



## ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Co-Chairs: Roanna Bennie and Marie McMahon

May 7, 2015

**APPROVED 09/17/15**

### **MINUTES**

**Members Present:** R. Bennie, L. Ornelas, L. Ascione (for himself and proxy for R. Fritsch), D. Miramontez, P. Hopkins, G. Beitey, M. Sanft, D. DiMarzo, W. Hamidy, L. Pink, D. Willkie, J. Young, S. Gobble, K. Reinstein, F. Bereaud, N. Gehler, M. McMahon, L. Woods, M. Kjartanson, M. Hart

**Members Absent:** G. Ramsey, A. Jacobson, H. Irvin, R. Cassar, B. Fritsch, T. Schilz, S. Lickiss

**Guest:** C. Jay

---

The regular monthly meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee was held on Thursday, May 7, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in Miramar College Room M-110. The meeting was called to order at 2:41 by co-chair M. McMahon, a quorum being present.

**Agenda/Minutes.** Upon motion by R. Bennie, seconded by L. Pink, the revised agenda was unanimously approved. Upon motion by F. Bereaud, seconded by D. Willkie, the minutes of March 5, 2015, were unanimously approved as presented.

**Budget.** B. Bell reported on the 2016-17 budget, giving both a macro overview and a micro summary of what the tentative budget means to Miramar College, discussing what processes we go through, and what he's seeing for next year, and answering questions as they arose.

The District's Enrollment Management Plan allocates the District FTES to the three colleges and Continuing Education. Miramar's District-allocated FTES target for this year is 8,089, up from 7,931 last year. He explained that the District and Miramar can take advantage of additional resources if Miramar College reaches 10,000 FTES, so in the enrollment management processes both within our campus and within the District, the Miramar goal currently is 10,000 FTES. The timeline for reaching that goal has been revised from 2019 to 2020. That will increase the apportionment revenue for the entire District by \$600,000. That sum will flow through the resource allocation formula and flow through our budget model processes, and it will increase our discretionary budget, and depending on how the resource allocation formula is applied, it may affect our pocketbook. So there are advantages and benefits for us to reach this 10,000 FTES. Historically, Miramar has been allocated 18% of the total FTES for the District, but the District realizes that by continuing that allocation, Miramar won't get to 10,000 FTES on its own for many more than 10 years; so the District has decided to

take 100 FTES off the top of the District's 427 FTES growth and allocate that directly to Miramar, with the balance allocated in the same proportion. That will increase Miramar's proportion by 0.5% to 158 FTES.

That 100 FTES is a minimum allocation; if the District receives more FTES from the State Chancellor's Office, that minimum is slated to increase. District recognizes that Miramar is the most productive of the three campuses, and there is an expectation that Miramar will continue to be productive. He will continue to look at ways in our campus budget allocation process to funnel revenue to Instruction to supplement the amount of FTEF that we've put on the schedule that will generate more FTES. So, in essence, the District is contributing a part to get to this 10,000 growth and Miramar College's responsibility is to remain productive, and the District's commitment is to contribute a minimum of 100 FTES.

His modeling processes and his nine years' experience on campus indicate that if we take the model that the District gives us that includes dollars and FTEF, and only allocate the FTEF that the District says that they are allocating to Miramar, he knows that on average Miramar will have at the end of the year between \$500,000-\$900,000 unspent. When we were in our fiscal crisis, Miramar needed to be able to give that money back to the District because the District was going into reserves to support all of its institutions. Now that we're out of that fiscal crisis, he's taking that historical amount that he knows that we're going to save or not spend year-to-year, convert it into FTEF and allocate it out to Instruction. He calls that the "B Factor", which is currently equal to 24 FTEF. On our tentative budget we are adding above and beyond what the District is giving us, out to the instructional schools. He will fine-tune that B Factor on June 30<sup>th</sup> when he knows what Miramar's performance is this year. Right now it appears it will come out pretty much on target. If we come under target and have extra budget available to us, he'll know that we're performing as expected and will bump up that simulation and allocate more FTEF out to Instruction during our adopted budget process. If we go over budget and are less productive, he'll have to pull back that 24 FTEF to assure that next year we don't spend more resources than we've been allocated.

There will be no additional discretionary funds for supplies or support and he can't transfer resources between categories because he needs to keep resources within the allocation given to us; however, he will try to adjust his models to see how to accommodate or address the need for supplies and support staff.

He does an analysis each year when he gets the tentative budget and compares the tentative budget to the prior year's adopted budget, and the bottom line right now is Miramar is receiving \$1.4 million more than last year's tentative budget. It needs to be compared to the adjusted budget, so taking that adjusted budget \$1.4 million year-to-year change down to more like \$900,000 which is still a significant amount of increase. The majority of those increases are in funding for adjunct employees and funding for contract salaries.

The tentative budget was received on May 1st. Before that, he did a budget simulation for Miramar to give the deans a heads-up of what he thought, based on his experience, the tentative allocation would be and how that would translate into FTEF. It proved to be right on, added the 24 B Factor to the 344 that District has given us and reducing that allocation for the accreditation editor, the accreditation co-chair, and the one approved staff member gives us a total FTEF allocation for Fall and Spring 2015-16 of 376.7, as of today, and that's 12.12 FTEF more than last year, at the end of the year.

