

BUDGET COMMITTEE

MEETING AGENDA

June 18, 2014

3:00 p.m.



Location: Building 4, Conference Rm. #2460

Time: 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Committee Members:

Mike Gregoryk, Chair	Mark Fernandez	Edmond Xiong (Student)	Bill Scroggins (Guest)
Richard McGowan, Co-Chair	Martin Ramey	Fernando Aguayo (Student)	
Irene Malmgren	Rosa Royce	Lance Heard	Kerry Martinez (Notes)
Audrey Yamagata-Noji	Michelle Sampat	Gary Nellesen	
	Johnny Jauregui	Member-at-Large Vacancy	

AGENDA ITEMS:

- 1. Agenda Check**
- 2. Review Budget Committee Meeting Summary of June 4, 2014**
- 3. Accreditation Assistance – Gap Analysis Review**
- 4. State Budget Update**

PAGE BLANK

**Mt. San Antonio College
Budget Committee
Summary of June 18, 2014**

ITEM	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTION/OUTCOME
<p>Committee Members:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Gregoryk, Chair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard McGowan, Co-Chair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Irene Malmgren <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grace Hanson for Audrey Yamagata-Noji</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Michelle Sampat <input type="checkbox"/> Martin Ramey <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mark Fernandez <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rosa Royce</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Edmond Xiong (Student) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fernando Aguayo (Student) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Johnny Jauregui <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gary Nellesen</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lance Heard <input type="checkbox"/> Bill Scroggins (Guest) <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kerry Martinez (Notes)</p>		
<p>1. Agenda Check</p>		<p>Approved, as presented.</p>
<p>2. Review Budget Committee Meeting Summary of June 4, 2014</p>	<p>The Budget Committee Meeting Summary of June 4, 2014, was approved, with changes noted by Richard McGowan.</p>	<p>Approved, with changes noted by Richard McGowan.</p>
<p>3. Accreditation Assistance - Gap Analysis Review</p>	<p>Mike Gregoryk explained the document titled ACCJAC "New" Standards Gap Analysis - Budget Committee. He stated this document includes only the items that the Budget Committee should look at; and the document that was originally given to the Budget Committee members included items that were not applicable to the Budget Committee. Mike stated that he, Richard, and Irene met to talk about this process. Irene shared some of the highlights of the process that she used in instruction. They then went through the Budget Committee document, item by item, and talked about who would be the most appropriate member to address each standard.</p> <p>Irene explained that the Accreditation Steering Committee has asked all of the committees on campus to tackle this gap analysis. What they would like to affirm is that the committees, in many cases, hold the expertise and can help in understanding the reasons why we do what we do here at Mt. SAC. There are writing teams within the Steering Committee that will write reviews of the processes and highly detailed outlines. The goal is to turn the whole accreditation report into</p>	

	<p>one voice. This is a way for the working groups within the committees to give input and to assess where we are right now. This is a 3-part process; the first part is to read the standard and to decide if it is being met, in order to be accredited the standard must be met. The second part is based on the first decision, and assuming you do meet the standard, you need to demonstrate that you meet the standard and provide the evidence. Irene gave examples of evidence and noted that it is important to give the accreditation team clear and detailed directions on where that evidence can be found. The third part is to identify what is missing, which is where the gap is found. There are writing teams for each standard who will take the responses that the committees provide and begin to draft responses to the standards. Their draft will then turn into the self-study.</p> <p>Richard reviewed the new document with the Budget Committee members and assigned the standards. There were a number of standards that were generic enough that everyone could contribute. Other standards were assigned according to each member's applicable area of expertise. It was suggested that Kerry send the document to each member to work on over the next 6 weeks. Mike suggested sub-groups meet over the summer to work on their assigned standards. Each group will submit their document to Kerry who will build a master document. Mike stated he would like everyone's submittals to Kerry prior to the August meeting so she can have the master document completed and ready for review. Kerry will send weekly updates of the document to everyone. Irene stated the Accreditation Steering Committee would like to have the finalized document submitted to the writing team by mid-October. Mark suggested creating a Gap Analysis page on the Budget Committee website where Kerry can post the updates live, everyone will be able to look at it any time they want. Rosa suggested that Kerry send out a reminder e-mail to each member, with the link attached, each time she posts an update to the webpage.</p>
<p>4. State Budget Update</p>	<p>Mike reviewed with Budget Committee members an e-mail from Dan Troy at the Chancellor's Office titled Budget Update: Final Agreement. He noted there wasn't a lot of change from the May Revise. He stated they had heard that the COLA may change to 1.7% but it remained at 0.85%. He noted it is nice to receive new revenues but the unfortunate part of it is that there are other needs in the College</p>

