

**Mission College Academic Senate  
Ext. 5413**

**Unapproved Minutes**

**Thursday, April 23, 2009**

**Copies of the MCAS minutes & agendas can be found online at:  
[http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/agendas\\_minutes.html](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 4:12 p.m.

Senators	A	P	Senators	A	P
Ashley (Ext.5177) Social Science		X	Joh (Ext. 5321) Math		X
Beggs (Ext. 5188) AAS		X	Johnston (Ext.) Soc.Science/AF	X	
Brichko(Ext. 5222) CATA		X	Charland (Ext. 5046) StudentDev		X
Cabrera (Ext. 5413) CATA/AF	X		Kashima (Ext. 5319) ESL		X
Kumar (ASB Rep)	X		O'Neill (Ext.5082 ) ESL		X
Dewis (Ext. 5327) Communic.		X	Ostrander (Ext.5274)StudentDev.		X
Glaser (Ext. 5093) ESL		X	Pembrook (Ext. 5275)CommServ		X
Harrison (Ext. 5340) AAS		X	Sabherwal (Ext. 5357) CIS		X
Hernas (Ext. 5169) Comm Serv.		X	Winsome (Ext. 5217) Natural Sci		X
Guests: P. Johnson, E. Kleppinger, H. Dennis, M. Rivas, D. Lamkin, J. Wilczak, S. Pancella, D. McKay, A. Malchow, J. Van Tassel, R. Lowenberg, St. Lipman, J. Del Frate, E. McAlister, C. Cox, J. Cormier, C. Lam, C. Kuri, S. Zeisler			Al Baker (Ext. 5253) Natural Sci		X

**II. Approval of the Minutes for March 16, 2009**

The agenda incorrectly stated that the minutes for March 16, 2009, needed approval. The minutes for April 16, 2009, will be agendized for approval at the next Academic Senate meeting.

**III. Order of the Agenda**

The order of the agenda was approved. (M/S/U – Charland/Hernas)

**IV. Oral Communication from the Public**

None.

**V. Information & Announcements**

Senator Ashley reminded everyone that the Child Development Center is holding a Book Fair.

Senator Brichko announced that more faculty are needed to serve as marshals on the Commencement Committee. A call to serve will be sent out.

**VI. Administrative Business/Actions/Appointments**

**A. President's Report** – None.

**B. Other Reports** – Cathy Cox reported on the New Program Development Committee. She updated the Senators on the members of the committee and the recent activity, specifically on the idea to pursue the avenue of green technologies. She stated that there is no clear direction on how to move forward with this idea, however the committee plans to move forward in the areas of resource conservation and efficiency. She added that this is a two-prong approach – the committee seeks information from areas in the green technologies field and also wants any new curriculum developed be taught as an interdisciplinary program. Once those interested have responded, the plan is to meet again in May 2009. Curriculum will be presented to the Curriculum Review Committee in Fall 2009, so the New Program Development Committee hopes to create a program approval process in Fall 2009.

**C. Committee Appointments** – none.

**VII. Old Business**

**A. Discuss and Consider Issues Related to the Future Direction of the College and District: Structure**

Senator Pembroke led the discussion and opened with a review of points and issues discussed at past Academic Senate meetings regarding this issue. The academic areas identified for potential improvements were:

- Process
- Accountability
- Communication
- Transparency
- Too many layers, therefore decision-making often unresponsive
- No year-round coverage of Division or Department Chairs
- Senior Office Coordinators – only three to support 10 divisions
- Need to have more checks and balances
- Document responsibilities and formally train people
- Processes need to be defined and written
- Shortcomings with the “peer-to-peer” system of Division Chairs

A discussion ensued on the reasoning behind the administration's decision to look into changing the Division Chair structure. It was stated that the Brain Trust report has fueled this decisions. An audience member remarked that just because the Brain Trust forwarded a

recommendation does not automatically mean it is a valid idea. It was also stated that perhaps the study has been given too much credibility—there are known data errors in the report and still the report is given much validity.

