

## **MCAS Shared Governance Report 11-24-08**

**NB: These are just my own notes, not official meeting minutes. If I have made errors, I will be happy to correct them. Sk**

### **Chancellor/Senate Roundtable 11-18-08**

The Chancellor indicated that Albert Moore, Tom Kesey and Patricia Stokke are putting together a communication plan for the results of the organizational review. Tentatively, the consultants' report will be sent to the Chancellor on or around Thanksgiving. The Chancellor and staff will review it for factual errors only (for example, the number of faculty we have in the district). The full report will then be sent out to shared governance committee heads and posted online by 5pm Dec. 1, Monday (tentative plan). It is expected that each shared governance committee will take the first 2 weeks in December to discuss the report and provide feedback to the shared governance committee chairs who will take all the feedback to GAP which will forward all the feedback to the District Council. The District Council, which is the highest participatory governance committee in the District and has representation from all the major constituencies, will discuss the report and all the feedback and make recommendations to various decision-makers on how to move forward.

I believe there will be at least 2 types of recommendations (some will be in both categories): budgetary and structural. Because the 09-10 budget begins its development phase in December at the level of District Budget Advisory Council, I am expecting that there will be discussions about the budgetary recommendations at that time. In December, January and the first half of Feb, the 09-10 tentative budget will be developed based on many factors: the consultants' report, feedback from participatory governance groups, District Budget Advisory Council recommendations, recommendations from the Office of Administrative Services and the recommendations of the Chancellor. The tentative budget will be brought to the Board for consideration for approval. The Board has a responsibility to create a balanced budget which means we will have to figure out how to deal with the \$9 million ongoing deficit between now and the end of Feb based on all the factors mentioned above. I highly recommend that if you have any concern about the budget development, you continue to check your email and even attend meetings in Dec and January in spite of the holiday break.

### **GAP 11-19-08**

There was a discussion on how to obtain feedback/comments/responses to the Organizational Study from the Brain Trust. The tentative schedule is:

- 12/1 (ish) the document is made available to district, WV, MC
- 12/9 (afternoon ish) the consultants will hold a 1.5 hour meeting here at MC for discussion
- 12/10 GAP meeting is a "welcome anyone" open forum to discuss
- 12/19 MC (aka Harriet/GAP) sends "official" response to Chancellor

My understanding is that each participatory governance group will be the recipient of feedback from their constituents, so, for example, faculty would send feedback through their Division Chair, or Academic Senate rep, or Union rep or all three and those groups would bring them to

GAP which would bring them to District Council. I have also been assured that everyone's input is valued and welcomed.

### **CBAC 11-19-08**

The college is required to tie budget and resource allocation to program review so CBAC has created a form which asks programs to request funds and also asks programs to indicate in the request the ways in which these requests are tied to college and district goals and other broad planning statements in addition to other factors such as number of students served and legal/health requirements. The form allows programs to express unique variables which may only affect their program or request. We are moving toward a zero-based budgeting process in which programs will eventually need to submit a request and explanation for their entire operating budget including personnel. We are doing away with roll-over budgeting. It is very difficult to rank requests from different programs. We have asked the Office of Administrative Services to bring back budget allocation models from colleges which were given full accreditation in 2008. For this Spring's process, CBAC is considering only requiring programs to request non-personnel funding. CBAC members are currently reviewing program review forms.

### **DBAC 11-19-08**

We still don't know if the state Chancellor's Office will grant us an extension for restoration. We expect a resolution of this in the next 2 weeks.

Consultants' tentative timeline:

Dec. 1, 5pm: report posted on web

Dec. 3 – District Council will discuss report

Dec. 9 – Mission College will hold a forum with consultants to discuss findings

End of Feb – balance budget for 09-10 due to board

Aside: there was some discussion about how the colleges around the state that have HbA are on notice now to get in compliance with state regs. There was further discussion on how just a few years ago, the issue was not HbA, but concurrent enrollment. Apparently, at that time, rather than fining each college according to the amount it had misreported to the state, the state Chancellor's office decided to average the fine and apply it to all colleges who had violated concurrent enrollment regulations at all. This meant that some colleges which had benefitted by millions of dollars were fined much less than that and some colleges which had only benefitted by a few thousand were fined much more than that. On the HbA issue, apparently, the decision was to fine the district which was first found to have violated the regs (us) and fine us a fraction of the amount by which we apparently benefitted.