besides Student Support Success, Student Equity, and DSP&S; there are some general needs, and getting more than 0.85% in COLA would have been a good step towards that. He knows that many of the constituent groups lobbied for an increase but it was unsuccessful. Irene stated the majority of the money is going towards growth.

Rosa reviewed with the Budget Committee members a document titled 2013-14 New Resources Allocation. She stated this report was created last April in order to identify the one-time budget items that were approved in 2013-14 and may need budget in 2014-15. She noted the items highlighted in pink that apply and may need funding for 2014-15. Rosa stated these are Fiscal Services' "best guess." There is a need to fund, as a second year request, some of these items earlier than the regularly scheduled time, which is in September/October. It was agreed that the process needs to be revised to include these one-time requests that need funding on July 1st, not October 1st. Mike suggested that an e-mail be sent out that addresses the non-personnel one-time funded items, and says "please identify when your must-have needs occur." Mike suggested separating the Immediate Needs requests from the New Resources Allocation requests on the document, creating two different documents. The process needs to be very clear in identifying the difference between the two types of one-time funding requests. Irene stated there is also the need to figure out how to track these requests to alleviate the confusion for the "worker bees" who do not know what type of request to submit. Mike suggested this subject be brought to President's Cabinet for discussion. The Budget Calendar will need to be updated. Irene stated that Dr. Scroggins has asked her to put together a three column calendar that includes the Budget Calendar, President's Advisory Council (Strategic Plan), and Planning for Institutional Effectiveness (PIE).

Richard noted that he has never come to terms with the concept of ongoing needs being funded with one-time money. If there is an ongoing need and there's no money for it then it shouldn't happen. Mike suggested a recommendation be made from the Budget Committee to President's Cabinet asking why we are funding ongoing expenditures with one-time money. This practice does not work because

there is no new ongoing money to fund them in the following years. We are creating false hopes and confusion. The process needs to be assessed, revised, and good communication sent out so that everyone can easily understand it. It was also noted that the College should address the structural deficit which should be going down instead of increasing every year. Mike suggested a sub-committee be formed to address these issues.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

- Review Draft ACCJC "New" Standards Gap Analysis - Budget Committee
- Review 2014-15 Adopted Budget and Prioritized New Resources Allocation Requests
- Continue Review of the Budget Review and Development Process
- Budget Committee Web Page

FUTURE MEETING DATES:

- August 20, 2014 (Tentative)
- September 3, 2014
- September 17, 2014

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Budget Committee

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes	No		Description	Systematically Collected?	
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	Yes	No
Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality, Institutional Effectiveness and Integrity						
I.A.3. The mission guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.						
I.B.4. The institution uses assessment data, organizes its institutional processes and allocates and reallocates resources to support student learning and student achievement.						
I.B.6. The Institution disaggregates and analyzes outcomes for subpopulations of students important to its mission. When the institution identifies performance gaps,						

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Budget Committee

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?				2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	No	Description	Systematically Collected? Yes No	
it implements strategies, which may include human and fiscal resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.							
I.B.7. The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices in educational programs and student and learning support services, resource management, and governance to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.							
I.B.8. The institution engages in continuous, broad based, systematic evaluation and planning. The institution integrates program review, planning, and resource al-							

