

**Mission College Academic Senate
Ext. 5413**

Approved Minutes

Thursday, February 11, 2010

Copies of the MCAS minutes & agendas can be found online at:

http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/agendas_minutes.html

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by President Stephanie Kashima at p.m.

Senators	A	P	Senators	A	P
AlBaker (Ext.5253) Division. II		X	McKay (Ext.5312) Division. I		X
Beggs (Ext.5188) Division. III		X	Nakahama (Ext.5433) Division II		X
Cabrera AF/ Division.	X		Oliver (Ext.5427) Division. III	X	
Glaser (Ext.5093) Division. I		X	O'Neill (Ext 5082) Div. I		X
Harrison (Ext.5340) Division. III		X	Pembrook (Ext.5275) Div. VI		X
Johnston AF/ Division. VI		X	Sun (Ext.5570) Division. VI		X
Kashima (Ext.5319) Division. IV		X	Trang (Ext.5081) Division. V		X
Martin (Ext 5349) Division IV		X	Winsome (Ext.5217) Division. II	X	
Guests: T. Karas, S. Sabherwal			Wise (ASB Rep)		X

II. Approval of the MCAS Minutes Dated 12/10/09 and 2/4/10.

The meeting minutes dated 12/10/09 were approved as presented. (M/S/P – Trang/Martin)

The meeting minutes dated 2/4/10 were approved as presented. (M/S/U – Beggs/Pembrook)

III. Order of the Agenda

A motion was made to have Item VIII. C follow Item VI. (M/S/U – Sun/Pembrook)

IV. Oral Communication from the Public – None.

V. Information & Announcements – None.

VI. Administrative Business/Actions/Appointments

A. President's Report: President Kashima reported that according to recent survey results, voters would support a facilities bond measure of either \$200 million or \$400 million. The Board of Trustees is now debating which amount to go for. President Kashima reported on an MC issue with the California CC Classified Employee of the year nominations. The college was late in beginning the nomination process and therefore only WVC will be submitting a nominee this year. President Kashima noted that the MCAS has recognized Classified staff in the past and can do so again this semester. Finally, Ms. Kashima reported that anyone interested in participating on the

District Enrollment Management Committee should contact Vice President of Instruction Norma Ambriz-Galaviz.

B. Other Reports – None.

C. Committee Appointments – None.

VIII. New Business

C. Accreditation Progress Report

Director of Library Services Tim Karas presented the Senate with Mission College's second progress report to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). Mr. Karas explained that every community college goes through a six-year accreditation cycle and two years ago, Mission College was put on warning. Since then, MC created a 132 item planning agenda. One year ago, a progress report was submitted, detailing the agenda items completed. Now, the college is about to submit its final progress report, which is due to the commission March 15, 2010. After today's presentation to the Senate, the progress report will be presented to GAP and then the BOT. In April, a commission team will visit the campus to validate the report, then send a letter reporting whether it is accepted and what our status is. Best case scenario is that MC is taken off warning; worst case is that MC is put on probation.

President Kashima pointed out that recently, the ACCJC has been lifting probations and warnings. This appears to be a positive sign. Senator McKay added that according to recent reports, the ACCJC is having problems with overstepping its authority and is itself on probation. VPI Ambriz-Galaviz explained that the commission is on probation because in the past, it was reviewed by the Federal Government for being too lenient in enforcing rules. In response, the ACCJC became more serious in its enforcements, but did not provide colleges with specific achievement benchmarks. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, along with Chancellor Jack Scott requested a meeting with the ACCJC to discuss the concerns of the colleges, but their request was denied.

The progress report is documentation of all the work that has been done to improve the college, including reorganization. Mr. Karas thanked the faculty for their hard work and dedication to this process. The Senators thanked Mr. Karas for all his work on accreditation.

At this time, the regular order of the agenda resumed.

VII. Old Business

A. Discussion of Possible Program Discontinuance

President Kashima began by stating that the program discontinuance process is an opportunity to revitalize programs and make them better than ever. But the college can only sustain a certain threshold of low efficiency programs. Therefore, program health must be reviewed in order to make future planning decisions. This is not about saving money, but about ensuring that we offer high quality programs with high demand. President Kashima acknowledged the sensitivity involved in the process, but noted that in stopping the PD process, faculty would essentially be handing the control to someone else.

VPI Ambriz-Galaviz stated that we must ensure a systematic process of evaluation. She noted that program discontinuation is a feared result of program review, but that the processes of program discontinuance and program review are essentially the same. She expressed concern that people are arriving at outcomes before going through the process. Variables will influence decision-making. The Senate ad-hoc committee already went through the process of analyzing these variables and the results reinforced the decision to recommend the program discontinuance policy. The committee looked at the college educational master plan and found that there had been little or no action taken by some of the programs currently being reviewed. Program review processes didn't prompt action; neither did a push from the OI, and therefore we are going through the program discontinuation process today. Dr. Ambriz-Galaviz stated that a watch-list is beginning to form based on enrolment, efficiency and program review.

