

Mission College Academic Senate
Ext. 5413
Unapproved Minutes
Tuesday, June 10, 2008

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by President Stephanie Kashima at 3:40pm

| Senators | A | P | Senators | A | P |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Abdeljabbar (Ext. 5250) Tech. | | X | Joh (Ext. 5321) Math | | X |
| Ashley (Ext.5177) Social Science | | X | Johnson (Ext. 5185) StudentDev. | | X |
| Beggs (Ext. 5188) AAS | | X | Kashima (Ext. 5319) ESL | | X |
| Brichko(Ext. 5222) CATA | | X | Malchow (Ext. 5370) Comm | | X |
| Cabrera (Ext. 5413) CATA/AF | X | | O’Neill (Ext.5082) ESL | X | X |
| Cooley (ASB Rep) | X | | Ostrander (Ext.5274)StudentDev. | | X |
| Dewis (Ext. 5327) Communictns | X | | Pembrook (Ext. 5275)CommServ | | X |
| Glaser (Ext. 5093) ESL | | X | Shokun (AS B Rep) | X | |
| Harrison (Ext. 5340) AAS | X | | Thickpenny (Ext.5287) CATA | | X |
| Hernas (Ext. 5169) Comm Serv. | | X | Ting (Ext. 5330) Math | | X |
| | | | Winsome (Ext. 5217) Natural Sci | | X |
| Guests: L. Harris, E. Kleppinger | | X | | | |

II. Approval of Minutes for May 22, 2008

The minutes for May 22 were not available at the time of the meeting.

III. Order of the Agenda

The order of agenda was approved (M/S/U – Brichko/Thickpenny)

IV. Oral Communication from the Public (5 Minutes/Person)

There were concerns expressed about Board Item # 5.3 – new administrator contracts. It was opined that it is not responsible to offer 2 yr contracts to administrators in time of a budget contract. During the last layoffs in 2003, when administration was asked why administrators were not being laid off, the answer was that they had contracts that couldn’t be broken. This is not about the value of administrators and their competence, but rather about the wisdom of offering 2 yr contracts.

Chancellor’s salary – there was a concern about whether was the Brown act was violated because the current executive level salary schedule was not publicized. Stephanie will follow up.

HbA – Constantin resolution. This resolution puts a lot of responsibility on the academic senates. There was a request to put it on future agenda for senate. There was a recommendation that we should also tie it into Land Corp resolution of Senate. Stephanie reported that Cathy Cox has written some thoughts on this to Jane Patton. Further much of what is being requested is already being done through the curriculum process. Angelica is working with Pat Andrews to draft a response to the resolution. Stephanie should work with Angelica to draft response from Senate Presidents. Angelica and the Chancellor advised the board that the resolution may violate Ed Code, Title 5, AB1725 and Board policy. There was a request to form a subcommittee to address this, but it would need to be agendized. This isn’t really a union issue per Union President.

EIR report - there was a question about the EIR report that states that the north side plans of Mission is open for “opportunity building” – what does this mean? Stephanie will follow up.

IV. Information & Announcements (College & District) (5 min.)

Info/Announcements – The Senate welcomed new senators Lora Glaser, representing the ESL Division, Thais Winsome, representing Natural Sciences (we haven't had rep from Natural Sciences for 10 years) Helen Ostrander, representing Student Development, and Aaron Malchow, representing Communications. The Senators expressed their appreciation for every new senator.