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Budget Committee

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes Highly Effective	Effective	No Somewhat Effective	Description	Systematically Collected? Yes No	
location that leads to accomplishment of its mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Institutional planning addresses short- and long-range needs for educational programs and services and for human, physical, technology, and financial resources.						
Standard III: Resources						
III.D.1. Financial resources are sufficient to support and sustain student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. The distribution of resources supports the development, maintenance, allocation and reallocation, and enhancement of programs and services. The institution plans and manages its financial affairs with integrity						

ACCJC "New" Standards Gap Analysis – Budget Committee

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?				2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What's Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes		No		Description	Systematically Collected?	
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective			
and in a manner that ensures financial stability. CW IIID Intro							
III.D.2. The institution's mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning, and financial planning is integrated with and supports all institutional planning. The institution has policies and procedures to ensure sound financial practices and financial stability. Appropriate financial information is disseminated throughout the institution in a timely manner. CW IIID1, IIID1a, IIID2c							
III.D.3. The institution clearly defines and follows its guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development, with all constituencies having appropriate opportunities to							

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Budget Committee

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes Highly Effective	Effective	No Somewhat Effective	Description	Systematically Collected? Yes No	
participate in the development of institutional plans and budgets. CW IIID1d						
III.D.6. Financial documents, including the budget, have a high degree of credibility and accuracy, and reflect appropriate allocation and use of financial resources to support student learning programs and services. CW IIID2a						
III.D.7. Institutional responses to external audit findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated appropriately. CW IIID2b						
III.D.8. The institution's financial and internal control systems are evaluated and assessed for validity and effectiveness,						

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Budget Committee

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes	No		Description	Systematically Collected?	
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective			Ineffective
and the results of this assessment are used for improvement. CW IID2e						
III.D.9. The institution has sufficient cash flow and reserves to maintain stability, support strategies for appropriate risk management, and, when necessary, implement contingency plans to meet financial emergencies and unforeseen occurrences. CW IID3a						
III.D.10. The institution practices effective oversight of finances, including management of financial aid, grants, externally funded programs, contractual relationships, auxiliary organizations or foundations, and institutional investments and assets. CW IID3b						

ACCJC "New" Standards Gap Analysis – Budget Committee

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What's Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes Highly Effective	Effective	No Somewhat Effective	Description	Systematically Collected? Yes No	
III.D.11. The level of financial resources provides a reasonable expectation of both short-term and long-term financial solvency. When making short-range financial plans, the institution considers its long-range financial priorities to assure financial stability. The institution clearly identifies, plans, and allocates resources for payment of liabilities and future obligations. CW IID1c						

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Budget Committee

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)	
	Yes	No		Description	Systematically Collected?		
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective		Ineffective	Yes	No
III.D.12. The institution plans for and allocates appropriate resources for the payment of liabilities and future obligations, including Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB), compensated absences, and other employee related obligations. The actuarial plan to determine Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) is current and prepared as required by appropriate accounting standards. CW IID3c, d							
III.D.13. On an annual basis, the institution assesses and allocates resources for the repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments							

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Budget Committee

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes Highly Effective	Effective	No Somewhat Effective	Description	Systematically Collected? Yes No	
that can affect the financial condition of the institution. CW IIID3e						
III.D.14. All financial resources, including short- and long-term debt instruments (such as bonds and Certificates of Participation), auxiliary activities, fund - raising efforts, and grants, are used with integrity in a manner consistent with the intended purpose of the funding source. CW IIID2d						
III.D.15. The institution monitors and manages student loan default rates, revenue streams, and assets to ensure compliance with federal requirements, including Title IV of the Higher Education Act, and comes into compliance when the federal government						

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Budget Committee

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes Highly Effective	Effective	No Somewhat Effective	Description	Systematically Collected? Yes No	
identifies deficiencies. CW IIID3f						
III.D.16. Contractual agreements with external entities are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, governed by institutional policies, and contain appropriate provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution and the quality of it programs, services, and operations. CW IIID3g						

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Budget Committee

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)	
	Yes	No		Systematically Collected?			
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	Yes	No	
Standard IV: Leadership and Governance							
IV.A.2. The institution establishes and implements written policy authorizing administrator, faculty, and staff participation in decision-making processes. The policy makes provisions for consideration of student views and judgments in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest. Policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose committees. CW IVA2							

