



Mission College Academic Senate President's Report 3/6/08

Title 5 Section 53200 (b):
Academic Senate means an organization whose primary function is to make recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters.

Section 53200 (c):
"Academic and professional matter" means the following policy development and implementation matters:

1. Curriculum including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines.
2. Degree and certificate requirements.
3. Grading Policies
4. Educational program development.
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success.
6. District and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles.
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports.
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities.
9. Processes for program review.
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development.
11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate.

Let's begin with the positive:

Last Thursday evening I was fortunate to attend the Silicon Valley Engineer's Week Dinner at the invitation of Rendee Dore, along with Jeff Nelson, Kate Disney, and others. It was a wonderful dinner and a great opportunity to meet engineering faculty and students from San Jose State as well as local high schools who are very excited by the proposed Industrial Technology program at Mission. The people I talked with were very excited by the potential of the program and the hard work of Rendee, Cliff Monroe, and the Mission College faculty who have been working to develop the curriculum and program.

Now, on to the crisis at hand:

There is discussion in every meeting I sit in (which is a lot of meetings, folks!) of the critical nature of the budget problems we are facing. Over the next few weeks there are likely to be many calls from various bodies for participants to work on strategic plans, to re-examine processes, and to develop responses.

Unlike private industry, where a CEO can make a decision and the workers just have to go along with it, our governance is participatory. It may not be perfect, but it does give us a voice – if we don't give it up through apathy or exhaustion. I know how easy it is to get burned out. But it is **absolutely vital** that we have participation from every segment of the college in these processes. Every department, every division, every program has a role to play. If you're asked to participate in program review, make sure someone from your division steps up. If a committee you sit on is asked to send a representative to work with another committee on a plan, make sure that someone is appointed.

SHARED GOVERNANCE AND OTHER MEETINGS

As usual, please remember that these are only my notes. For more complete information, please consult the minutes of the meetings or contact the chair of the committee.

DIVISION CHAIRS COUNCIL, 3/3

- Primary topic was strategic responses to the budget and enrollment situation in the District.
- Supplemental instruction implementation was discussed; John made it very clear that SI is not to be used as a method of chasing WSCH but is only to be added to courses when it is pedagogically sound.
- How fast can new curriculum be moved through to add in SI or other changes? Can new courses/programs be put into the catalog with a note that they are "pending approval" even if they haven't completely finished the approval process? This would depend on whether SOCs could enter courses into Datatel earlier in the approval process.

- Final FTES from 08/09 will be our new base and will set the funding level for the college for up to the next three years.
- A suggestion was made that the DCs work to develop a strategic plan as soon as possible, with input from me and from the ACE president, which could guide the various tactics being implemented. I did communicate to the DCs that the Academic Senate has called for a similar committee and that it seems as if we are all thinking along the same lines and with a similar attitude on the urgency of the situation.

DBAC, 3/6

- The concerns expressed by the Academic Senate a few weeks back were agendized for discussion today. Along with the three specific concerns I conveyed on behalf of the Senate, there was also discussion of concerns raised by members of BAMS about the fact that BAMS is being asked to discuss criteria for budget reductions and issues relating to fixed costs in addition to developing a new budget model. There was a lengthy discussion on this topic.
- A suggestion was made that BAMS not seek consensus on issues but rather use votes to determine actions as a way of moving forward as other groups do. There was some agreement that the process of developing a model is taking too long, but the point was also raised that we have to use the existing model until a new model is approved and that results in “minor adjustments” each year to “tweak” the existing model. The result is that the model we’re working with now is not the same as the model that existed many years ago, when BAMS began working. To make those adjustments, BAMS has to come to DBAC for guidance.
- One person pointed out that the existing model does have some strengths, and asked whether we should disband BAMS? Other people stated that BAMS is close to a model, and needs to look carefully at what it has and bring the process to closure. However, when I moved that DBAC direct BAMS to meet more frequently to move the work forward, the motion failed for lack of a second. It was pointed out by Linda Francis that Finance is very busy now with budget development, and that from their viewpoint it would be much easier to work through the summer (which is, of course, not as easy for faculty to manage).
- The final suggestion on this topic was that if the current (tweaked) budget model actually works reasonably well, then perhaps the real issue is the transparency of the model – and could that issue be dealt with by increased education on the budget model and how it works?
- A summary of the recommendations made at the Board Budget Workshop was presented (I am passing out a copy today to the Senate). There are several major assumptions made, of which increasing our FTES by 865 is key. Stan stated that there will be no layoffs in 07/08, but if the District can’t reduce expenses next year there are likely to be layoffs in 08/09. There have already been layoff notices sent out in a neighboring district.
- Linda Francis pointed out that April 30 is the date for the P-2 report, which is what the State uses to determine the funds that they will advance us this summer. It’s critical to have strategies in place by that date.
- Six recommendations were brought to DBAC from BAMS for approval. Four were approved:
 - Review activity code actual to determine if costs decreasing as a result of lost FTES
 - Establish budget (reduction) criteria guidelines and associated controls to be used for budget development
 - Zero out existing Fixed Cost Schedule and establish new one based on current budget constraints
 - Decrease overall amount on Fixed Cost Schedule.
- However, two additional recommendations were referred back to constituent groups for discussion prior to a decision by DBAC. Those recommendations involve possible actions relating to hirings and transfer-outs to categorical programs, and will need to be discussed by the Senate prior to the next DBAC meeting.