and EK spoke in support of student clubs, and the way that they feed into programs and help students build and maintain

- connections to campus – all of which supports retention.
- EK suggested that more eight-week classes would also help retention, noting personal experiences where students begin the semester in one 8-week class and then immediately re-enroll for the second half of the semester.
- EK suggested that we rethink how summer semester is scheduled. Students may not want to give up 6 or 8 weeks of their summer. Increased flexibility for course scheduling would allow faculty to offer 2 or 4-week intensive courses.
 - FH noted that in the past, Michael Gilmartin has indicated that scheduling courses with different start dates is administratively challenging.
 - CP: Yes, this is difficult. Without consistency, it is hard for students to know when they are starting. But we could market this in a different way, or have one or two standard start dates.
 - PG suggested that we look at summer offerings to take advantage of 4-year students who are home for the summer. For example, we could offer GE requirements that are impacted at 4-year schools.
 - EK: The 4-year system is set up with the assumption that students go home for the holidays. Maybe students would be willing to sign up for short courses during those times to take advantage of their breaks.
 - RS: A lot of this comes down to marketing. MPC has never been very good at marketing. We're trying not to spend money, but creative ways of offering courses is going to require spending money for marketing. We might be able to get people who would take a shorter course, but we can't just add those offerings to a schedule and not let people know that they're there.
 - EK: Social media might fill in the gaps for us. We should focus on creating a better package, and then letting students get the word out through word of mouth.
 - RS: Yes, but we also have two different populations, and we need to work at reaching both.
 - SW: If Student Services knows what the "package" of offerings is early, we can help to get that word out.
- PG asked whether we have considered partnering with CSUMB for workload courses, following City College/UC Davis model. Or what other partnerships with CSUMB could we have, not just the international programs that are listed?
 - WT: We are exploring this. We might want to work with CSUMB and offer to help with developmental courses, for example. For international students, In-country recruiters would also help recruit the students, and then we could partner CSUMB for dorms, etc.
 - SW noted that she once had a high school student who was a candidate for the Matsui scholarship, but as a condition of the scholarship, he was required to go to Hartnell for 2 years, and then finish at CSUMB for the 3rd year. Have we considered a partnership like that?

- WT: It would be great if we could do that – but getting the underwriting from a donor like Matsui is rare.
 - RS: We used to have a very large and successful international program here. It was lucrative, and brought wonderful diversity to the campus. After 9/11 it was a challenge to handle the visas, so it was discontinued.
- FH summarized the conversation and the feedback that we want to deliver to College Council:
 - This is a very daunting task.
 - It is difficult to prioritize any of these ideas without more data.
 - There are lots of ideas on the list about new enrollment, but we would like to see more focus on retention. Some ideas include:
 - Clubs.
 - Creative packaging for timing of classes (recognizing that it is difficult from Student Services end)
 - Marketing could help with communicating course offerings
 - We are excited by the prospect of international students again populating our campus.

B. Academic Senate Goals and Objectives

- FH presented the [updated goals and objectives](#), with new goal language that had been sent from the goal groups since our previous meeting.
 - CP asked about the BSI-level content course listed as an objective of the group working on collaboration between instructional and student services faculty group. Would basic skills faculty create the courses?
 - FH: Conversation is ongoing about how these courses would be developed.
 - CW: We have discussed these as 1 or 2-unit classes that would provide additional information about content areas that aren't typically thought of as "Basic Skills" areas. We are still discussing whether they would skills building or an introduction to the content.
 - PG suggested that the objective of the Deficit Reduction goal be restated so that it has more to do with communication.
 - FH & PG agreed to work on the wording of this objective.
- FH: Traditionally, the Academic Senate has endorsed the goals. Are we ready to go with this?
 - The group endorsed the goals (with the understanding that the objective for the deficit reduction group will be revised) by consensus.

IV. New Business

A. MPC Enrollment & Demographic Trends (Rosaleen Ryan)

- Rosaleen Ryan (RR) gave a presentation titled "[MPC Enrollment and Demographic Trends: Implications for Access and Success.](#)"

- The presentation compares the fall 2010 and fall 2013 student populations along several key demographic indicators, including headcount by location, city of residence, ethnicity, age, educational goal, and unit load, number of noncredit enrollments, and number of Basic Skills enrollments.
- The comparison shows that our current student population is younger, slightly more ethnically diverse, less college-ready, and more focused on transfer than it was in fall 2010. The headcount at our main campus has shrunk, but headcounts at both Marina and in DE courses have grown.
- RR also gave this presentation to the Board at the 9/25/13 meeting to give Board members a better idea about who are students are and what trends we are seeing as the demographics begin to change.
 - This presentation provides context for a series of additional reports RR will give to the Board in future months. The topics of those upcoming reports will be as follows:
 - Basic Skills Math, ENGL, and ENSL Success (November)
 - Success through the Lens of Equity (January)
 - Retention & Success in Face-to-Face and DE Courses (February)
- PG noted that the data in the presentation is expressed as a percentage in most cases. If enrollment is going down, is percentage the most relevant way to express the trends? Would the change in percentage be as big if the enrollment had stayed the same?
 - RR: The actual “n” is listed, as well. The percentage is still important. For example, it tells what percent of your students need to take a Basic Skills ENGL or Math course at any given time, regardless of the actual headcount on campus.
- FH: What are the implications for success and access when we look at these trends?
 - RR spoke about success implications using “age” as an example. Statewide, older students do better in terms of completion – but if our population is younger, what are the implications for us?
- EK pointed out that the data suggests that our culture is changing, and that we are becoming more of a transfer school. That’s okay, but it also leaves the impression that we’re losing life-long learners. Are we concerned about that?
 - WT: Yes, we are concerned about that.
 - FH: One hypothesis to explain the drop in life-long learners is repeatability regulations. Our lifelong learners were taking “repeatable” courses. Does the data here show a correlation? Is that something we could investigate?
 - RR: we could probably determine this. We could look at when the changes occurred, and what the demographics looked like. Haven’t done that yet, but we could certainly look at that.
 - KC: Speaking to EK’s concern about providing continuing education for life-long learners, isn’t this what we’re trying to do with our Continuing Education

programs? It's not that we're saying that we're not serving this population; it's that we're serving them differently.

- WT commented that the Board will be hearing many presentations that fall under the heading of "student success," in part to get them into the habit of receiving data like this. WT also plans to present data related to SLOs, and other similar of accreditation-related topics.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:15.