

Moorpark College
Academic Senate President's Report
BOT Meeting of September 11, 2012

My report covered four subjects:

- MC Academic Senate's decade-long tradition of not invited Chancellors or Trustees
- A recommendation to create a Policy relative to the hiring of Academic Consultants
- The Accreditation Report
- The District-wide Participatory Handbook (PGH)

Our Senate has not invited a Trustee for at least a decade. So it isn't that we aren't inviting "anymore;" it is that we just don't. Trustees have individually mentioned MC not inviting; it seemed best just to get the subject out in the open. My comments beyond that pertained to three of the Accreditation Recommendations: Formal Channels of Communication, Delineation of Functions and the Board as a Policy-making body. Even if Trustees are *perceived* as speaking against something already acted upon by the BOT or perceived as delving into the operations, we're working against ourselves.

Unlike other forms of hiring, VCCCD seems to have neither policy nor procedure regarding the hiring of Consultants. For two years now the district has committed to hiring a consultant to serve on the Academic/Instructional side of the house. How are these decisions made? Are these consultants necessary? Is this a burgeoning tradition of spending \$40k every Fall? My recommendation is the two-in-a-row hiring of a Consultant trigger an audit of need. A BP/AP on hiring consultants is for transparency of process, which we currently lack. The audit you mentioned pertained to my suggestion for a Board Policy, not in support of a Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

The Accreditation Report has been developed in a remarkable collaborative manner, which is in stark contrast to the previous accreditation report. The draft, which was on the BOT agenda last night, still had to corrections and inclusions needs, but on the whole is accurate. It has been sent out to the campuses for comment. As a Senate President whose signature is required, I have no problem signing. Remember last time we had about one week to respond to the report and no involvement in creating it.

In regard to the PGH, it is about to be launched and is lumbering along, while not perfect, it too was an inclusive process that involved public forums, 5-6 months of work and vetting. My hope here is not only that we review the document at the end of this year for efficacy but also the collaboration required in this long-overdue review continues as it did with the accreditation report. I am happy--in a weird way--to say in the accreditation report that we actually had enough time to agendize the district wide PGH over a dozen times.