Curtis reiterated the need to define the features/attributes of an organization that we want or expect. He reminded everyone that this is an opportunity to define what the college will look like and how we would like the organization to function. At this time, the following list of attributed was created:

- trust
- respect (collegial, etc.)
- all faculty treated equally
- ability to “discipline” faculty
- react nimbly
- honor shared governance
- contact respected (for example, article 21)
- transparency
- institutional knowledge/honor history of college
- transition of information when change in leadership
- students first
- faculty driven
- honor processes clearly defined/written
- efficiency
- accountability/ownership
- few layers
- year round coverage
- responsibility
- cohesiveness/community/connection lost with multiple buildings
- training of those in leadership
- cost effective
- knowledge of processes
- consistency of leadership (lower turnover)
- leadership grown from within the college
- training to junior colleagues from those who are Senior

It was stated that it can be difficult for faculty to discipline themselves. It does not serve students or anyone well when this situation occurs. That type of situation does not serve our students well at all. An audience member stated that through emailing a retired faculty member, she was told that a Division Chair structure or a Dean structure can work but each has a critical element. The Dean structure can react nimbly but the college needs to ensure that shared governance is firmly in place. A DC structure, while having shared governance firmly in mind, is more cumbersome. A Senator pointed out that no matter what structure is implemented, all processes must be defined, written, and available for everyone.

It was pointed out that originally, the college was a small family-driven system and proved quite efficient. A visitor agreed, remarking that when everyone was in the same building a faculty member could walk across the hall to solve things. As more buildings were built, that sense of community was lost and procedures were not written. We need to become a true

community with a sense of unity. Senator Pembroke noted that ownership of processes and accountability is a key to supporting faculty and learning. A big part of the problem is the lack of written processes. A visitor disagreed, stating that with a dean structure faculty would be told what to do and therefore written processes would not be critical. Ownership would be taken away. Another visitor stated that processes should help the organization be resistant to the personality in charge.

A visitor asked why the college would want to shift the power from someone who has been employed with the college many years to someone here for a short time. We should trust experience. It was agreed that we lose expertise when people leave and we need to capture institutional knowledge. A visitor added that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges recognizes that colleges are better off if they train, grow and promote from within and maintain those with the long-term best interest for the organization.

A Senator asked Chancellor Hendrickson whether he is open to an instructional administration organization that includes Division Chairs. The Chancellor responded that he is open to any instructional administration structure that allows the college to reach its goals.

Dean of Instruction Jim Wilczak distributed a document containing different configurations of Deans, Division Chairs, and Directors. Each configuration had a different combination of the number of each position and showed a cost analysis of salary only. These examples were only for the instructional side of the college. An assumption was that any configuration could do the same amount of work by shifting responsibilities. Another assumption for some configurations is that Deans move from staff roles to line Deans with groups reporting into them. The VP of Instruction reminded the Senators this is the product of the request for cost analysis of Deans versus DCs.

It was asked why the Chancellor requested an organizational structure be brought forth by May 1, 2009, why we are examining instruction only and why is it assumed that only instruction needs to change as a cost savings function? The Chancellor responded that the district and colleges are talking about the organizational structure of instruction from departments to VPs. We need to look at changing the way we do business. Statistically, in regard to our Accountability Report for Community Colleges student success data and our enrollment numbers, we are falling behind other area colleges and that is the reason that the District hired the Brian Trust. Recently, he requested for people to form writing teams to make proposals. The proposals are due in May 2009 so that everyone can access them before the summer begins. He stated that eight areas are being reviewed. The proposals are intended to have a review and allow for changes. The core of the college is within the instructional structure. The Chancellor stated that although he does have a bias for full-time deans, he is open to any structure that achieves our goals. He noted that in recent times, the Division Chairs have stepped up and done a great job. This is not a personnel evaluation but one of structure; if we don't improve the manner in which we deliver courses, resources will be unavailable for student services needs.

At this time, a motion was made to extend time on this item until the end of the meeting. (M/S/U – Ashley/Hernas).

A visitor remarked that through her own cost-analysis of our structure versus the structures in place at 11 other colleges, she found that our instructional administration costs come in at eight out of 11, while the overall administration of the district comes out at number one. The Chancellor thanked her for the information and assured the group that we are looking at many areas, not just instruction. We need to ensure that in the future we perform in the manner expected by the State.

A visitor stated that he has worked under various structures, and everything depends on how competent, accountable and responsible the person in charge is. This year the DCs have done an outstanding job with the administration giving them the tools and data to do the job correctly. This has never happened before. The Dean of Instruction agreed and reminded the group that student enrollment is up 10% with using about 10% less resources. It was also suggested that instead of moving to a different, structure, we should fix whatever is wrong with the current structure.

A Senator spoke to the Chancellor and commented that the DCs have been accountable 7-days of the week this year. However, she has never seen any administrator taking responsibility for HbA. The senator also took issue with the Chancellor's comment about whether students will be choosing us after the economy picks up. Faculty are professionals providing individual attention by student-focused faculty. The students are choosing us. The Chancellor responded that our sister colleges have been out-growing us for a number of years, but our lower enrollment was hidden because we were receiving apportionment monies for students that were not here through the HbA issue. Enrollments across the board will decline at some point and we need to put a structure in place now to continue to move us forward. Other area colleges are structured in a more economical fashion and that is one reason why they are out-performing us. An audience member pointed out that because other colleges still have HbA, we should not be measured up against them.

