



Mission College Academic Senate President's Report 4/24/08

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.

Budget: Grim and grimmer news - the budget situation is not getting any better. Each week, the news gets worse, and while we may have begun digging our own financial hole with the HBA situation, the State budget crisis (including the over-reporting of massive amounts of property tax revenue by two counties) has now given us a steamshovel to help us dig even deeper and faster.

In January 2003 we were hit with a similar situation, but in that year the District made decisions on cuts without allowing enough time for those decisions to be made through collaborative consultation and participatory governance processes in all cases. In this respect, we are more fortunate this time around than we were five years ago. We have to make some very tough choices in the coming weeks and months, but at least we have some time to work on making those choices.

Two weeks ago, I ended my report by saying: "The Academic Senate needs to lead the discussion on how to address this issue and how to make the hard decisions that we are facing. What levels of service must be maintained? What can be cut?" The Senate is working with the DCC, Student Services, the Classified Senate, and the collective bargaining groups to keep in constant communication. The "Collaborative Committee on Enrollment and Budget" has been meeting to ensure strategic communication and collaborate on ideas that cross constituent boundaries so that we can respond quickly (see below for a summary of ideas from our most recent meeting). However, every single department and service area of the college should be looking at what our core services are and how we serve the students, and the mission of the college.

State Senate: Last week I attended the ASCCC Spring Plenary Session. I've already sent out a summary of some of the resolutions passed at the Session, and the official versions will be posted at <http://asccc.org> soon for you to read. There were some terrific breakouts on a wide variety of topics, including changes to the disciplines list, Title 5 changes, faculty involvement in budget and in hiring and tenure processes, the Basic Skills Initiative, SLO's, and much more.

Curriculum: There are a lot of course proposals moving through the curriculum review process right now. I have asked Brenna Wundram to have the minutes and agendas of CRC sent out to all faculty on a regular basis. The agendas list which courses and programs are going for first readings, and which are going for second readings (and approval by CRC). Following CRC approval, they are signed off by the VP of Instruction and then they come to me for Academic Senate sign-off. Although our past practice has not required individual senators to read the course proposals, really when I sign I am saying that the Senate as a body has approved these curriculum changes. In order to do this, Senators need to be reviewing these changes and giving me that authorization.

As a practical matter, we don't have time to agendize every single course offering for separate discussion. What I am encouraging you to do is to monitor CRC agendas and minutes as they are distributed, note the course numbers/names of those items coming up for discussion in CRC, and take a look at those course outlines or programs in

CurricuNet on a regular basis. Then, when the Senate is asked to approve curriculum, I can agendize an item asking for discussion and approval of these items with minimal wasted time. (If items need special discussion, they can of course always be agendized as separate topics.)

I have also been discussing with Brenna and with CRC some possible changes to the new program approval process which I may bring to the Senate for consideration in May as a way of streamlining the process for approval of some programs and certificates.

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.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, 4/17/08

- There was a lengthy presentation on OPEB bonds (OPEB stands for Other Post-Employee Benefits). OPEB bonds are a method of restructuring the District's liability for retiree medical benefits to level out the payments over time to a steady, predictable amount rather than allowing payments to escalate as the liability grows. The Board is under some pressure to adopt a method of dealing with this issue to comply with GASBY 45 standards by a mandated deadline (this summer? I'm afraid I don't remember the exact date.)
- The members of the Kuwait Task Force and the project consultant, Raj Ayyar presented their progress to the Board. Most of the points presented had been discussed when Raj visited the Mission College Academic Senate a couple of weeks ago. When talking about the possibility of offering distance education classes to the Kuwaitis while setting up the affiliate relationship, Raj indicated that they would be conducting a needs assessment first. I was assured, when I asked, that he would then be consulting with department and division chairs in the District regarding the offering of specific courses and the scheduling of those courses.

DIVISION CHAIRS COUNCIL, 4/21/08

- The Division Chairs were presented with a list of instructional budget requests for 2008/09 to prioritize before sending them to John Williams. There was a discussion over whether a request for funding of the Library for Saturday hours next year should be considered as an "instructional" request or prioritized by some other group in the budget model. Non-FTES-generating requests from Counseling had been removed for prioritization by the Student Services Council. The decision of the DCC was that the Library request should not be considered in their prioritization.
- Big discussion on supplemental instruction implementation. Mission College and WVC must use the same accounting methods and processes for dealing with S.I. "Embedded" supplemental instruction will not be allowed by the state.
- It was suggested that a survey of students who dropped classes might be useful to discover reasons for drops. Such a survey could be done anonymously via SurveyMonkey and sent out automatically via email.