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Budget Committee

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?				2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes		No		Description	Systematically Collected?	
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective			
IV.A.3. Administrators and faculty have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. CW IVA2a							

File location: Dropbox\ACCJC 2016\Gap Analysis\Committee Templates – Budget Committee

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?) Description	3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)	
	Yes	No				
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	Systematically Collected? Yes No	
Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality, Institutional Effectiveness and Integrity						
I.A.1. The institution’s mission describes its broad educational purposes, its degrees and credentials offered, its intended student population, and its commitment to student success, as reflected in student learning and student achievement. The institution’s programs and services are aligned with its mission.	X					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual reports and similar documents should focus on how everything relates to the Mission Perhaps every division should reference the mission on their websites Perhaps college schedules should list the mission of the cover page
I.A.2. The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, and whether the mission directs institutional priorities and educational needs of students.		x		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit and manager PIEs should tie college goals to unit and division goals. I am not sure that we are using data to do this. Data is used for faculty prioritization processes. Also used to some extent for budget 		Need to find evidence that data is used to measure how well the institution is accomplishing its mission.

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)	3. Gaps (What's Missing/ Next Steps)	
	Yes	No				
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	Description	Systematically Collected? Yes No
					allocations. End of year reports from Committees that report to C&I (see committee web pages (Irene to provide links) Need dates in which the reports were discussed. Coversheet for new courses asks faculty to address College Mission. Data on number of returned courses and reasons for being returned.	
I.A.3. The mission guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.	n/a				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction Office review • EDC, C&I, and AS approval 	
I.B.2. The institution defines and assesses learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services.		X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes website • TracDat reports • Documents housed in Outcomes website under “accreditation” 	X
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students need to know about SLOs and their function • All faculty must list their SLOs or direct students to slo.mtsac.edu on every 	

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)	
	Yes		No	Description	Systematically Collected?		
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective		Ineffective		Yes
I.B.7. The institution regularly evaluates its policies and practices in educational programs and student and learning support services, resource management, and governance to assure their effectiveness in supporting academic quality and accomplishment of mission.					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual PIE reports include Outcomes data Stage 5 review of outcomes for all courses and programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional coordination between OC and student leadership required Need to institutionalize Institution Core Competencies 	
I.C.5. The institution regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations of its mission, programs, and ser		X			AP and BP logs. Approval of: AP 4021 AP 4025 AP 4020 AP 4105	Ensure completion of approval and review process.	
					BP/AP - http://www.mtsac.edu/governance/trustees/apbp/ (e.g., SP&S Minutes –		

ACCJC "New" Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?				2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)	3. Gaps (What's Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes	No				
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	Systematically Collected?	
					Yes	No
vices. CW IVA5					<p>http://www.google.com/cse?cx=003190139150420571560%3Arshtwv9maew&cof=FORID%3A0&q=Student+Preparation+and+Success+Minutes#gs.tab=0&gsc.q=Student%20Preparation%20and%20Success%20Minutes&gsc.page=1</p> <p>Mt. SAC Catalog – http://www.mtsac.edu/catalog/2013-14/index.html</p> <p>Student Planners</p> <p>Governance Committee/Council Minutes - http://www.mtsac.edu/administration/senates/academic/minutes.php</p>	

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	No Ineffective	Description	
					http://www.mtsac.edu/governance/committees/b SCC/2012-13%20Basic%20Skill%20Initiative%20Annual%20Report.pdf http://www.mtsac.edu/governance/committees/curriculum/memory.html http://www.mtsac.edu/dlc/minutes_agendas.html C&I minutes of June 10, 2014	
Standard II: Student Learning Programs and Services						
II.A.2. (MGH & MTJ) Faculty ensure that the content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Faculty and others responsible for instructional courses,	Yes				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C&I oversees the process with AS recommending to the BOT, BOT is final approval body of all courses and programs 	Yes Curriculum documents need to be posted to the web Website needs updated for further documentation. Completed June 2014.

