

Ventura College Academic Senate  
Minutes  
Thursday, January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2017  
3:30-5:00pm  
Multidiscipline Center West (MCW) – 312

I. Call to Order at 3:35. The following senators were present:

**Division: Visual Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences and Languages**

Andrea Horigan (AH)

Bill Hendricks (BH)--*absent*

**Division: Health, Kinesiology, Athletics and Performing Arts**

Brent Wilson (BW)

Terry Morris (TM)--*absent*

**Division: Sciences**

Kammy Algiers (KA)

Malia Rose-Seisa (MRS)

Cari Lange (CL)

Erin Brocker (EB)--*absent*

**Division: English, Math & Learning Resources**

Gabe Arquilevich (GA)

Chris Frederick (CF)

Jaclyn Walker (JW)

Donna Beatty (DB)

**Division: Career Education**

Roxanne Forde (RF)

Laura Woyach (LW)--*absent*

Heidi Dalton (HD)--*absent*

Deanna Hall (DH)

**Division: Student Services**

Paula Munoz (PM)

Angelica Gonzales (AG)

## **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

AH expressed her dissatisfaction about working without a contract.

## III. Acknowledgement of Guests --none.

## IV. Informational Items

a. Facilities Master Plan Susan Royer --*Moved to February 2<sup>nd</sup>*

b. Suggestions for debriefing and improving our handling of emergencies from faculty prospective: Senators discuss the Thomas Fire and its aftermath as it affected the campus. Issues of chain of command following disaster, communication (or lack thereof), and general preparedness (or lack thereof) are discussed. Also discussed are the absence of emergency buttons that work and cell service in building elevators across campus. SB relates the story of a faculty member who was trapped in an elevator the night the fire broke out and was only found because a cleaning crew heard her and summoned help. LM relates that she discussed with the president the need to work to improve our emergencies operations. President promises to have a campus wide forum during the second week of February to solicit feedback on procedures. Senate decided to wait and bring their concerns/suggestions to that forum. PC states that it was very unfair that we gave finals on Monday, some on Tuesday, and then cancelled the rest—too much confusion and inconsistency. AH: In the breakdown of communications it became clear that the college president did not have an obvious "wingman" to pick off where he necessarily had to leave off (because of his own personal loss during the fire). This should be addressed. LM will bring these concerns forward.

c. Faculty Staffing Priorities Committee: LM briefs senators on the status of this committee and what needs to be done in the next month. We need 7 members for this committee (plus the senate executive committee). 3 members will be from the senate and 4 are at large. LM will send out a call for at large members. Brent Wilson, Roxanne Forde, Kammy Algiers will serve from senate. KA suggests that once the committee itself is established we communicate by email to review/revise the rubric.

## V. Action Items

a. Approval minutes (11/2/2017) (11/16/17) (2 mins): Motion to approve by MB; 2<sup>nd</sup> by BW. Discussion: None. Vote: 3 abstentions, otherwise all in favor.

b. Guided Pathways (1<sup>st</sup> Reading): LM gives an overview to the senators re: the principles of the GP model. Comments: AH remarks that the timing of this is not good—it comes at a time when faculty are feeling particularly frustrated and undervalued; now here is yet another project that we should put our energy and expertise behind. She does not favor moving forward on this. Other senators concur with this perspective. They are not opposed to the GP project on principle (although some express skepticism). Rather, the timing of this is the issue. LM says that she believes that this will go forward with or without senate's buy-in. But not getting on board has the potential to really affect our funding going forward under the most recent allocation model proposed by the governor last week.

SB: This new (proposed) allocation model came up in BRC yesterday. Peter Sezzi made a comment in that meeting that this new model is a long way from being implemented (i.e. we should not be making decisions based on this). Senators seem to concur with this perspective.

DB: How can we ensure that these monies would actually flow to faculty (and not end up like COLA in the pockets of the district)? Senators briefly discuss this.