A discussion ensued, and concern was expressed that the timeline for the program discontinuance discussions is too rigorous. Senator McKay noted that the timeline is determined by the Senate. It could be determined that a program should follow a specific course and return to the Senate and present the results. However, the discussion must end somewhere.

At this time, President Kashima presented an Excel spreadsheet comparing the process proposed by the MCAS to the process proposed by the WVCAS. A discussion ensued, and the following process was tentatively agreed on:

- Week 1: MCAS President will contact affected program faculty and ask them to create a 20 minute presentation on their program including detailing of reasons for the current challenges of the program, interventions already attempted, recommendations for the future of the program, and detailed rationale for those recommendations
- Week 2: MCAS President and VPI meet with affected program faculty to review and discuss data and interventions already recommended to the program - and to give direction and focus re their presentation
- Week 3: nothing
- Week 4: MCAS meeting # 1:
 - o MCAS President presentation of qualitative and quantitative indicators - 10 min
 - o MCAS President presentation of previously recommended interventions - 10 min
 - o MCAS Q&A - 20 min, presentation by program faculty - 20 min
 - o Program faculty Q&A - 20 min
- Week 5: MCAS meeting # 2:
 - o MCAS deliberations - Senators only speak

Concerns were raised that the above timeline is very tight. President Kashima acknowledged these concerns, but reminded the group that affected faculty have been aware of that their programs would be under review since December 2009 and the data from the VPI is already available. President Kashima recommended that people do not focus too much on the issue of the degree of accuracy of every piece of data. The PD

process is based on the best information we have and a variety of data points, both qualitative and quantitative.

Senator Trang stated that her constituents were concerned about impacts on the catalog and schedule production along with summer 2010 and fall 2010 offerings. President Kashima stated that the soonest classes could be affected is spring 2011 due to the production of the schedule of classes. VPI Ambriz-Galaviz added that regardless, students already enrolled in programs will be allowed to finish the program.

A discussion ensued on the idea of a Saturday session for public comment, and it was agreed that if the Senate is to give the public the most opportunity to express their opinions, it would have to fall on a Saturday. It was agreed that “the public” would encompass all those external to the college and all faculty, staff and district employees. President Kashima urged all Senators to attend. It was agreed that the exact date for the Saturday session would be decided at a later time.

VIII. New Business

A. Discussion of First Week Issues

At last week’s Senate meeting, various Senators and faculty expressed concerns regarding issues that occurred during the first week of classes. Today, President Kashima stated that she brought the issues up at a Division Chair Council meeting. It was decided that most issues were operational and therefore should be brought to the Division Chairs and the Office of Instruction.

VPI Ambriz-Galaviz explained that faculty concerns should first go to their Department Chair, then to the Division Chair and finally to the OI. The dissemination of information can sometimes get muddled in this process. However, the VPI and Division Chairs are working hard to problem solve.

In reference to the issue of room changes, Senator Trang stated that her division believes the lack of sign posting could be due to the decrease in SOCs. Dr. Ambriz-Galaviz agreed. It was suggested that the Administration Office or the Welcome Committee handle sign postage.

The Senators asked for further discussion on this topic and President Kashima agreed to reagendaize it.

B. 2009-2010 Senate Goals Discussion

President Kashima explained that the MCAS 2009-10 goals must be submitted to GAP as soon as possible. The Senators agreed on two goals: program discontinuance and minimum qualifications review.

D. Balance of Curriculum/Academic Directions Committee Discussion

This item will be reagendaized.

IX. Future Agenda Items -

X. Report out to Divisions

The Senate will discuss information that should be reported out to Divisions by Senators before the meeting minutes are distributed.

XI. Correspondence, Publications, & Announcements

XII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4 pm. These minutes are respectfully submitted by Academic Senate Secretary Lauren Milbourne.

XIII. Planned Future Agenda Items

- A. Discuss and Consider Issues of Academic Integrity in Course Scheduling(20 min) (I/A)**
- B. Discuss and Consider Response to Pick a Prof Request for Faculty Grading Data**
- C. Discuss and Consider Issues Related to Plus and Minus Grading**
- D. Consider Adoption of Institutional SLO Strategic Plan (Fall 09)**
- E. Consider the Inclusion of an SLO question in Faculty Interviews**
- F. Consider Approval of Operating Procedures for Study Abroad Programs**
- G. Standards for Articulation Agreements with High Schools**
- H. Review Local Minimum Qualifications in District**
- I. Discuss and Consider Term of Office for Academic Senate President**
- J. Retention Discussion**
- K. Testing Center and Makeup Testing**
- L. Coordination of Noncredit/Community Ed Offerings and Noncredit/Credit Instructional Programs Offerings**
- M. Computer Literacy as a Graduation Requirement**
- N. Discuss and Consider Compensation for A Senior Office Coordinator Faculty Senate Representatives**
- O. Discuss and Consider Voting Practices for Division and Department Chairs**
- P. Guidelines for Independent Study Approval**