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)	3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)	
	Yes	No				
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	Systematically Collected? Yes No	
<p>programs and directly related services act to continuously improve instructional programs and services through systematic evaluation to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated learning outcomes. CW IIA1, IIA2b,d,e,f</p>					<p>Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EDC review the courses DL reviews the DL courses Data: WebCMS stages (See Curriculum training documents and senate reports) Data: WebCMS course and program coversheet Systematic evaluation includes the 4-year review cycle (AP 4020) Other evidence includes WebCMs proposals http://webcms.mtsac.edu/webcms/admin/all_proposals.asp <p>Senate report: December 5,</p>	

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes Highly Effective	Effective	No Somewhat Effective	Description	Systematically Collected? Yes No	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2013) Department minutes (and advisory committee minutes for CTE) minutes are recorded on all course submissions. SLOs on 4 year review assessment cycle (See C&I senate report (April 24) for AP 4020 implementation information 		
II.A.3. The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, align with the mission of the	Yes – meeting all regulations			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authentication recommendation and follow-up Cheating and plagiarism policy Classroom evaluation process for DE faculty (See 	Yes	Need plagiarism software

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?				2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)	3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes	No				
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	Description	Systematically Collected? Yes No
institution and are conducted with integrity. CW IIA1					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> contract page 144) Student evaluations for DE (see contract page 135) Compliance survey for faculty teaching DE (need dates and sample) Academic Integrity taskforce information Needs DL link Instruction Office review EDC, C&I, and AS approval 	
II.A.7. The institution schedules courses in a manner that allows students to complete certificate and degree programs within a period of time consistent with established expectations in					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Course management and enrollment management task force Enrollment management 	

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?) Description	Systematically Collected?		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes Highly Effective	Effective	No Somewhat Effective Ineffective		Yes	No	
higher education. CW New				plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department plans for program completion • AP 4020 Section C 			
II.A.10. The institution awards course credit, degrees and certificates based on student attainment of learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education. If the institution offers courses based on clock hours, it follows Federal standards for clock-to-credit-hour conversions. CW IIA2h,j	X			Course Outlines of Record contain Measurable Outcomes, which are used to ensure that students are evaluated on attainment of these learning outcomes. Course credit, degrees, and certificates are based on student achievement of these outcomes. Course unit values are approved based on class lecture/lab hours. This is evident in the Course Outline of Record.	X		A potential gap may be consisted adherence to the Course Outline of Record for any given course. Do departments evaluate whether or not there is a consistent approach to the COR? Is there evidence that all students in a course are expected to achieve the same outcomes listed in the COR?
II.A.11. (JF) The institution makes	X			Catalog Reference Page 6	X		

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?) Description	Systematically Collected?		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes Highly Effective	Effective	No Somewhat Effective		Yes	No	
<p>available to its students clearly stated transfer-of-credit policies in order to facilitate the mobility of students without penalty. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution certifies that the expected learning outcomes for transferred courses are comparable to the learning outcomes of its own courses. Where partnerships of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements as appropriate to its mission.</p>				<p>Evaluation of Other College Coursework</p> <p>Page 7 Acceptance of Domestic Coursework from Accredited Colleges and Universities in the United States</p> <p>Acceptance of International Coursework from Accredited Colleges and Universities outside the United States</p> <p>Page 14 Advanced Placement Credit for Mt. SAC General Education Requirements for the Associate Degree</p> <p>International Baccalaureate Credit for Mt. SAC General Education Requirements for the Associate Degree</p> <p>Page 97 Associate degrees for transfer</p> <p>Page 114 DEFINITIONS OF TERMS</p> <p>Board Policies BP 4050</p>			

