President O’Hearn called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

Guests: Gary Nellesen
        Carolyn Keys
        John Nixon
        Grace Hanson
        Pat Rasmussen
        Barbara McNeice-Stallard
        Ginny Burley
        John Vitullo

1. **Welcome**

   Dr. O’Hearn introduced and welcomed guests to the President’s Advisory Council meeting. Dr. O’Hearn also thanked Gary Nellesen for assuming the role of Interim Vice President, Administrative Services, while a second search is conducted.

   Dr. O’Hearn explained that the President’s Advisory Council is the main planning body for the campus and its goal is to coordinate planning efforts as we try to be more strategic on what we do and how we do it. The Council frequently invites the Chair of a College committee to a meeting to provide an update of what the committee is working on and how it is doing. It is believed that these reports help strengthen the institution. Dr. O’Hearn said he very much appreciates the advice President’s Advisory Council members give him.

2. **January 12, 2005 Meeting Notes**

   Meeting notes were approved as presented.

3. **Budget Committee Report**

   Interim Vice President Nellesen told PAC members that the Budget Committee is nearly finished with its work on developing an expenditure budget allocation process. He thanked Vice President Nixon, Director Baldwin, and Professor McGowan for their work as an ad hoc committee.

   Interim Vice President Nellesen gave a brief budget update on the 2004-05 budget and preliminary information on the 2005-06 budget based on information in the Governor’s proposed budget. There are no major changes to the 2004-05 budget with the exception of a review of the Full-time Faculty Obligation penalty. If this penalty is not imposed, that will mean a budget savings to the College of over $865,000, and change the projected deficit to approximately $2.06 million.
For 2005-06, based on the Governor’s proposed budget, the College is forecasting a deficit of approximately $3.6 million. Mr. Nellesen noted, however, that budget development is in its earliest stages and much will change before a final budget is approved.

Based on information available, the 2005-06 College budget would reflect:

- Two percent in growth funding, which is an additional $1.6 million for the College.
- An increase in COLA to a total of 3.93%, which adds another $1.2 million to the budget, for a total of $3.3 million.
- The second year of equalization is not anticipated to be funded, which will impact our budget by $2.6 million.
- Additional costs (subject to collective bargaining) due to increase in STRS rate and a smaller increase in PERS – approximately $700,000.
- Salary schedule progression at a cost of approximately $960,000.
- New faculty hires and related costs budgeted at $943,853. Because the College has made the decision to go ahead and hire new faculty rather than risk being penalized, the savings from the Early Retirement Plan will drop by approximately $743,034.
- The College also needs to continue to send out class schedules, as we did this semester, in order to increase enrollment. This cost is approximately $150,000.

Interim Vice President Nellesen reiterated that much work needs to be done in Sacramento; however, should the current projections hold true, the General Fund reserves would drop below the 10% level required by Board Policy. If that occurs, the College will begin working on a plan to recover and return to a minimum 10% reserve.

President O'Hearn agreed that figures for 2005-06 are very preliminary and the Community College system is hoping for significant change. Not receiving the second year of equalization funding is a major blow to all low-funded districts, representing over $2.5 million for Mt. SAC alone. He said that he and other college presidents and chancellors are working hard in Sacramento to try to influence legislators to adequately fund community colleges.

4. **Institutional Effectiveness Committee Report**

Ginny Burley, Chair of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, reported that the Committee’s initial charge was to review the program review process and come up with a process that more closely coordinates with other processes on campus, i.e., budget requests, scheduling, and position requests. The old Program Review process used forms that were long, cumbersome, and not readily usable for administrative units.

The Committee has developed a planning process that allows for annual unit/department review of their operations as the basis for participating in the larger planning cycle for the College. The forms are simple and clearly focused on development of unit goals and intended outcomes/objectives, with their corresponding structuring of data gathering, assessment, and activities needed for realizing the intentions. The process was re-named to avoid some of the negative connotations of the ineffective “Program Review” process. It is now “Planning for Institutional Effectiveness” (PIE).
There was discussion on how completed reports connect with PAC, how we know if progress is being made, and how we ensure that the institution is moving forward in terms of SLO – separate and apart from the budget.

