



# Mission College Academic Senate President's Report 2/28/08

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.

This has been a very busy week for all of us. We're gearing up for the visit of the accreditation team next month, dealing with budget and enrollment management issues, and trying to carry on the business of the college all at the same time.

Last Saturday I attended the annual **Board Budget Workshop**, at which the Board hears presentations on the District Budget and recommendations for the budget priorities for the coming year. Last week I summarized the three priorities being recommended by DBAC to the Board. They were presented at the workshop, along with a great deal of background information and suggestions for dealing with the projected. The District is facing a huge deficit, approximately \_\_\_\_\_, and the solutions proposed by the Finance department included a number of measures including:

- Increasing the amount given to the District by the Land Corp. from the current 25% to 50% of lease revenues for three years.
- Implementing a solution to the District's OPEB liability for retiree health benefits, which could involve issuing OPEB bonds or purchasing certificates of participation (COPs)
- Defunding vacant positions.

... and a number of other strategies. I can't say that they were received cheerfully by the Board (several trustees expressed reservations about the first two items bulleted above) but there is a recognition that we need to take strong action to address the situation. All the strategies for dealing with the budget shortfall hinge on recovering at least 865 FTES by the end of next year. There was a great deal of discussion of the factors that have lead us to the current budget crisis, and what we may be facing in the future, as the trustees tried to get more understanding of the situation we're in. However, as one trustee commented near the end of the workshop, "The Board priorities are survival!"

There were comments from trustees that the District budget appears to have a structural problem. Some questions were asked – by both trustees and others in the meeting – about whether the budget problems would have existed even without the HBA situation (the answer was "Yes") and it was also stated that one key question is what size we should be – whether we should try to grow back to the size we claimed to be before the HBA audit.

No priorities were actually adopted by the Board at this meeting; this was an information item only to allow the Board to discuss and consider options. Furthermore, the specific proposals for dealing with the budget shortfall have not been presented to DBAC or District Council nor discussed with any of the shared governance bodies in the District due to time constraints. (In District Council 2/27, it was stated that they will be brought forward for discussion in the near future).

On another front, **supplemental instruction** is still a major topic of discussion. The meeting between the State Chancellor's office and the two college Vice Presidents of Instruction is still pending, and that meeting will determine the specific record-keeping requirements for us to report FTES generated through supplemental instruction. However, the development of curriculum for supplemental instruction is a separate matter, and does not need to wait for the results of this meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Shared Governance and Other Meetings**

As usual, please remember that these are only my notes from meetings. For more complete details, please consult the minutes of the actual meetings.

#### **CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE, 2/26/08**

- I have asked CRC to consider an issue that has been raised based on discussions at the state level concerning the academic integrity of courses offered in extremely compressed formats (i.e., three weeks or less). An ASCCC resolution recommended that local curriculum committees review courses separately if they were to be offered in such a compressed timeline to ensure that the academic rigor of the class would not be compromised, similar to the review required for courses offered in distance education formats.
- The issue of supplemental instruction is still being addressed, and Brenna Wundram will be meeting with me and Stephanie Kashima on Friday to develop the checklist of measurable criteria for review of S.I. course proposals that was requested by the Senate.
- There was also discussion about lab fees and the proper use of lab fees attached to classes. There was concern expressed about what constitutes "tangible materials" and "lasting value" (two requirements for acceptable items that can be paid for via lab fees); there also is some concern about how these fees relate to courses involving travel.

#### **GAP, 2/27/08**

- GAP met the chair of the visiting team for our accreditation, Mr. Robert Dees, and the team assistant, Lynanne ??????. Mr. Dees asked a number of questions of GAP members, focusing largely on issues relating to recommendations from the last accreditation report and the mid-term report, such as program review, SLOs, and student equity.
- Some of their questions addressed the "work-to-contract" issue, of which the District Academic Senate resolution was a part. The focus of the questions seemed to be on whether the issues which lead to the situation were still a major focus of attention in the college, and the consensus of GAP was that in general the situation in the District now is much improved over where it was at the time of the resolution.
- Jonathan Brennan presented a matrix of planning agenda items, showing the "owners" (key people and/or entities responsible for the item) and giving updates on actions taken to address each item. Two planning agenda items concerning the Senate will be agendized for discussion later in the semester: reactivation of the Student Success Committee and the assignment of a task force to review the cultural pluralism requirement for courses. An additional major item involving the Senate is the implementation of program review.
- Daniel Peck presented the 500-word response to the ARCC data he has prepared for submission to the state this Friday. (A copy of the draft will be distributed to Senators separately today.)

#### **CBAC, 2/27/08**

- Haze Dennis and Susie Faries, members of the Senate's task force on the College Budget Allocation Model attended CBAC to begin observing the budget allocation process for this semester so that they can give input on the process. (Pat Lavallo has had to drop off this task force; two other members were unable to be present).

- There will be very limited funds available for next year; a call for requests will be sent out after CBAC has given input to Worku on the wording of the call.
- A call for summer session budget requests will also be sent out. There will be approx. \$153,000 (total) available for Summer this year.
- There was discussion about the effect of declining FTES on the college's funding by the District; the statement was made that the District is trying to fund each college "to the level of their capacity", whether the money comes from the District, from Land Corp, or other sources, so that they can restore as much FTES as possible.

**DISTRICT COUNCIL, 2/27/08**

- Trustee Chris Stampolis has agendized a discussion on the Brown Act for the Board meeting on 3/6 (item 8.2). This is an information item only, and the Board meeting will be at Mission College that night. My understanding is that this item is an outgrowth of concerns expressed during the Board's recent self-evaluation process.

**DISTRICT JOINT ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE, 2/27/08**

- Preparations for the visit of the accreditation teams to both colleges next month are nearly complete.
- The team will be using CC 219/220 as their headquarters during the MC visit, 3/17-3/20. Due to the schedule of their visit, I may decide to cancel the MC Academic Senate meeting on March 20.