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What's Missing/ Next Steps)	
	Yes	No		Description	Systematically Collected?		
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective			Ineffective	Yes
II.A.13. (JF) The institution requires of all of its degree programs a component of general education based on a carefully considered philosophy for both associate and baccalaureate degrees that is clearly stated in its catalog. The institution, relying on faculty expertise, determines the appropriateness of each course for inclusion in the general education	X				LaVerne, University of Southern California Procedure passed through SPAS and Academic Senate requiring faculty review and approval of course equivalencies. <u>AP 4270</u> <u>AP 4280</u>		Review of College policies in the Catalog regarding General Education. Review of General Education philosophy statement (add to purpose and functions of EDC or the GE subcommittee)
					Catalog Reference Page 63-64 <u>GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS</u> Philosophy Statement Page 64 <u>GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES (GEOS)</u> www.mtsac.edu/instruction/general/geos_mtsac.html Page 104 CSU Lower Division Transfer Admission Requirements Page 104-107	X	

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes			Systematically Collected?		
	Highly Effective	Effective	No	Yes	No	
<p>curriculum. The identification of general education courses are based upon student learning outcomes and competencies appropriate to the degree level and include preparation for and acceptance of participation in civil society, skills for lifelong learning through a variety of means, and a broad comprehension of the development of knowledge, practice, and interpretive approaches in the major areas of knowledge, traditionally referred to as the arts and humanities, the sciences, including mathematics, and social sciences.</p>				<p>Description</p> <p>CSU GE Pattern</p> <p><u>Page 108</u> UC Lower Division Transfer Admission Requirements</p> <p><u>Page 109-110</u> Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) Pattern</p> <p><u>Page 112</u> Advanced Placement Examinations in CSU/UC General Education – Breadth Certification</p> <p>Board Policies</p> <p><u>BP 4025</u> Philosophy and Criteria for Associate Degree and General Education</p> <p><u>BP 4270</u> Use of General Education Courses Completed at Other Accredited Institutions</p> <p>Administrative Procedures</p>		

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)	
	Yes	No		Systematically Collected?	Yes		No
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	Description		
					<p><u>AP 4020</u> Program and Curriculum Development</p> <p><u>AP 4050</u> Articulation</p> <p><u>AP 4051</u> Course Equivalencies and Variances</p> <p><u>AP 4235</u> Credit by Examination</p> <p><u>AP 4270</u> Use of General Education Courses Completed at Other Accredited Institutions</p> <p>Other <u>General Education Request Form</u> Faculty initiate general education request by completing Supplemental Form on WebCMS. Mt. SAC GE requirements align with CSU GE Executive Order 1065 to ensure seamless transfer of credits to the 4 year state institutions. Evidence is available on</p>		

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)	
	Yes	No		Description	Systematically Collected?		
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective		Ineffective	Yes	No
II.A.15. Career-technical programs maintain currency through analyses of appropriate data. Graduates completing career-technical certificates and degrees demonstrate technical and professional competencies that meet employment standards and other applicable standards and preparation for external licensure and certification. CW IIA5		X			WebCMS. General Education subcommittee of EDC		Implement two year requisite process Need to include employment data to measure effectiveness This standard should be shared by Business and Tech & Health division, Art (CEA)

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?				2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)	3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Yes		No			
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	Description	Systematically Collected? Yes No
II.A.16. When programs are eliminated or program requirements are significantly changed, the institution makes appropriate arrangements so that enrolled students may complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption. CW IIA6		X			data for completer – find specific examples • Maintain articulation agreements • C-ID (AJ, JOUR) submissions and ADT degrees • CTE alumni survey AP 4021 revision provides guidelines Programs/degrees/certificates that are changed cycle out student cohorts to allow them to finish (EDT to IDE program). Development of Families AP 4051	X
II.B.4. Co-curricular programs and		X			EDC and C&I review co-curricular courses and	
						Do we have data on enrollment, scheduling, and completion for when degrees/certificates are modified to show students are not negatively affected?
						What are we defining as co-curricular? Who reviews the