VI. Administrative Business/Actions/Appointments (10 min.)

A. President's Report

Stephanie has changed the name of the President's Report to the Shared Governance Report. There was a question as to whether this report will include discussions from the roundtable with chancellor. Stephanie indicated that she plans to report out to the Senate on all meetings and discussions she has except for discussions about personnel which are considered confidential matters. Stephanie stated that she has already met with Harriett and discussed next year's priorities. Stephanie indicated communication and faculty involvement in issues were her priorities for the upcoming year in addition to the obvious priorities of Program Review, Accreditation follow up and SLOs. Stephanie reported the highlights of her shared governance report: all positions without funding have been halted; the Chancellor has initiated the hiring of an organizational study firm to conduct an District organizational study; there were 4 new District/central services positions approved by the Board in Feb; achieving a balanced budget depends on the procurement of \$ \$3.4 from Land Corp and the use of \$5.3 million from the Retirees Health Benefits Fund 293; Trustee Constantin's Resolution on Curriculum Process. Stephanie directed Senator's to the full Shared Governance Report for details. There was a question about whether this is the time to do a reorganization. There were questions about where the money for org study will come from and indications that that question has not been answered by chancellor. There was some explanation about a board meeting item mentioned in the shared governance report. The question was why was the District EM Plan firm selected by WVC? Chancellor indicated that because it wouldn't adversely affect Mission and that we need to move central services because we have no space for expansion of central services. Stephanie asked the Chancellor at the Board meeting about his reference to the expansion of Central Services and the Chancellor indicated plans to hire a District financial auditor and the lack of funds to do so at the present time. The Chancellor later explained his hope to hire 4 positions for district and the lack of funds to do so. It was stated by a faculty member that movement is being made on one or more of those positions. There were some expressions of concern about the Mission College President's lack of advocacy re District EM Plan hiring of firm by WVC. It was reported that when the MC College President heard about the use of Mission College as collateral for OPEB bonds she was caught off guard, but didn't verbally object. It was asserted that the President was not consulted about that decision and so wasn't aware until that Board meeting.

Equivalency committee. Senators were asked whether or not the Senate President should sit on the Equivalency Committee or whether former AS President Cathy Cox could. There was agreement that senate president should sit on this committee esp given the challenges of next year.

Shared governance report. There was a recommendation that faculty show up to support senate president in shared governance meetings. There was expression that at first District Council/District Budget Advisory Committee meeting, academic senate's questions were met with a dismissive tone by some members. There was expression of importance of faculty to show up to ask questions and show faculty presence and provide another perspective and support for faculty concerns expressed by senate president. Stephanie sent around a sign-up sheet for

senators to sign up to attend upcoming meetings. It was stated that the chancellor already has a draft process for hiring the firm and will give it to the new chancellor. A faculty member requested a copy of this draft process, but the request was denied. The Chancellor said he will share it at the next senate roundtable meeting.

There was the question of possibility of issuing vote of no confidence against chancellor for yet another skirting of shared governance. It was stated that this could be a strategic move to show the new chancellor our deep concerns about the lack of consultation with senate on senate matters. It was opined that a vote of no confidence is serious action and that faculty should not take it without thinking it through. Perhaps just let this chancellor go and start fresh. We will need to pay close attention to new chancellor. It was stated that bringing issues directly to the board can be effective in an election year.

B. Other Reports

VII. Old Business

A. Discuss and Consider Proposed Changes to the Program Review Process (Senate) (I/A) (15 min)

Senators were given materials on the revised Program Review form. Senator Ashley indicated that the former chair of the committee wasn't able to continue as chair and Senator Ashley offered to serve as chair to the end of summer. Proposed process:

Beginning of September: programs receive data

October 1 – First draft of Program Review form due

October 15 – First review completed

November 1 – Second draft due

November 15 – Second review completed

December – finish up any last minute changes

Spring – Friday Forums – 3-4 Fridays at the beginning of the Spring semester – 15-30 minute presentations on the highlights of their program review

We revised the form to make it more accessible. The new form includes space for listing of 1-5 program goals with comments and justifications; a 5 year implementation plan; program descriptions including number of FTE, classified staff, class sections, equipment and other information; program narrative summary. There is plenty of opportunity for program staff to explain all the nuanced information about their programs. It was advised that we consult with WVC on their form to create similar forms. When the forms go to the Board for approval, there will be questions about the differences. We have completed the Academic Programs form, but are working with Student Services VP to create the Student Services form. We also need to address reviewing areas that are neither or both Instruction and Student Services such as instructional labs. The committee also has plans to create a form for reviewing administration.

It was noted that faculty/staff can find program review tedious if not presented properly. We need to work on reminding faculty/staff of the benefits of program review such as highlighting their successes and achievements to the rest of the college community. There could be a celebration at the end of the process. We should include the Program Review process on Flex Day training.

