

**Ventura College Academic Senate
Minutes
Thursday, September 21, 2017
3:30-5:00pm
Multidiscipline Center West (MCW) – 312**

I. Call to Order at 3:32pm. The following senators were present:

Division: Visual Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences and Languages

Andrea Horigan (AH)

Bill Hendricks (BH)

Division: Health, Kinesiology, Athletics and Performing Arts

Brent Wilson (BW)--*absent*

Terry Morris (TM)--*absent*

Division: Sciences

Kammy Algiers (KA)

Malia Rose-Seisa (MRS)--*absent*

Cari Lange (CL)--*absent*

Erin Brocker (EB)--*absent*

Division: English, Math & Learning Resources

Gabe Arquilevich (GA)

Chris Frederick (CF)

Jaclyn Walker (JW)

Donna Beatty (DB)

Division: Career Education

Joanna Capazzi (JC)

Laura Woyach (LW)

Heidi Dalton (HD)

Deanna Hall (DH)--*absent*

Division: Student Services

Paula Munoz (PM)

Angelica Gonzales (AG)--*absent*

Curriculum Committee Liaison

Michael Bowen (MB)

Senate Executive Team

Lydia Morales (President) (LM)

Philip Clinton (Vice-President) (PC)

Colleen Coffey (Secretary) (CC)

Stephanie Branca (Treasurer) (SB)

II. Public Comments (3 mins)--None.

III. Acknowledgement of Guests: Dave Keebler; P. Scott Corbett; Peter Sezzi; Rick Trevino; Eric Martinsen; Heather Aguilar; Chloe Branciforte

Agenda was reordered so that Dr. Keebler could present first.

V. Informational Items

a. President David Keebler (10 min.) --This was moved to first. He first thanks senate for their work. He talks a bit about some of the challenges facing the college this year and about the challenges of his particular position. Talks about how systemic change needs the whole community and he is committed to systemic change for the college. He knows this can be difficult. He urges senators to keep the dialogue going. BH: What about the contract though? You (Keebler) say to keep the conversation going, but why do we have no contact still? Reply: He is as disappointed as anyone that contract is not resolved. BH: Can't someone like you get involved and nudge those conversations? Reply: Yes, we do. But again, he (Keebler) does not have any authority in negotiations. KA: Question about processes: with senate sometimes there are topics we discuss. She does not know the exact process after that. How does he see those items as getting into the bigger stream? Reply: Only two agents in curriculum: the academic senate, and the BOT. There is nothing (administrators) do except support that. LM: About communication and sharing: one of the big takeaways from the retreat last Friday is how many great things are happening in silos and she is still trying to wrap her head around how we communicate more effectively. Reply: We do have our governance processes but that is formal. Acknowledges that we have communications challenges—trying to address this very challenging issue. Shares about the "library" atmosphere at the district, whereas on campus everything tends to be more convivial. PM: Re: Master Plan: Is that still in draft form? Reply: No, not a draft--it is set. We are looking at the first 3-year implementation plan. SB: Could you share with us briefly the marketing plan that is being used to advertise the spring schedule? Reply: Acknowledges that we have stumbled over marketing the last 3 years. We now have Patti Blair who will be heading up a district-wide marketing plan, then the college will supplement that. But we are in formative stage of that plan.

b. AFT Update (Peter Sezzi, Chief Negotiator) (5 min.) --Updates senators about state of negotiations. Faculty are encouraged to attend the BOT meeting on Tues. 10/17.

c. Presentation on Senate Budget (10 min.) --Update from Senate Treasurer. SB hands out a sheet to senators re: senate funds. This is preliminary informational item. This report will be updated again at a future meeting. This is to present sources of funds and to show historically how they have

been used/spent. KA asks about account 5242 and whether that \$5,000 must be used on Great Teachers Seminar (i.e. could it be used on a different kind of pedagogical seminar besides this week-long residential seminar?). **SB will find out the answer to this.** KA: Asks about account 5241 who is using these funds? Where are they going? Is this something that is really benefitting the whole campus? PC: Replies that this sub-committee does prioritize applications based on when was the last time people had requested funds. A lot of people get partially funded with these monies; very few are fully funded. Senators discuss this process. PC: We could request a copy of the applications and then use the accounting that SB has to establish who is receiving funds for what purpose. PM: Sees value in having this information available. This could be used to justify additional travel/professional development funds. DB: Suggests tracking how much was unfunded for faculty travel, rather than tracking what was. This could justify additional allotment of monies. Senators concur.

IV. President's Report –had to be moved here since agenda was re-ordered. **LM will be sure that student housing makes its way onto the next agenda.** Re: Friday's retreat: the communication breakdown was really an obvious issue that kept coming up again and again. She will use her President's Report to try and pass on as much information as she can. Dave Keebler had agreed to give "allusers" email access to 4 more faculty. Then he backed out on that. LM has been doing a lot of work to figure out a good process because senate does not want her to be the secretary for the college. Initially VPs had said they would take this on, and then when LM started sending things to the VPs, now they don't want to do it. The latest: Laura, Sebastian or Blair can post on the portal or in the master calendar. Senators object to this: on the portal doesn't do anything—can't find anything on there. **EM: Suggests an all faculty Canvas page. Then faculty could choose what notifications they wanted. Senators like this idea.**

LM was asked to remind faculty to fill-out BIT reports when needed. There is funding from the State Chancellor's office for a hunger-free campus. Some of the ideas: we host a food pantry (we do have one but it is only 1 day per week). We also had CalFresh on campus hope to get it back. Difficulty of communicating brought up again. Re: the TV on 2nd floor of MCE: senators like the TV advertising idea but the difficulty is that there is no consistency—some kiosks are run by Rhonda, others by Bus. Dept. There is no obvious solution but all agree this is an issue that must be addressed.