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?				2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	No	Description	Systematically Collected? Yes No	
athletics are suited to the institution’s mission and contribute to the social and cultural dimensions of the educational experience of its students. If the institution offers co-curricular or athletic programs, they are conducted with sound educational policy and standards of integrity. The institution has responsibility for the control of these programs, including their financial aspects. CW New					programs for Title 5 compliance and sound educational practice. (Repeatability updates, e.g.) Cultural experiences for international travel for Forensics		integrity of the programs (as directed by this standard)? Funding is not a C&I purview (final part of standard) No institutional review for co-curricular programs like Forensics Definition of Co-curricular
II.B.7. The institution regularly evaluates admissions and placement instruments and practices to validate their effectiveness while minimizing biases. CW IIB3e	n/a						N/A: best handled by Assessment & Matriculation and SP&S
Standard IV: Leadership and Governance							
IV.A.4. Faculty and academic administrators, through well-defined structures and processes, have	X				<u>Purpose & Function</u> Statements from EDC, DL, Outcomes (reviewed EDCMinutes08-26-13, C&IMinutes09-10-13)	X	Assure that Purpose & Function Statements are up-to-date and posted on website.

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What's Missing/ Next Steps)	
	Yes	No		Systematically Collected?			
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	Yes	No	
responsibility for recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services. CW IVA2b					<p><u>Recommendations on courses & programs</u> flow from faculty → EDC → C&I → AS → Board. Minutes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collect samples of recommendations from WebCMS through AS minutes. E.g., LCOM 80, 90, 100 EDCMinutes11-05-13, C&IMinutes11-12-13, ASMinutes12-05-13 AS Minutes 10-24-13 has good list of curriculum & program approvals C&I Minutes 09-10-13 re WebCMS function to attach dept & advisory minutes to course & program changes. <p><u>Recommendations on policy/procedure</u> flow from faculty committee → C&I → AS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E.g., DL 	X	Assure that modified APs are updated/posted on website.

ACCJC “New” Standards Gap Analysis – Curriculum & Instruction Council

Revised 6/16/14

Standard	1. Do we meet the Standard?			2. Evidence (Based on What Data?)		3. Gaps (What’s Missing/ Next Steps)	
	Yes			Systematically Collected?		Yes	No
	Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	No	Ineffective		
					Description recommendations on course review DL Minutes 09-24-13, C&I Minutes 10-22-13, ASMinutes03-06-14 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AP 4021 C&I Minutes 02-25-14, ASMinutes03-06-14 • Activity Courses Related in Content C&I Minutes 11-26-13, AS Minutes 12-05-13 • Effective Date of Course Review C&I Minutes 11-26-13 • Unified Course Date AS 03-20-14 • AMAC approval 		AP 4021 needs to go back to AS for approval & posting.

File location: Dropbox\ACCJC 2016\Gap Analysis\Committee Templates – C&I

PAGE BLANK



Budget Update: Final Agreement

Troy, Dan

to:

SO2CBO

06/16/2014 10:57 AM

Hide Details

From: "Troy, Dan" <dtroy@CCCCO.EDU>

To: <SO2CBO@LISTSERV.CCCNEXT.NET>

Please respond to "System Office Memos to CBOs"

<SO2CBO@LISTSERV.CCCNEXT.NET>

Colleagues,

Yesterday, the Legislature passed the final version of the 2014-15 and sent it to the Governor's desk. The details of the budget did not change from the my report of the Conference Committee agreement (for reference, that message is included below).

I would like to draw your attention to a few additional notes on the agreement:

- The STRS employer rate for the 14-15 year will 8.88% (an increase of 0.63%). From the 2015-16 through the 2019-20 fiscal years, the rate will grow by an additional 1.85%, annually. In 2020-21, it will further grow by 0.97%, resulting in an employer contribution rate of 19.1% at that time. The details can be viewed in AB 1469.
- Trailer legislation includes legislative intent that funds provided for increased access "be expended for purposes of increasing the number of FTES in courses or programs that support the primary missions of the segment." The Chancellor's Office will also be required to annually report on the number of course sections and FTES that were added in the previous year that are "within the primary missions of the segment." Clearly, there is significant interest from the Legislature in *how* the system grows, not just in how *much* it grows. The details can be viewed in the Education Omnibus bill, SB 860.