For summer, we have an increase of 2.5. He knows that we're still trying to grow fall and spring and not necessarily summer, but that we still need to add additional FTEF to our summer program; so we're looking at allocating a smaller percentage to summer until he hears differently from Instruction that we need to start focusing on summer. We're increasing our fall and spring FTEF by 12 from last year and that equals 376. For summer 2016, we're increasing our FTEF by 2.47 which equals 42.29. Summer 2015 is out of this year's budget. He explained that summer starts the academic year, but is split between two academic years. The first two months of summer 2015 are paid out of the 2014-15 budget, and the last three payments will be paid out of the 2015-16 budget; but the FTEF allocation will remain the same – we're not going to combine from two budgets. He gives Instruction a combined fall and spring allocation and it's up to Instruction to plan how to spend that allocation. He reviews that number and reports out every Friday, and he gave kudos to deans, saying the deans are right on! He knows when he reviews the number tomorrow there will be a 1.8 surplus which is the agreed-upon number right now. He has confidence in the deans and chairs and everyone involved in enrollment management on this campus because they have historically, since he's been on campus, done exactly what he's asked them to do at the macro level which is all he looks at.

He explained that we have two budgets a year. One is a tentative budget and the other is the adopted budget. The tentative budget will go to the Board in June and is the best estimate of what the budget will be next year. It is done in June so we can have a budget in place for July 1<sup>st</sup> and it authorizes spending as of July 1<sup>st</sup>. Subsequent to that we will have our official budget from the State Chancellor's office and that will be the adopted budget which will come sometime in September. Historically there's minimal change between the tentative and adopted budgets.

Academic Support Services. M. McMahon said that Academic Support Services was really about tutoring and the proposed idea to restructure the current system, and which discussion started in Academic Affairs. After this committee had a couple of meetings, it was then parlayed over to Academic Senate, and there's been some debate, and a forum, and things have accelerated. At Tuesday's Academic Senate meeting that plan was tabled until the fall 2015.

High School Agreements. R. Bennie presented and discussed the below chart on High School Programs. Most start in the fall, and each requires a specific MOU under an umbrella MOU. She reported that Deans’ Council has reviewed a large document on Dual Enrollment.

**HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS**

HIGH SCHOOL	PROGRAM NAME	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	LOCATION	NOTES
Scripps Ranch HS	Career Pathway	35	HS	2 year sequenced programs in Business with internships
	Accelerated College Program (ACP)	25	HS	After testing into English 101: Personal Growth and English
Mira Mesa HS	Early College	5	Miramar	"High Flyer" students: 1 course per semester
	Running Start	Up to 20	Miramar	College Math only
Serra HS	Accelerated College Program (ACP)	35	HS	Personal Growth and Speech Communication

SLOs Assessment and Action Plans. R. Bennie said that by this time next year every course must be assessed and needs to be in TaskStream. It is completely possible to have every course at some time in this assessment cycle assessed and then action plans developed. The goal to complete by June 1<sup>st</sup> is unrealistic, given that we’re at 25% now, but folks should be encouraged to keep working. However, we can finish by June 1, 2016, if we keep moving down this path. A high percentage of course SLOs are in, but not 100%. L. Murphy and the Instruction Office staff helped to get the program SLOs into TaskStream from SLOJet and the catalog, and they are now at 100%. She wants faculty to verify their program outcomes as entered into TaskStream. At the next Deans’ Council, G. Beitey will distribute all program SLOs for the deans to make sure that they get to the department chairs to check off that those SLOs are correct. This summer the catalog gets rearranged with the new program list from program review, then we can be confident that those are the correct program outcomes that are being published in the 2017-18 catalog.

She stressed that it is essential because it has to be there for accreditation. It is essential to have every course assessed with plans before accreditation comes, and is not optional. This spring in the present effort to make our ACCJC report more robust, some people got help getting their outcomes moved from SLOJet into TaskStream; but assessment isn’t something that anyone can help with – because only faculty can assess outcomes, so no further help is available. That assessment needs to get into TaskStream and action plans need to be developed.

Both courses and programs have to be done by next June. Most people have mapped their courses to their programs, so if you have done the mapping, then you're able to look at your program outcomes based on your course mapping. You have to assess, analyze, and dialog, improve, and do action plans. Within the three-year program review cycle, every course should have every outcome assessed in that three-year cycle. The cycle that we just reported for ACCJC will come to a close and a new cycle will start in the fall. The current cycle is Fall 2012-Spring 2015. The next is Fall 2015-Spring 2018. Accreditation wants to see that every course has been assessed and every program has been assessed, but our reporting time falls in the middle of that three-year cycle so they will have to lead out on how to do that. It was advised that we need to have this done by June 1, 2015, because in Fall 2015 a new cycle starts, and we have to report to ACCJC on the current cycle in March 2016.

Accreditation Evidence Needs. R. Bennie thanked those who have contributed to evidence needs that we've asked for under Standard 2.A, and said there may still be a few requests coming out. In particular, if there's been improvement of a program or a course, because of assessment we need to document that for accreditation. We need evidence of assessment that created change at program and course levels. Accreditation will be looking for documentation of how we've used this process and can show improvement in courses resulting from assessments.

2015-16 BSI Action Plan Approval. S. Gobble presented and discussed the 2015-16 BSI Action Plan. It was moved by D. Miramontez, seconded by L. Woods, and unanimously carried to approve the 2015-16 BSI Action Plan.

Chairs Committee and Election. M. McMahon announced that M. Kjartanson was elected Chair of Chairs for the 2015-16 school year.

Farewell Comments. R. Bennie said it had been a good year for her and that she had been enriched by the group and had the highest hopes for the college. She thanked the committee members for their work, and hoped that she had helped to advance the story for the college. M. McMahon will also be leaving the group and volunteered to help the incoming Chair of Chairs, M. Kjartanson.

Subcommittee Reports. C. Jay reminded the committee that the Honors Luncheon will occur on May 6<sup>th</sup>.

Suggested items for the next meeting included proxy practices, and Accreditation evidence as a repeating item.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

*Katinea A. Todd*