The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

Guests: Barbara McNeice-Stallard  Virginia Burley  
Mike Gregoryk  John Nixon  

1.  **May 3, 2006 Meeting Notes**

   Meeting notes were approved as presented.

2.  **Budget Committee Report/State Budget Update**

Vice President Gregoryk shared a chart from the Community College League of California showing the 2005-06 Final Budget, the 2006-07 Governor’s May Revise Budget, and the 2006-07 Senate and Assembly Budget versions. Mr. Gregoryk said that, if budget negotiations continue to go well at the State level, Mt. SAC could be one of the top five fiscally sound community college districts in the State. He explained the differences between the Senate and Assembly versions and which would be most beneficial for the College. At this point, the biggest difference is equalization, with the Senate proposing to fund it at twice the amount of the Assembly.

Vice President Gregoryk said there is about $100 million that the State hasn’t decided how to distribute. He thought that could mean about $2.4 million for Mt. SAC. He pointed out that the College is experiencing huge overruns in facility projects, and that there are also not sufficient funds to equip the new and remodeled buildings, so this infusion of funds could be very beneficial for the College.

Vice President Gregoryk said he thought there would also be additional funds provided by the State for instructional equipment and scheduled maintenance needs.

Mr. Gregoryk said the College is looking at a major expenditure for a new student information system. The College is currently in the negotiation phase with Sungard and Datatel. He believes that within the next month there will be an announcement on which direction the College plans to go.
Mr. Gregoryk discussed the College’s budgeting process related to growth. Many districts budget growth dollars as they receive them and can then run into problems if they don’t grow. The Budget Committee has been discussing this issue indepth and it is its recommendation that the College not spend growth monies before they are earned. As a result, the College will not budget growth in 2006-07 until 2007-08, when it is earned. He said that a tentative budget will be presented to the Board of Trustees at this month’s meeting.

Vice President Gregoryk said the College has struggled with deficit spending for the last five or six years, pointing out that the year Dr. O'Hearn joined the College, he was faced with a $7 million deficit. Mr. Gregoryk said the 2006-07 budget will be a balanced budget.

President O'Hearn commended Vice President Gregoryk on this fantastic news. It has been his goal to end the deficit funding and maintain a balanced budget.

Vice President Gregoryk also commented on the College’s funding of retiree health benefits. He said Mt. SAC is in the best financial condition of any district in the State. The College has set aside $50 million in funding for retiree health benefits. Many districts are just now beginning to address this issue.


As we finish our first year of implementation of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Administrative Unit Objectives (AUOs), the Institutional Effectiveness Committee provided both a detailed report of the alignment of unit goals to College goals, and an executive summary.

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee reviewed the information submitted carefully and focused on assessing the general responsiveness of the campus to identified College goals. The Committee was concerned that a large percentage of goals were not responsive to the College goals. The committee members thought the following contributed to the large percentage of goals that were non-responsive to College goals.

- **Confusion in goal alignment.** A number of departments identified a connection between their own goal and multiple College goals even though it was difficult for an outside reader to see much connection between the department goal and any of the College goals. In many instances, a department linked one of its goals with a College goal based on one phrase of the College goal but thus missed the complexity implicit in the entire goal statement. These patterns resulted in department goals that were often not responsive to College goals. Examples of goals that did not respond to College goals are included in the detailed summary.

- **Differentiation between Outcomes and Goal Development.** For goals A and G that refer to the creation of a risk-free environment for outcomes assessment across the campus, a number of departments confused SLOs or AUOs themselves with goals. A general confusion about whether to consider outcomes statements as goals prevailed for many of the other College goals. Again, this confusion led to reporting goals that were not responsive to the College goals.

- **Support for Goal Development.** In some areas, what was reported as a goal didn’t sound like a goal. Because goal setting is a relatively new requirement, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee believes that some sample goals may be helpful in assisting departments to develop goals.
• **Difficulty in assessing progress towards College goals.** Even when unit goals are responsive to College goals, it is not clear at this time how we might use the data to establish progress toward College goals. Since this is the first year of the process, we may consider these results as the baseline for future cycles of planning and evaluation. However, even if responsiveness to College goals increases and there is greater alignment of unit to College goals, we will still need a clearly defined way to measure progress.

