



Mission College Academic Senate President's Report 10/11/07

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.

This past Friday, I and the leaders of the other Senates in the District – Laurel Kinley and Shoba Singh, representing the Classified Senates of WVC and MC, and Angelica Bangle, president of the WVC Academic Senate – met with the Chancellor and Trustees Chris Stampolis and Don Cordero to discuss a joint Board/Senates meeting to be held in November. The purpose of this meeting will be simple but profound: to allow members of all five groups to meet and share their backgrounds and goals with one another. It is a community-building exercise that we all feel will help us as we move forward this year. The format of the meeting will be somewhat structured, as we hope there will be a large number of people participating from all five groups. The meeting will take place at a public location mid-way between West Valley and Mission, and the time is being set to maximize the opportunities for faculty and classified staff to attend. A notice will be sent out when the final date and location are determined, and the meeting will be open to the public as required by the Brown Act.

Institutional Review Board:

Last week, at a roundtable with the Chancellor and other Senate presidents (WVCAS and the two Classified Senate presidents), Christina Oborn presented a preliminary proposal for the establishment of a district Institutional Review Board in order to comply with the 1991 Code of Federal Regulations on the Protection of Human Subjects. In order to receive grants from Federal agencies, and to protect researchers and the District from potential liability in the future, the District must certify that grants meet certain guidelines and have been properly reviewed by a board which meets certain legally-required standards. Just as a note, research conducted by the institutional research departments of the colleges would generally be exempt from this requirement.

Accreditation

Over the next two weeks we are in the final push to complete our self-study. This has been one of the biggest, most difficult, and most labor-intensive projects I have ever worked on, and I want to thank every single faculty and staff member who has stepped up to the plate and worked on this project over the last year. We'll be revising right up to the deadline to make the report as close to perfect as possible. However, since the site visit dates have been changed (now March 17-20, 2008), our target is to send the two college reports to the Board for their November 15 meeting, and that means that we are getting very close to the end of this marathon process.

Student Participation

Another person I want to thank is Jim Brodie, ASB president, for the terrific job he is doing this year in identifying students to participate in various shared governance bodies. We have student reps both on the Academic Senate (Michele Cooley) and on GAP and CBAC (Adam Black). Student participation in shared governance is

encouraged by Title 5, and it's a terrific asset to us as we plan and make decisions that will have an impact on the students we serve. Thanks, Jim!

Cathy Cox
President
Mission College Academic Senate

SHARED GOVERNANCE AND OTHER MEETINGS

As usual, please remember that these are my notes only. For full, "official" details please consult the minutes of the meetings listed.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, 10/4

- The Board held a special meeting at 5:00 to discuss the process they would be using for their annual self-evaluation. Self-evaluation is required by WASC and by Title 5, but the methods used are up to the individual board. For the first time in many years, our Board has hired an external consultant to come in and provide professional assistance in this process. Dr. Marilyn Manning has already interviewed all 9 trustees, including the student trustees. During this meeting she discussed the overall process that will be used to carry out the evaluations. Trustees are being asked to complete several documents that will establish the measurable criteria on which they are being evaluated, including selecting their top five values as a board of trustees, indicating their "norms and commitments", and selecting their key priorities from a list in the Trustee Handbook (published by CCLC). Trustees will complete these forms and return them to Dr. Manning this week, and she will then compile the responses to establish the criteria for the evaluations. Once that is done, a followup meeting will be scheduled to spend several hours with the Board going over the evaluation results. Trustee Atkins noted that during her 20 years on the Board, this is the first time a process such as this has been used and it was generally agreed that this was something they needed.
- During the regular Board meeting, the first major item was the approval of the final budget for 07/08. The budget as presented is not balanced. A great deal of time was spent on discussion of that fact, and different strategies that could be employed to alleviate the discrepancy. Presentations were made explaining specific issues with certain areas at both colleges – the Child Development Centers, the Campus Centers, and the ASB accounts. The budget was eventually approved, but with the understanding that it will be necessary to bring back certain areas for further discussion so that the imbalance can be dealt with in some fashion.
- The Board also conducted a "study session" on the issue of OPEB (Other Post-Employment Benefit) bonds to assist in funding retiree medical benefits for employees hired pre-1994. This is a possible solution to the funding problems presented by the new GASB 45 accounting standards which go into effect next year. However, some board members are not comfortable with the way these bonds work, and there is concern about the long-term effect of tying up our money in the bonds and whether they would adequately resolve the problem.

DIVISION CHAIRS COUNCIL, 10/8

- Arlene Atondo visited the DCs, and discussed issues relating to class census and attendance. One thing that came up in discussion was a difference between regular census classes, "daily census" classes, and "positive attendance" classes. Apparently there is some confusion about which classes should be positive attendance and which should be daily census; daily census classes are more advantageous to the District in terms of the number of FTES claimed, and we may have classes which should be listed this way which are currently treated as positive attendance. This issue will be investigated and discussed further in the near future.
- The new chair of the DC Council is Ellen McAllister. At this meeting, the DCs announced that in accordance with the Mission College Shared Governance and Decision-Making Plan (which was last revised in 1998 and is currently being discussed in GAP) , they are going to consider the ten division

chairs as the voting membership of DCC, with additional non-voting ad-hoc members to include a representative from the Academic Senate and the Classified Senate. This differs from the practice of the past several years in that for several years, meetings have alternated between being run by the VP of Instruction and being meetings of the DC's without the VP.

- Aaron Malchow attended the meeting and discussed ideas for dealing with the consequences of the HBA crisis.
- The DC's also discussed the LVN-to-RN program and whether it was possible to support the program without putting the college at risk financially.

GAP, 10/10

- Worku distributed the list of budget requests which fall into the "Big Ticket Items" category (over \$30,000) and those considered "Strategic Directions" requests. These lists as distributed have not been prioritized, and GAP will be doing that in the next week or two.
- Most of this week's meeting was spent reviewing the Planning Agenda (PA) items from the Accreditation Self-Study. Jonathan Brennan told GAP that originally over 150 PA items had been written, many of which were either close duplicates of one another or which were able to be consolidated based on similarities. As of this point, there were still over 60 items. Harriett pointed out that there were over 100 PA items on the 2001 report, and that is an unmanageable number both to track and report on for the next report. Any item listed in the Planning Agenda is something we are committing to do during the next seven years, so only those items which are really major should be included. Jonathan hopes that by the time the draft is done we will be down to about 10-12 major items per standard.

CBAC, 10/10

- Most of the CBAC meeting was spent reviewing the placement of budget requests into the categories required by the budget allocation model, specifically looking at requests which Worku had tentatively identified as falling into the "Strategic Directions" and "Instructional" categories to see if they were appropriately categorized. A number of adjustments were made to the placement of requests.

DISTRICT COUNCIL, 10/10

- District Council held its semi-annual review and orientation session, to ensure that all members are informed about the charge of the council, its role, and its operating procedures.
- During the HBA update, the Chancellor indicated that the auditor expects that it will take 2-3 weeks to complete the audit once the envelopes are opened and sorted. Since the auditor has not yet begun to open and sort the envelopes, and there are a great number to deal with (and the same auditor is also conducting the District's annual fiscal audit right now) it may be 4-6 weeks before we have a report. The colleges will have a chance to review the report before it goes to the State Chancellor.