This led me to ask why the State Chancellor's Office appears to continually be fining colleges across the state for regulatory violation. My belief is that there cannot be that many intentional cases of fraud going on and that there must be a systemic issue here. Why wouldn't the Chancellor's Office look at the regular cycle of fining colleges and, through introspection, arrive at some systemic solutions to these apparently systemic problems.

Dr. Hartley answered that the problem is that our State Chancellor's Office is not really the kind of state advocate that the UCs and CSUs have in their Board of Regents and State Chancellors' Offices. In the UC and CSU system, there is much more autonomy in decision-making and those who work for the State Chancellors' Offices are clear that they work for the UC or CSU

system. However, in the State Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, the employees see themselves as working for the state of California to protect the state from mismanagement of funds or other liabilities by the CCCs. This creates an antagonistic relationship that does not support harmony, but encourages a watchdog type of mentality. In my mind, this explains a lot about how we got to where we are now with our deficit.

### **Board Meeting 11-20-08**

West Valley College removed Hours by Arrangement from 250 Courses. There will be more to come at the Dec. 11 meeting and the meetings in March and in May. On Dec. 11, WVC will bring forward courses that reduced or modified their HbA (as opposed to removed). Some of the HbA are being replaced by scheduled lab classes, especially in English because they were judged to be beneficial to students.

There was a long discussion on defunded positions. The BOT wants all positions that the Executive Management Team moves from defunded to funded brought to the BOT for approval for funding. Angelica and I expressed that the critical analysis of administrative positions that are moving forward is not apparent to faculty and staff and that it appears there is a double standard for review – one for faculty and staff; another for administration. The Chancellor has indicated in the twice monthly Senate Roundtable meetings that a critical analysis has taken place and that there is no official movement forward such as calling for interviews. All actions regarding administrative recruitment are preliminary only and not binding.

I have been in discussions with Dr. Robles and Chancellor Hendrickson regarding the need to publicize our space availability for students. The Chancellor has been working diligently on this. Some of you may have seen his letter in the San Jose Mercury News a week or so ago. Further, he wrote an editorial for the Silicon Valley Business Journal last week (sent out to all users by Ruth Carlson). He also met with the editorial board of the SJMN last week. I recommended sending a letter of response to the SJMN in response to the 2 articles on the 10,000 students that will be sent away by the CSU system in the fall. The CSUs don't have room for more students and are encouraging eligible freshmen to take their 2 years of GE at a community college. Further, they are asking that transfer students complete all their GE at community college before transferring. Other Bay Area CCCs have also stated that they have limited space. At this point, we are the ONLY district in the area which is actively recruiting more students. I spoke with Ruth Carlson and she is planning a media event, possibly in conjunction with a CSU, to get the media to come and report on our open doors.

### **MCAS meeting 11-24-08**

There was a recommendation to administer a comprehensive student survey to improve student success and retention. The Title V Grant will be sponsoring the administration of just such a survey either this semester or next and student government input will be solicited on the creation of the survey. Daniel Peck is heading the project and we will be using the standard Noel-Levitz student satisfaction survey and adding some specific questions of our own.

### **Division Chair Council Meeting 11-24-08**

Flex Day 1/30/09 – proposed presentation by Division Chairs – “Past, present, & future”. There was a preference for the college direction to be expressed by the College President and Academic Senate Presidents (past/present). The Division Chair Council reviewed the Program Review form for Office of Instruction and collaboratively filled it in. Each Division Chair was

asked to submit their Division's process for assigning classes and rotating class assignments. There must be a consistent, clearly stated policy. Division Chairs need to make sure that faculty are not going over the 1.4 overload limit without going through the appropriate process. All FT faculty should be fully loaded before anyone is assigned overload. Seniority is not relevant except in cases of reduction in force. It is not relevant in class assignments and scheduling.

**Post Script:**

As a last note, I would like to thank all those who work so doggedly to complete their course and program Student Learning Outcomes statements and Assessment Plans. When I see the amount of time and energy that our faculty and staff are willing to devote to this college, I feel a great sense of hope about our future.

**Have a restful Thanksgiving!**