PM: She does not believe we have the support services or programs in place to move students through at the pace they are contemplating in this GP model. Moreover, we do not have campus-level accountability for 3SP or Equity monies (i.e. we have no way to guarantee that the GP monies would flow to the faculty who put their energies into this). She expresses mistrust in the systems we have to handle these kinds of funds. RF adds onto PM's comments by remarking on the Strong Workforce monies. In that case administrators made all the decisions about how to spend those dollars. None of the monies flowed to faculty or directly to programs. Faculty from CTE were not included in these discussions. Senators briefly discuss this. KA: Regardless of how we vote we should put in writing a paragraph of why we are acting in the manner we do. LM: agrees with senators' perspective and expresses understanding of their frustration but wants to make one last pitch for senators to get on board with this idea. DB: Does LM see ramifications of voting no? LM: Yes, this will go forward and we won't be at the table and won't get any of the money for faculty release time, etc. Faculty cannot make any demands about how these monies are spent (assuming we even receive them) if we do not support this. She expresses understanding of the senators' skepticism about the campus allocation system (i.e. the Strong Workforce, 3SP monies, etc.).

GA: Asks about MC and OC? Answer: they both signed off. Asks how this could go forward without faculty inasmuch as the curriculum will need to be updated and they will need faculty to do that work? He would want to see in writing that a faculty body will be in charge of how monies are spent. SB: Point of clarification: is it that we are voting whether we believe or do not believe in this concept? Or are we voting whether we want to undertake the work related to implementing this? Answer: We are not making a statement about the value of GP either way. Rather, the senators feel that the timing of this proposal is terrible. They do not want to further discuss or take any action on GP at this time.

PM: Motion NOT to sign off on the Guided Pathways action plan; 2<sup>nd</sup> by RF. Vote: 8 in favor; 1 opposed; 7 abstain.

c. CTE Liaison position: KA motion to approve; AH 2<sup>nd</sup>. Vote: Unanimous.

d. Accreditation Steering Accreditation Group Response to ACCJC: Motion to approve by MB; 2<sup>nd</sup> by GA. Vote: 1 abstention and all others in favor.

#### VI. Discussion Items

a. AP 7120-Recruitment and Hiring: Part-Time Faculty: LM gives senators the background on this issue. Senators briefly discuss this. Some concern that this might be relied upon too much by deans to fill jobs (as opposed to taking the trouble to interview/hire the best candidates). JW: Asks what is in the best interests of part-time faculty? If this will make their life easier, we should support it. DB points out that when we get a full-time position here the other two colleges get the first opportunity to apply (as transfers). Couldn't we create the same kind of system for part-time transfers between campuses? PC: He is skeptical of the district's ability/willingness to support these decisions as they would need to. LM: Getting the sense that senators don't see this as a good idea. We have been asked only to provide feedback. She will carry this forward.

b. AP 3420 Equal Employment Opportunity Plan: If senators have comments or questions about this plan, please send to LM or PM (they are both on the DCHR). Not time to discuss otherwise at this time.

c. All faculty announcements:

VII. President's Report: LM has met with Dr. Gillespie several times now since our last meeting. She says all three senate presidents have expressed to him how hard it is to get initiatives through the senates because of the current climate of faculty feeling very frustrated and undervalued. New district-wide career education committee and Dr. Gillespie wants to add at least 3 faculty to that. LM suggests adding the CTE Liaison to it. The Vice Chancellor of BS (David El Fattal) will be conducting a cost-benefit analysis of a compressed calendar. Re: KA's previous question about being able to see campus rooms available (as opposed to having to go through the deans' offices): LM will send a link to all faculty so they can do this (caveat: you have to do this search while you are on campus). AP/BP 7211 Equivalency: DCHR wants us to come up with a compromise. She took some of the suggestions she heard in this body and has a proposed compromise for the senate to consider. She will send this out in the next package (for 2/1). CL asks that this be sent out in plenty of time because many people in her area want to see this. Re: Sabbaticals: Other two colleges are very surprised that we rank all the sabbatical requests and send them all forward. Senators briefly discuss this.

*Meeting adjourned at 5:03pm. Remaining items were not discussed.*

#### VIII. Senate Subcommittees/Task Forces/Work Groups Reports

IX. Campus Committees Reports. Curriculum Committee updates (5 mins)

X. Announcements for the Good of the Order

XI. Requests for Future Agenda Items

XII. Adjournment