Motion to approve the Program Review form Malchow/Ostrander. There was a recommendation to update the data given to programs on goals from 2001 data to more recent data. It was stated that this process can be simple: Academic and Vocational program goals are: transfer or getting employed. Under Program/Dept goals, the column in the left hand side, there should be 5 spaces listed instead of 4. It was explained that we were trying to demonstrate that one didn't need to include only 1 goal per box; one could include more than one goal in each box. The committee

will redo the sample to include more than one goal per box. It was mentioned that because of the BSI activities, it would be wise to include all Basic Skills programs in the same year of program review schedule. It was recommended that we approved the form as a one year trial form and work with WVC next year to get aligned with their form. Motion to approve as one year form with understanding that we may revise form after discussing with WVC and the senate will reevaluate after one year. Amendment to motion approved Beggs/Malchow approved. Original motion approved.

B. Continue Discussion on Strategic Responses to Budget & Enrollment Challenges Facing the District (I/A) (40 minutes)

Budget/Enrollment issues – Lydia Harris, retired faculty member and member of Retiree Organization and Ed Kleppinger, Faculty Union (ACE) President attended to answer questions about use of retiree funds for balancing the budget. The proposed 08-09 district budget plan relies on 2 sources of new funding to backfill our deficit. The first is Land Corp monies of \$3.4 million which need to be requested by the District and approved by the Land Corp. The second is the use of \$5.8 million from the Retiree Health Benefits Fund 293. This plan includes recommendations for one time responses and ongoing responses. Senators were reminded that the one-time recommendations will not take care of the ongoing deficit. There was concern that this use of retiree benefits fund money will set a bad precedent. There was discussion as to whether or not it had been done before. It was opined that this had happened before when the Datatel system was purchased. It was asserted that that system was purchased with retiree benefit fund monies which were never paid back to the fund. It was explained that the issuance of Other Post-Employee Benefits bonds that was approved by the Board recently does not need to get voter approval. This is one of 2 methods for securing funds for ongoing retiree health benefits. One method is to issue bonds as we have. The other method is to pay it as one goes. The annual premium for this liability for the District is about \$7 million/year which will go steadily up to about \$10 million in a few years but will cap at \$10 million/year and then start to decrease annually until the liability ends. Other Districts such as Foothill/DeAnza are using the pay-as-you-go system. They are getting the money as a line item in their budgets from their operating budgets. In other words, they will need to cut their operating budgets to pay for this cost. So either it is an ongoing budget or, with OPEB bonds, it is a 25-30 year commitment with a steady amount of about \$7 million/year. Our District decided to go with the bond method. There are some Southern California districts, among others, that have gone the bond route also. The bond method also offers the possibility that there may be a 10-15% investment return which would benefit the District long-term. The Board was extremely hesitant to do this, but felt there was little other choice for the fiscal health of the District. Our fiscal situation was created by declining enrollments and the HBA fine and ongoing loss of apportionment from HBA. It was expressed that a third method, which the District had been using, was to take money out each year from the budget and put it in a Retirement Savings Fund.

There was a question as to why the Land Corp monies which total about \$15 million at the present are not being considered for use rather than Retiree Benefits funds. It was expressed that it was not clear why that money was not being considered or offered. There was some conjecture that it was being saved for student scholarships, but there is no indication that any specific plans have been made which would preclude the Board and Land Corp from using the money to benefit the District's educational needs.

It was stated that some staff in the Finance Office are not entirely happy with the use of the \$5.8 million from the Retiree Health Benefits fund. There is currently about \$10 million in the account. Also, concern was expressed over new administrative positions being recommended without funding sources identified. It is feared that the existing \$10 million will be used as a funding source for new administrative positions. The retirees are not happy to see that fund being

used for any purpose other than retiree benefits. However, they filed a lawsuit against the District regarding their ongoing benefits and won and a 1974 Board item says that those premiums will be paid forever for these retirees. So retirees are not extremely worried because of the lawsuit, but they are watching the situation and understand the OPEB bonds very well.