PAC needs to work on developing College goals, but doesn’t want to do it in a vacuum.

5. **Student Equity Plan**

Carolyn Keys and Phillip Maynard, Co-Chairs of the Student Equity Committee, distributed copies of the College’s recently-completed Student Equity Plan.

The revised Student Equity Plan was developed following the five pre-established statewide Student Equity Goals, clarifying the barriers, recommended activities and key contacts, priority level and budget implications. There are five target areas included in the plan: Access, Course Completion (Retention), ESL and Basic Skills Completion, Degree and Certificate Completion, and Transfer. Dean Keys reviewed the findings of each area.

One area of concern relates to disabled students. The College could only track those disabled students who are registered with Disabled Student Programs & Services (DSP&S), and they represent 3.4% of the total student population. Undoubtedly, the total College student population of students with disabilities is higher, but because of the confidential nature and optional disclosure of disability status, it is difficult for the College to ascertain the numbers of students with disabilities who are not registered with DSP&S.

Campus-based research strongly suggests that specific ethnic groups face inequities and need intervention. This is particularly true of the African American, Alaskan Native, and American Indian students in all five target areas. The Latino population also experiences similarly low performance in the course completion area; however, Latino students had the highest achievement in obtaining their AA/AS, certificates over 18 units and certificates less than 18 units.

The Student Equity Committee conducted an evaluation of the activities identified in the plan and found that progress is being made, but there is still work to be done. The Student Equity Plan is not meant to be static, but should be a living document that is constantly reviewed, referred to and updated.

Professor Maynard said Mt. SAC is way ahead of most colleges. He said most colleges seem confused as to why they should have an equity plan. The plan was due in the Chancellor’s Office on January 31, and many colleges have requested an extension of the deadline for submitting reports.

Dr. O’Hearn thanked the Student Equity Committee for their very thorough report.

6. **Review of Proposed Administrative Procedure 3250**

At the last PAC meeting, Terri Smith Long and Deb Blackmore agreed to work with Dr. Jane Wright to review Policy 3250 – Institutional Planning and the proposed Administrative Procedure. Previous discussion on this was that the Policy was too specific and the Administrative Procedure was too broad.
Professor Long and Dean Blackmore presented PAC members with both a revised Policy and a proposed Administrative Procedure. PAC members reviewed both documents and offered comments and suggestions for revisions. Dr. Long will make the revisions and forward the information to the President’s Office. The revised policy will need Board approval. The proposed Administrative Procedure will be forwarded to Dr. Wright.

**Action: Dr. Long will update Policy and Administrative Procedure 3250 – Institutional Planning, and forward both documents to the President’s Office.**

7. **Compressed Calendar**

Dr. Long informed PAC that both faculty groups – the Faculty Association and Academic Senate – voted to move forward with the compressed calendar concept. Students supported the concept of a compressed calendar, but wanted to include a spring break. Classified employee groups didn’t indicate either their support or non-support of the concept. Dr. Long said that if it is the intention of the College to move forward with a 16/6/16/6 calendar beginning with the 2006-07 academic year, we need to begin planning now. She said that faculty are sensitive that much needs to happen in order for the proposed new calendar to be successful.

It was suggested that the Vice President of Instruction and Vice President of Student Services should send a joint recommendation to move to the compressed calendar to PAC. If PAC endorses that recommendation, then PAC should make the recommendation to President O’Hearn.

**Action: Dr. O’Hearn will follow-up with Dr. Nixon and Dr. Yamagata-Noji.**

8. **Other**

- Diana Casteel distributed copies of the Information Security Work Group. This committee report was updated to include the name of the chair and terms of committee members.

9. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held February 16, 3:00-4:30 p.m., Administration Building, Room 205.

The meeting adjourned at 4:22 p.m.
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