Also state funding available for Dreamer students. We also have the CA Comm College completion grant. This is money that students can get but they have to be enrolled in 15 units. LM says we need to connect that to Equity monies so that students are sure to have the support they need to succeed in 15 units. BH: How many Dreamers do we have? Reply: 420ish.

At the district there is much discussion of the allocation model. BOT has had the District Strategic Plan on its agenda several times. She hopes we'll get to that today (item VI (d)). Start date of 8/20 for next fall has been put forth but it has not been formalized yet.

District sent out their response to the ACCJC (they were out of compliance). VC ASAG is also preparing its response to issue of SLOs/SUOs. Common Assessment Initiative is looking for people if anyone wants to be involved. Area C meeting is at MC this year on 10/14 if anyone wants to attend.

LM will also attend the Plenary 11/2-4. ASCCC has the intention of sponsoring part-time faculty to attend one of the statewide senate plenary sessions. They have asked us to submit a name if there is a p/t faculty on our campus who wants to attend. While it is too late for the coming Nov. session, we can submit names for remaining plenary sessions this year.

V. Action Items

a. Approval minutes (9/21/2017) (2 min.) --Motion JW; 2nd by GA. Discussion: None. Approval: all in favor, one abstains.

b. Integrated Student Success Plan (1st reading) (10 min.) --PC: Motion to disapprove and send back to the Student Success Committee to add more details highlighting the positive things we are doing campus-wide. JW seconds. Discussion: Senators discuss the lack of specifics in this plan. CMC asks why the language here is so general and not specific. PC: The fear (he thinks) was that if specific things were called out then it would give the appearance that monies were only going there. PM: We would told it was supposed to be broad. So that is what was put together. RT: ISSP is not a prescriptive document. KA: As senators (faculty) we want what we are doing to be in there, otherwise this can be used to justify just any sort of activity they want to do. Senators concur. SB: Language needs to be more than a goal, with a plan, steps to get there. She agrees with KA that without that specificity, she has a hard time approving this. JW: This could be any "Joe Schmo" college—really generic. Doesn't at all call out the great things that we are doing. HA: She is part of this committee and they started with something very different. Senators discuss this further. There is a lot of concern about how vague this is and watered down. KA: Asks what our options are? Reply: Motion to not approve as to first reading. AH: Her comment is going back to "if we say we do not approve", it is going to go anyway? We seem to have little impact on these things whether we sign them as not. RT: Whether certain things should be specifically listed? Misconception was that if specific things were called out, then other things would not be funded. KA: So what we have here is based on a misconception? That is not good. Vote on the motion to disapprove and send back to the SSC: unanimously approved.

VI. Discussion Items

a. ASCCC on AB 705 (10 min.) --LM begins by updating senators as to why the ASCCC has "reluctantly" taken the position of opposing this bill and writing to the governor urging him not to sign it. Our senate can decide whether we support this [opposition] to the bill, or if we support this bill as is. GA: Asks about how this connects to pre-requisites. LM: With this new bill, they are requiring an element of data that seems to negate the ability of colleges to utilize rigorous content review as regulation currently allow to help students be successful. EM: Talks about the multiple measures assessment project and the data that it generated (specifically, complete high school records). PM: Some of us do not support this because there is a student success scorecard in place. When you look at our Ventura County data, most of our students are coming under-prepared. This is an effort to get rid of our remedial classes. This is a social justice issue. Our students don't have a lot of support and now we're removing supports. EM: Agrees it is a social justice issue. Motion by MB to support ASCCC opposition to AB 705; 2nd by PM. GA: Whole philosophy of remediation has back-fired. He wants to have a meeting with counselors, EAC, ESL, to discuss this. Question: what do we do with students not ready to start to English 2? He thinks the most at-risk students are being served by what this bill is putting in place. Vote: 7-1-9. This discussion was cut short due to time. There is much disagreement and many questions remain surrounding this issue (as evidenced by the fact that a majority of the senate abstained from taking a position). *Postscript: This motion invalid due to this item being a discussion item, rather than an action item.*

Meeting adjourned at 5:06pm.

- b. ASCCC Appointment to Common Assessment Work Group (3 min.)
- c. Resolution Re: Productivity and Course Archiving/Deletion (10 min.)
- d. District Strategic Goals and Objective (3 min.)

VIII. Senate Subcommittees/Task Forces/Work Groups Reports

a. Curriculum Committee updates (5 min)

IX. Campus Committees Reports

X. Announcements for the Good of the Order

XI. Requests for Future Agenda Items

XII. Adjournment