



Mission College Academic Senate President's Report 3/13/08

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.

Yesterday at GAP, President Robles unveiled a proposal for an administrative reorganization of the college. This proposal is already being discussed widely across the campus, and she has asked all constituent groups to agendaize discussions so that we can provide feedback to her by the April 23rd GAP meeting. There is a lot to talk about, and this report is not the place to do it. However, I would strongly encourage everyone to look closely at it with an eye not only to potential *problems*, but also to any potential *benefits* that could come from reorganization.

It should be clear to all of us at Mission that while we have many things we do very well, we also have a number of major areas that need improvement, and many of those areas relate to both administrative turnover and lack of appropriate oversight of key functions. Whether or not the plan presented yesterday is adopted as presented or modified to a different configuration, it is an attempt to respond to those issues in a way that would meet the needs of the college, within our limited budget, and improve our ability to carry out our mission. Division Chairs would still be retained. Department chairs would still exist (although with less overall release time). There would be an overall increase of one administrative position and one classified position.

The administrative structure of the college is an administrative area of responsibility. It may impact the Academic Senate in certain ways, in particular if there are faculty who are no longer contained within academic divisions who would then need some mechanism for representation in the Senate. There are other considerations, as the structure of many key governance bodies may be affected. All of those are things we will need to discuss in the Senate. If possible, we'll try to do that before the Spring break; if not, I will agendaize it for the first meeting when we return. In the meantime, please discuss this in your departments and divisions.

Accreditation: New issues of the Senate Rostrum should be arriving in your mailboxes very soon. Please note that this issue contains a number of articles that are of key importance. The one that jumped off the page at me concerns accreditation, and the change to the "two-year rule". This is a major change that will have an immediate impact on Mission and West Valley, as it requires WASC and ACCJC to hold us to a two-year timeline to correct any deficiencies noted in our accreditation. As I have already indicated, I expect both program review and SLO's to show up as shortcomings here at Mission. It is absolutely essential that we achieve full compliance with the accreditation standards in both of these areas within the next two years, and I am working as hard as I can to get the Program Master Planning Committee established and operating before Spring Break, with the intent of implementing Program Master Planning in Fall 2008.

Budget: As requested, I have invited Randy Castello to visit us next Thursday to provide an overview of the District budget allocation model as well as the two new models which have been presented in BAMS. This overview will be the only topic of next week's Senate meeting, which will be from 2 – 3 p.m. and will be for information only.

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.

LAND CORPORATION, 3/6

- The Board of Directors considered requests from the District to dramatically increase the total amount of revenues paid back to the District (from 25% of lease receipts to approximately 50% for a three-year period). After much discussion, it was agreed to fund the increase for one year only.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, 3/6

- Trustee Stampolis brought forward an item on the Brown Act as it relates to discussions of issues outside of agenda meetings. He cited several specific sections of the act; there was no discussion of the matter by the trustees.

PERFORMANCE GOALS COMMITTEE, 3/10

Although I do not attend PGC, Clement Lam, chair of the committee, gave me some notes to pass on to the Senate:

- 2 additional FTEF have been approved by PCG for the LVN-RN program for 08/09, in addition to the two grant-funded full-time faculty positions currently being hired. (The new FTEF is dependent on the availability of FTEF overall next year, but is needed to bring the program to the necessary staffing levels for the courses being offered).
- He also clarified some issues raised in GAP recently – Any summer class that starts before July 1 but ends after June 30 may be counted for either the current or next fiscal year, but once they're reported they can't be moved later. Classes beginning after June 30 can only be counted for next year.
- PGC "continues to advise department chairs to consider supplemental instruction whenever they see fit."

DIVISION CHAIRS COUNCIL, 3/10

- Danny Nguyen gave a presentation on noncredit instruction to the Division Chairs. Non-credit differs from several other types of classes with very similar names (not for credit, community education, ????) and does count for apportionment although the amount received by the college varies. It also counts towards our base. The presentation was extensive, informative, and valuable, and I intend to invite Danny to make a similar presentation to the Academic Senate in the near future. Handouts included the ASCCC paper on "The Role of Noncredit in the California Community College" (http://www.asccc.org/Publications/Papers/Noncredit_2006.html). There was brief discussion on the possibility of using noncredit courses as a way of "feeding" students into our credit programs, and on what infrastructure would be necessary to implement such a plan.
- I explained the Academic Senate's intent to form a cross-functional team to work on enrollment issues. There were questions about whether this might already be the purview of GAP, and I explained that we believe this is an academic matter and that furthermore GAP has been overloaded with a large number of tasks this semester. The various councils need to work together in a more coordinated fashion to make quicker progress on this matter.

CURRICULUM, 3/10

- The "New Program Approval Process" was discussed by CRC. Their recommendation to the Senate is that the existing process be retained, but that the sign-off sheet be eliminated in favor of using CurricUNET. Discussion then moved to the need for the chair of the DCC to sign off on behalf of DCC, rather than the chair of the proposing division.
- There was discussion also about what proposals are considered "new programs" needing to go to PGC, and whether there was a need for changes to the process relating to PGC and

the length of time before a program becomes permanent. There is a discrepancy between our use of the term “program” at Mission and the definition of a “program” in Title 5. In regulations, a “program” is any degree, certificate, or course of study leading to a specific educational goal. Here at Mission, we use “program” to mean “department”, which causes misunderstanding of what sorts of things need to be approved by the Academic Senate and by CRC. PGC and CRC need to start using “program” in the Title 5 sense. Any proposal needing to go to PGC for FTEF allocation should properly be called a “department”. However, **any** proposal for a new certificate or degree is a new “program” under Title 5, and must go through the New Program Approval Process.

- CRC considered the criteria for supplemental instruction developed jointly by Brenna Wundram, Stephanie Kashima, and myself. The criteria will be discussed by the Senate at today’s meeting. However, there was general consensus on a recommendation that all future course proposals or revisions relating to supplemental instruction should set up SI as a separate module – either a co-requisite or optional lab – rather than attempting to embed SI in existing courses, and as a result the committee felt that the proposed criteria relating to learning outcomes and assessment of S.I. would be covered by existing course approval forms. Other criteria can be covered by a separate form in CurricUNET.

GAP, 3/12

- In addition to the proposal for reorganization discussed at the beginning of this report, GAP also reviewed the planning agenda matrix to provide updates on progress before the accreditation visit next week.

CBAC, 3/12

- The timeline for the budget request process for Fall 08 was discussed and refined. There was significant discussion about the proper routing of requests for prioritization by the Technology Committee as well as requests to be considered by the Facilities & Safety Committee, the President’s Council, and items which go to GAP as “Big Ticket Items”.
- There are a lot of requests currently from various groups for budget training, and while there is some overlap there are also differences between the requests. In addition to the Senate’s request for training on the District Budget Allocation Model, division & department chairs have requested training through Staff Development on how budget administrators can use the budget system more effectively; there will be District budget forums on the “big picture” and the fiscal crisis both in our District and statewide; and the Classified Senate has requested an overview of the budget.

DISTRICT COUNCIL, 3/12

- At the next Board meeting, 3/20, there will be a presentation on a software program called “Board Docs” which is designed to make board documents, resolutions, minutes, and procedures more accessible. I will be watching carefully to see if this might answer some issues raised during our Technical Assistance and FCMAT visits.
- The Chancellor’s search committee reported that paper screening is going on right now. The pool was deemed to be sufficiently diverse to meet requirements. Initial interviews are scheduled for the week of April 15. The second-round interviews (finalists meet with the Board members) will be held on 5/6 – 5/9, and open forums will be held with each finalist on the same day as their interview with the Board.