There was a question as to whether the Board of Trustees had made any response to the May 15 Senate resolution on the Land Corp. It was stated that under Title 5, they are obligated to act on the resolution or give a reason in writing why they choose not to. It was recommended that we ask the Board to place this resolution in their agenda to provide a response. There was a recommendation that at the District Council meeting, we ask that this item be placed on the Board agenda for June 19. This is the prerogative of members of the District Council to make this recommendation. We should request that "response to the Land Corp resolution" be placed as an item on the Board agenda for June 19.

There was a question about the bond construction monies. A senator was concerned that of the \$42 million that the District borrowed, \$7 million will be used for the liability for the retiree health benefits, but that the other money will be used to finish the buildings at WVC. This senator was corrected with the following information: the District is taking the \$42 million that they have from the state which was allocated for construction to put into an account for retiree benefits and issuing the OPEB bond to pay for construction. The state has approved this use of funds. It was stated that to understand the District's use of money, one needs to track the movement of money very carefully.

There was another question about \$600,000 contribution to Fund 293 and a comment about 15% that was mentioned. It was stated the 15% was the figure cited for the amount that health premiums are expected to increase in the future which is much higher than the estimates that other Districts are using to calculate their retiree health benefits liability. In other words, there was concern expressed that the District is overestimating the amount that the District will owe for these benefits. The retiree group is working with the consultant regarding this concern.

The District budget plan for 08-09 includes a permanent reduction in MC operating budget of about \$500,000. There was a question as to where the cuts were going to be made. The total MC operating budget is only \$1.3 million. This is a cut of almost half the total budget. The College Budget Advisory Committee doesn't meet over the summer. It was stated that the college President has asked the Dean of Administrative Services to make the cuts in the budget. There was concern that these decisions are being made without faculty input. One faculty member expressed concern that her program's budget was cut without any consultation with her. The Land Corps balance of \$15 million was raised again as dwarfing this amount of \$500,000 which will devastate the college operations. Stephanie indicated that she could bring it up at the next Board meeting. There was concern that CBAC wasn't asked to meet over the summer to consult on these issues. A recommendation was made to invite President Robles to the next Senate meeting to discuss the current budget process and concerns. It was further recommended that we invite the College President and the Chancellor to attend senate meetings once a month, not at the same meetings to connect with the senates. It was also recommended that we invite community members to meetings to inform them of what is happening on campus. We should also invite Land Corp members including the chair Jack Lucas.

There was mention that the President Robles may be concerned that time is short and decisions need to be made, but it was pointed out that this issue of reduction in operating budgets has been on the Board agenda since March.

There was a question as to how to make faculty concerns about the budget public. It was recommended that the writer of the article in the Silicon Valley Journal on the District's fiscal problems be contacted. There was further discussion about why the current Board of the Land Corp consists of only the members of the Board of Trustees in spite of the fact that the original ByLaws required more members. Faculty have asked for the amended ByLaws that changed the original ByLaws from the Land Corp that indicate the change in the make, but have not yet received this documentation. It was recommended that faculty should recruit community members to run for the Board of Trustees. The senate asked Stephanie to ask President Robles and Dr. Negash for a copy of the plan and timeline and why the faculty were not involved in the decision-making process. Lydia Harris expressed that she is still a faculty member at Mission College and expressed that she felt the Senate was doing a fine job and stated her support for the senate.

One of the recommended items on the District budget plan includes reduction of faculty assignments. How will we be able to increase enrollment if faculty presence is reduced? There was frustration expressed that faculty are being asked to increase enrollment, but are not being given the tools to do so. There was concern that perhaps because of WVC geographical proximity to the District office, that WVC is having meetings and making plans about FSAs and other issues that may affect Mission without Mission's input. There was concern that there may be a plan to move counselors and librarians between the 2 campuses, but that nothing had been heard except hearsay.