COLLABORATIVE COMMITTEE ON ENROLLMENT AND BUDGET, 4/22/08

- Ed Kleppinger reported on the retirement incentive. One person suggested that once it is known who will accept the offer, the Senate should begin looking at the positions and programs of the faculty who will be retiring and begin to assess how to re-allocate FTEf among programs based on performance. This would involve both PGC and the Academic Senate, since it might segue into Program Discontinuance. A strong suggestion was made that the Academic Senate form a small subcommittee as soon as possible – with PGC

participation – to begin looking at programs. Any decisions would have to be made by January '09.

- Another suggestion was that the Senate convene a Budget committee, distinct from CBAC, to get a solid understanding of the overall budget of the District down to the line item level including actuals (not just projected budgets), other sources of income, and more. This group would need to be prepared to work over the summer as the draft of the budget is completed by August and goes to the Board in early September.
- DCC and Student Services need to meet on a daily basis during the week before school starts in Fall to ensure coordination and planning of enrollment management. This only happened once for Spring, needs to be daily.
- A key question raised dealt with the availability of Datatel programs to manage waitlists and prerequisite enforcement; I will be checking into this with I.S.

GAP, 4/23/08

- Harriett passed out TWO articles from recent issues of The Rostrum for GAP members – one praising the StRUT program as an “exemplary program”, and the other giving information about WASC’s implementation of the “two-year rule” and the impact of that on colleges undergoing accreditation.
- The Silicon Valley Chamber of Commerce wants to start a “young professional’s group” in partnership with Mission College, pulling in all sorts of services and courses. This is simply a proposal, but it will be interesting to see how/if this develops into anything for the college.
- Lengthy discussion of the College Reorganization proposal. Various points of view were expressed, including one opinion that the current division structure may be in part responsible for administrative turnover as it puts faculty division chairs in a conflicted role where they are responsible for making hard decisions that may be unpopular with their faculty colleagues. A lot of input was given by classified representatives, including a suggestion that program review should cover all administrative and service areas of the college (which is already incorporated into the Program Master Planning process). Tough decisions need to be made by individuals who can be held accountable for acting effectively and competently.

CBAC, 4/23/08

- Lengthy presentation by the Child Development Center to help CBAC understand their financing and the role they play in instruction, as well as in retention of students from other programs who receive their services.
- CBAC began the process of deciding which budget requests should be considered as “strategic directions” under the college’s budget allocation model. I expressed some concerns that the criteria for determining which requests fall into this category are not as clear as they could be; they are supposed to be based on the College’s strategic goals as developed by GAP each year, a process that has not actually happened recently.
- Of related concern is that the criteria for ranking requests – by all sub-groups in the model – are not clear and objective, but depend on the subjective evaluation of the members of those bodies more than they perhaps should.
- CBAC will meet jointly with GAP on May 14 to finalize the prioritization of budget requests for next year and make recommendations to Harriett on those requests. Following that meeting, CBAC will meet separately to review the budget process used this year and “debrief” on the overall process.

DISTRICT COUNCIL, 4/23/08

- Stan gave a budget update. Several of the “Decision Points” reviewed in DBAC last week depend on Board actions; there is reason to believe that the Board is not entirely supportive of taking some of those actions, as they would only provide a one-time solution to what may

very well be an ongoing budget problem. The shortfall from property tax revenue faced by the state may still increase.

- EMT has been asked to do an impact analysis of all vacant positions district-wide and the effects of not filling those positions by Monday, April 28. The colleges need to establish criteria for determining which vacant positions – both current and future – will be filled. (The Senate will be discussing this next Thursday, May 1).
- Dr. Hartley suggested that some categorical programs with vacancies might be able to absorb faculty/staff from other areas in the event of cuts to staffing.
- Angelica Bangle pointed out that we need to be looking at our goals and setting criteria that will allow us to achieve those goals. A key goal is sustaining the organization with existing resources.
- During the review of the Board Agenda, Ed Kleppinger asked that one particular course offering be removed from the packet to be approved by the Board on the basis that it had not yet been loaded and there was considerable disagreement in the Load Committee about this course. There was discussion about whether a course that had been approved by the WVC AS through CRC could be withheld from the Board because of a lack of load assignment. Dr. Hartley stated that no course would be offered until it was properly loaded. The decision was made by Stan to allow the course to go to the Board for approval with that understanding.