The Chancellor was asked exactly what needs to be fixed. The Chancellor responded that we have a lack of accountability due to our structure. We have groups of people that don't have in their function the responsibility to actually carry out functions. Our faculty to student ratio inefficiency shows up in a variety of areas, like lack of enrollment growth. Our structure should be producing better results. An audience member responded that Mission College enrollment is up by 15% and she is disappointed that the Chancellor continues to state that we must change in order to produce better results.

A Senator reminded the group that Marketing has always been under funded. Is the problem structure or finance? The Chancellor acknowledged that the problem is both structure and finance. It was pointed out that if this is the case, the organization needs to compare all costs like advertising, not just DCs versus Deans.

A Senator pointed out that we have an opportunity to institutionalize what was done to make things better this year. It was acknowledged what a great job the Dean of Instruction and VP of Instruction have done this year in providing information to PGC and the DCs. Much has now been institutionalized by the DCs, who should train and show faculty what needs to be done.

A visitor commented that form follows function, so rather than batting around what positions we have (deans versus chairs), we should be looking at what level of functionality we need and want. Then we can begin to examine what form will ensure that functionality. Another visitor cautioned that the discussion should not be so much about solving the problem but should be the culture. A heavy Dean structure could dis-empower the faculty and he wants a culture where the faculty are empowered. It was also pointed out that administrators answer to those above them, division chairs answer to those below them.

President Kashima stated that at District Council, a discussion will take place on the list of criteria by which to assess any proposals that come forward. She suggested that some of the listed attributes that we came up with today could be used for criteria.

At this time, a motion was made to extend the discussion by five minutes. (M/S/U – Ashley/Anna)

A discussion ensued on forming a task force to gather information on the current division and department structure of the college. The following motion was made (M/S/U – AshleyPembrook):

“that the Mission College Academic Senate create a task force to work on the issue of Division Chair structure and Department structure. The Task Force is to be comprised of willing Academic Senators and faculty. The task force will be charged with looking at the structures of Divisions and Departments and returning to the Academic Senate with information supporting whether the structures should be realigned.”

**VIII. New Business**

**A. Discuss and Consider Criteria for Assessing Restructuring Proposals**

This item will be reagendaized due to lack of quorum.

**B. Discuss and Consider Agenda Issues: Agendaizing Process and Prioritizing Future Agenda Items**

This item will be reagendaized due to lack of quorum.

**IX. Correspondence/Publications/Announcements**

**X. Future Agenda Items**

**A. Discuss and Consider Issues Related to Program Review**

**B. Discuss and Consider Shared Governance Structure Documents**

**C. Discuss and Consider Response to Pick a Prof Request for Faculty Grading Data**

**D. Discuss and Consider Issues Related to LVN-RN Positions and Tenure Track**

**E. Issues Related to Community Ed and Title 5, Student Attendance Accounting Manual**

**F. Discuss and Consider Issues of Academic Integrity in Course Scheduling**

**G. Discuss and Consider Issues Related to Plus and Minus Grading**

**H. Consider Adoption of Institutional SLO Strategic Plan**

**I. Discuss and Consider Role of District Council in Staff Development (5 min) (I/A)**

**J. Consider the Inclusion of an SLO question in Faculty Interviews**

**K. Consider Approval of GE requirement exemption (Charland/Kashima)(10 min)(A)**

**L. Consider Approval of Operating Procedures for Study Abroad Programs**

**M. Standards for Articulation Agreements with High Schools**

**N. Review Local Minimum Qualifications in District**

**O. Discuss and Consider Term of Office for Academic Senate President**

**P. Green Technologies Program Initiative – New Program Development**

**Q. Harriett’s visit to provide update on this year’s focus on:**

**a. enrollment management**

**b. datatel (information management, efficiencies, etc.)**

**c. tracking every student we should be counting**

**d. teamwork:**

**i. a) collaboration**

**b) accountability**

**R. Academic Rigor and the Carnegie Unit**

**S. Streamlining the Curriculum Process**

**T. Honorary Degrees**

**U. Retention Discussion**

**V. Board's Self-Evaluation**

**Lotus Carrier at Graduation**

**XI. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:23pm. These minutes are respectfully submitted by Academic Senate Secretary Lauren Johnson.