Prepare for reassignments – how can we increase enrollment if we don't have enough faculty to teach the classes? – is there a plan to move counselors and librarians between campuses? If so, why hasn't this plan been discussed with faculty – senates have purview over institutional planning processes – these ideas have not been brought to shared governance bodies

It was stated that trying to do something now to increase enrollment is important, but we are already behind the Bauer curve. We should have been acting several years ago. So even if we act, we cannot catch up to other campuses. There are a number of actions faculty would take if they had the ability. They would offer lots of short courses in General Education. We could fill every section, but we couldn't staff them because of the dysfunctional funding situation. Years ago, DBAC and Land Corp should have been discussing where to fund the District where it could have the most impact. The fact is that you can increase enrollment, but only if you fund it. We just don't have the money. We can advertise Distance Learning as much as we like, but if we don't have funding to staff classes, we can't run the classes. This is what we should communicate to Land Corp. In addition to other monies they can provide, we need an immediate infusion of funds to offer high market-value classes. At graduation, over half of the students graduating were General Studies – completely different from a few years ago. Currently, General Education and Basic Skills are in high demand and our schedule doesn't reflect that. There was motion to extend discussion time which was approved. Perhaps we need to market these online classes, short-term and weekend classes on our home web page. We currently list not only our distance ed classes, but also WVC distance ed classes. WVC does not do the same for Mission on their home page. Perhaps we should ask them to do so. If you have the funding, you can market on MySpace and YouTube which is very effective. GE courses attract many students outside our service area, but we cannot register them. We could request that Mission have access to the same system of online enrollment that WVC is using. We should invite Penny Johnson, Peter Anning and Arlene Atondo to discuss marketing and matriculation to increase enrollment. If we have an advisory council, the first order of business should be to have seed money to increase enrollment. Peter Anning has requested Land Corp funds for marketing. Can we get

information on our growth/decline without including the HbA factor. Where are we growing and where are we shrinking in enrollment? We are in a state of diminishing returns. If we are given the money, we will get the students in the door. If we can get the automated process of registration. There was concern about Trustee Constantin's resolution regarding the accountability of the college's for HbA in that it asks a lot of accountability from faculty, but when faculty need help to increase enrollment, there isn't a lot of assistance provided.

Motion to create District Enrollment and Budget Task Force. Malchow/Beggs – passed.

recommended task force membership – Academic Senate Presidents, VPs of Instruction, College Presidents, VPs of Student Services, PGC Chairs, Marketing Directors, Division Chairs, ASB president, Classified Senate Presidents

These recommendations can be discussed with District Council and the details can be worked out there.

IX. New Business

a. Discuss Chancellor's Recommendation to Conduct a District Organizational Study (I/A) (30 minutes)

There was concern expressed that the process would be that the Chancellor would hire an organizational study firm; faculty, staff and administration would be interviewed; the firm would make recommendations and the recommendations would be instituted.

Since institutional planning processes are the Academic Senate's purview, we assert that any organizational review be lead by the Academic Senates. There was a recommendation that a formal objection be made that shared governance was circumvented by the District Master Plan firm selection process which is another component in institutional planning. Other points made:

1. doing an org plan is not timely during budget crisis
2. doing an org plan is an important and valued activity
3. why are you sending out an rfp if funding hasn't been identified?
4. how can an org study be conducted and recommendations be made if we don't yet know our budget for next year? If we use existing groups to collaboratively perform a study – incoming data can be integrated to the plan as it comes in
5. who is going to set the criteria for evaluation?
6. who is going to get the recommendations?
7. who is going to act on the recommendations?
8. how will the firm consider the MC master plan?
9. MC Master Plan should drive the District Master Plan
10. where is the funding coming from for this consultant?
11. how will the org plan fit with collective bargaining?
12. if we pay for an org study, won't we feel bound to accept the recommendations, regardless of their merit, after spending all that money?

Motion made to extend Hernas/Malchow – passed. Senators asked that Stephanie read the questions into the minutes of District Council.

b. Discuss and Consider Fall Academic Senate meeting time change (I/A) (10 minutes) – postponed to Sept meeting.

IX. Correspondence, Publications, & Announcements

X. Future Agenda Items

- A. Consider Approval of Operating Procedures for Study Abroad Programs**
- B. Discuss Intellectual Property Issues with ACE**
- C. Discuss Concerns Relative to Community Education (McAlister)**
- D. Discuss Issues re: Faculty Development (Kashima) (Fall 2008)**

XI. Adjournment

Respectfully submitted
Stephanie Kashima