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee presented the following recommendations to President’s Advisory Council to enable the College to use Planning for Institutional Effectiveness planning efforts more effectively:

1. **We need to establish a formal mechanism for assessing progress toward College goals.** One possibility is that the PIE form be amended to enable units to indicate whether they are in the “planning,” “implementation,” or “completion” stage so that we have a better indicator about what kind of progress we have established.

2. **The College goals need to be reviewed and reconsidered.** Many are so complex that individual units have a difficult time aligning themselves to the goal directly.

3. **We need to offer an option in the PIE forms for goals that do not align to College goals.** Very appropriate and significant goals have been developed and reported in departments across campus that do not align clearly to any of the College goals. Being forced to align to a College goal may skew unit planning efforts unnecessarily so that we do not support genuine planning efforts within departments. A part of the difficulty we have noted in this year’s alignment may have to do with the demand that all unit goals align with one of the College goals. It is important that we make every effort to create a program review process that gives departments opportunity to plan with integrity, and acknowledging goal-setting that is not aligned to College goals may help us to support this intent more effectively. By providing a field on the PIE form for listing goals that do not respond to College goals, we may improve the form and increase alignment with College goals as well.

4. **It is important to find ways to document progress toward College goals that may not most appropriately grow from the PIE reports.** We have groups working specifically to help us establish progress toward some of our goals, i.e., the creation of a risk-free environment for outcomes assessment, and another on diversity efforts across the campus. In the ongoing effort to document progress toward meeting our goals, we need to find a way to include the significant and central efforts made by specialized groups. In other words, the department PIE reports may be inadequate to help the institution document progress toward some highly specialized goals, and we should include goals from those committees or work groups to more accurately assess our progress.

Dr. Burley said copies of the report would be distributed campuswide, but the Institutional Effectiveness Committee believes the College needs to provide more support, training, orientation, and communication with campus groups.

Dr. O’Hearn commented on recommendation number 2 – review of College goals. He said he would rather see the College bring together people with expertise from across the campus to work on the College goals and then have them come to PAC for approval.

Professor Jerry Allen suggested that, in some areas of the College, it would be helpful to have those experienced in writing SLOs assist in the writing of SLOs.
4. **Annual Committee Review**

As requested by PAC, the Task Force reviewed the information submitted by each governance and Academic Senate committee and provided its report to PAC.

PAC reviewed each committee individually and accepted the Task Force recommendations. It was noted that Michelle Grimes-Hillman, Academic Senate President, will be working with those Academic Senate Committees who requested changes to their membership. After review, if she determines that changes are appropriate, she will bring those recommendations back to PAC. It was stressed that the goal isn’t to increase or reduce committee membership, but rather to make sure we have the right people on committees.

It was also noted that the Professional Development Council is currently working on a restructuring proposal. Dr. O'Hearn said there is also some discussion about having the Professional Development Council report to the Vice President of Human Resources. PAC will review the Council’s proposal in late summer.

Diana was asked to prepare a report back to each committee.

**Action:** Diana Casteel will prepare a report back to each governance/Academic Senate committee.

5. **Annual Listing of Accomplishments**

Dr. O'Hearn said that, rather than appointing a task force to prepare PAC’s 2004-05 list of accomplishments, he and Diana would work on them and bring a draft back to PAC for member input.

**Action:** Dr. O'Hearn and Diana Casteel will prepare a draft of the 2005-06 PAC accomplishments and bring them back to the August meeting for PAC member input.

6. **Other**

- Because of summer vacation schedules, the July 5 PAC meeting is canceled.
- Raul Rodriguez said two Mt. SAC students who transferred to Pitzer College were recently named Fulbright Scholars.
- Odette Richardson thanked everyone who has been able to participate in the classified school employees week activities.

7. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held August 2, 3:00-4:30 p.m., Administration Building, Room 205.

The meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m.
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