Recapping some major details of the Budget Act:

- 2.75% for increased access
- 0.85% COLA
- \$148M for maintenance and instructional equipment (includes district flexibility and removes the local match)
- \$100M increase for the SSSP
- \$70M for Student Equity Plans
- \$50M increase for EWD
- \$49.5M for earlier mandate reimbursement claims
- \$37.5M for Proposition 39 energy efficiency projects and workforce development
- \$30M increase for DSPS
- All but \$94.6M of system deferrals will paid down
- A positive trigger allowing the Director of Finance to increase Proposition 98 funding if, in his determination, the Proposition 98 guarantee is higher than estimated at the time of the Budget Act. The first call on additional expenditures will be to pay down the remaining deferrals.
- Language equalizing the funding rate for CDCP FTES to the same level as credit FTES, as of the 2015-16 fiscal year
- An increase in the Cal Grant B award to \$1,648

Overall, we are very pleased to see the Governor and Legislature provide a budget so clearly supportive of

access and success. While the Budget Act does not regain ground for the lost purchasing power of the recessionary years, for the second consecutive year it does fund the annual COLA described in statute. We are also pleased to see that districts are permitted flexibility as to how they choose to allocate their share of the \$148M in Physical Plant/Instructional Equipment funding, and will not be required to meet a local match. Also, the partial funding for prior mandate claims chips away at the state's obligations to community college districts. The planned increase in CDCP rates will more adequately fund this important work and help incentivize the provision of CTE instruction.

With 72 districts come 72 opinions (at least!) of what makes a good budget, but we believe this agreement continues the progress made in 2013-14 budget to restore access to higher education and to support efforts to improve student completion and success.

Regards,
Dan Troy

Vice Chancellor, College Finance and Facilities Planning
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

From: Troy, Dan
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2014 9:34 PM
To: System Office Memos to CBOs (SO2CBO@LISTSERV.CCCNEXT.NET); System Office Memos to CEOs (SO2CEO@LISTSERV.CCCNEXT.NET)
Subject: Budget Update: Conference Committee Agreement

Colleagues,

Earlier this evening, the joint Budget Conference Committee met and approved the major provisions of the 2014-15 budget for the California Community Colleges and other areas of the budget.

While subcommittees of both houses had previously voted to augment the CCCs by \$246M by assuming the higher budget year revenue that has been estimated by the Legislative Analyst's Office (my message from May 23rd described those increases), similar to last year, the Governor held fast to the level of spending proposed in the May Revision. Ultimately, Governor Brown has prevailed.

A key adjustment made to K14 Proposition 98 spending is that it is will no longer be the case that deferrals will completely eliminated as of the 2014-15 fiscal year. Some of this funding will be diverted within the minimum guarantee to fund legislative priorities such preschool/child care, another round of funding for the Career Pathways Trust competitive grant program (\$250M, similar to the current year), and funding for prior mandate claims.

To that end, the Conference budget looks very similar to the Governor's May Revision, with a few notable changes:

- Funding for Student Equity Plans will be reduced from \$100M to \$70M
- \$30M augmentation for DSPS
- \$49.5M for reimbursement of previous mandate claims
- A reduction of \$94.465M in the paydown of deferrals
- Districts will have flexibility to determine the split of expenditures between maintenance and instructional equipment (\$148M)

- Cal Grant B awards will increase to \$1,648

Further, the final budget will include a *positive* trigger: If the Department of Finance determines as of the 2015 May Revision that the Proposition 98 guarantee is higher than what is estimated at the time of the budget agreement, additional expenditures will occur. The first priority would be to paydown the remaining K14 deferrals (\$94.465M for the CCCs).

Otherwise, the provisions of the Conference agreement are very similar to the Governor's May Revision (2.75% increased access, 0.85% COLA, \$50M increase for EWD, etc.). My message of May 13th covers the May Revision proposal in detail.

The current expectation is that the Conference budget will be voted on by each house over the weekend (probably Sunday), so the Legislature will meet the June 15th deadline.

Until the budget is final and signed by the Governor, changes are always possible. Further, in some cases there can be changes made to the budget bill language or included in trailer bills that have affect us of which we may not yet be fully aware. I will try to keep you updated as new information emerges.

Regards,
Dan Troy

Vice Chancellor, College Finance and Facilities Planning
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

-
-
-

PAGE BLANK