

Ventura College Academic Senate
Minutes
Thursday, May 3th, 2018
3:30-5:00pm
Multidiscipline Center West (MCW) – 312

I. Call to Order at 3:39pm. The following senators were present:

Division: Visual Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences and Languages

Andrea Horigan (AH)--absent

Bill Hendricks (BH)--absent

Division: Health, Kinesiology, Athletics and Performing Arts

Brent Wilson (BW)--absent

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)--absent

Division: Career Education

Roxanne Forde (RF)

Laura Woyach (LW)

Heidi Dalton (HD)--absent

Deanna Hall (DH)

Division: Student Services

Paula Munoz (PM)

Angelica Gonzales (AG)

Dan Walsh (DW)

Curriculum Committee Liaison

Michael Bowen (MB)

Senate Executive Team

Lydia Morales (President) (LM)--absent

Philip Clinton (Vice-President) (PC)

Colleen Coffey (Secretary) (CC)

Stephanie Branca (Treasurer) (SB)

II. Public Comments (3 mins)

Public Comments Pursuant to the federal Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need any special accommodation or assistance to attend or participate in the meeting, please direct your written request, as far in advance of the meeting as possible, to Lydia Morales/Philip Clinton, 4667 Telegraph Road, Ventura CA, 93003.

Public comment about whether curriculum must always be written by faculty. Understanding is that if instruction is non-credit or not for credit (i.e. like community service classes used to be offered), then it can be written outside the faculty/curriculum committee process. **This will be a future agenda item.**

III. Acknowledgement of Guests: Phillip Briggs, Hugh O'Neill

Motion by PM to reorder the agenda (to allow Phillip Briggs to have his items addressed); 2nd by MB. Unanimous.

V. b. Approval of rubric re: "No SLO/No Dough" (Phillip): Motion to approve by CL; 2nd by KA. Discussion: None. Vote: unanimous.

V. c. Approval of "Making Recommendations" revisions (2nd Reading): Phillip reviews the changes to this document (so far) with the senators. Motion by PM not to approve; 2nd by Jaclyn. Discussion: PM raises concern that the 6 factors identified were designed by RP group to give students support; then the college adopted it. But the Academic Senate has its 10+1. Senate should retain its autonomy to evaluate its own work; we should not be measuring ourselves against these 6 factors—these are not relevant to the work of the senate. 10+1 is our guide. AG: Also has a concern, specifically about the subjectivity of this. Ex: individuals do not need to feel nurtured—the measurement should be against the committee's output. CL: Initially these points were under a different heading, not under the values. She would like to see the "track changes" of how these came to the governance committees' values. SB: Asks if the senators think it would be more relevant to identify 3 strengths/weaknesses of the committee—framing the questions that way instead of the subjective format set forth here? RF: She has seen similar things come down from the top level, and perhaps now it will not have immediate consequences, but it opens the door. She offers the example of SLOs—first, proffered as "just a way to help students." Now, money is held back if SLOs are not conformed to. LW: Asks what the purpose of this is? Is it to reveal committee dysfunction? PB: Overarching goal is to improve upon the way that our committees work. KA: She is wondering if these are the 6 factors that we want to represent our campus with? She recommends putting

this in context of whole document. PM: Reiterates that this discussion is not about other committees—it is about how the Academic Senate runs. There is a concern that the Academic Senate President (Lydia) was a part of this and yet senators were not (until now) made aware of that. She reiterates that the power is with us, not with a task force that will tell us how to evaluate ourselves. Vote: 12-1-1.

Motion by KA approve only the Making Recommendations Document Taskforce Update (page 1 and 2); 2nd by JW. Discussion: None.

Agenda item for fall to further discuss the Beacons of Success.

IV. Informational Items

- a. Guided Pathways Update (Colleen): Updates senators re: 4/27 meeting with speaker from Bakersfield College
- b. Great Teachers Seminar Update: 6 faculty members will attend, both f/t and p/t faculty.
- c. Faculty response to Disasters (Kammy): Updates senators re: an effort by faculty to write a clear policy re: how to proceed re: finals if something should happen during final exams. Specifically, the proposal is that in such an event, it is up to the faculty to decide how to proceed. AG: Asks if this is already outlined in the Ed Code? Her memory is that it is. CL: The division has proposed this and collected the signatures. Senate's job is now to prepare this as a formal statement/resolution; bring it back to the senate; and then Lydia can present to the BOT. SB & CMC: Bring up the efficacy of using the syllabus too to transmit the information from the Ed Code that empowers faculty. MB: Title V, section 51023, requires local governing boards to set policies/procedures re: academic freedom. Ours appears to be AP 4030—but ours is not very well done. Pasadena City College's AP 4030 has a very good example of how this should be done—it enumerates the specific freedoms that faculty have. **Resolution and a revision to the AP/BP--senate wants this to come back at first meeting of next year.**
- d. Senate end of the year social hour (5/10)--Cask at 4:30
- e. Senate award nominations—Joy Kobiashi will carry the mace.
- f. Senate end-of-year survey—PC asks all faculty to please complete the end of the year survey.

V. Action Items

- a. Approval minutes (4/19/18): Motion to approve GA; 2nd by CL. Discussion: senators request a handful of corrections which are made. Vote: All in favor except for 2 abstentions.

VI. Discussion Items

- a. Classified 9+1: Senators are VERY concerned about nos. 7, 8, and 9. **Senate executive council will investigate how these came into being and make a recommendation as to how this to be addressed.** In particular, the word "Curriculum" needs to be stricken from 7 and nos. 8 and 9 need to be removed entirely as these are absolutely within the *faculty* purview, not staff.
- b. Senate dues drive/treasurer update (Stephanie): SB appeals to senators to please

done.

c. Procedures to approve **new** academic programs (Michael): Wants to alert the senate to the fact that we have an issue in the development of degrees, certificates, etc. We sometimes have faculty who say they want to start a new program that requires things we don't have. So the program is approved at curriculum but then the BRC looks at it and says, no we can't do that. Mark Pauley has recommended that there be a budget review first, before faculty go to the trouble of working up a program and submitting it to the state. This summer they will attempt to consolidate these procedures. LW: She supports "3,000%" what the CC is doing very much; an excellent streamlining. AG: If you are trying to address forms and faculty not having to do two sets, she thinks that is good. But she is cautious for the fear that an administrator will say "Oh, we have no budget" (which can be subjective) and it can inhibit program development. She is uncomfortable a bit with how this inserts management into the curriculum process. She wonders if this is being addressed adequately? MB: Part of the problem is that the CC only has authority over the curriculum; they cannot sit down with faculty and make recommendations. On the other hand, the BRC is going to have its own process. He looks to the Senate to have oversight of the combined procedure they will try to work up this summer so that the concerns that AG has raised are adequately addressed. PM: She would think the form that Mark brought to CC would have come to the Senate for approval. She also asks for an example: Diesel Mechanics is brought up. DW: Asks if it can be left to faculty to decide between two processes: (i.e. "Yes, I want to see the resource request rubric/recommendation from BRC before I proceed," or "I want to skip that step and just move forward on curriculum.") CMC: Also sees value in what DW suggested—a two path process (one with budget, one without) that faculty could choose between before they embark on writing curriculum. **Curriculum Committee will bring their proposed "hybrid" process(es) for senate to review/revise/etc. early next year.**

VII. President's Report: This was submitted to senators in writing.

VIII. Senate Subcommittees/Task Forces/Work Groups Reports

a. Curriculum Committee updates (Michael): Backlog of courses has been dramatically reduced. Meeting this a.m. with Courseleaf, the software that will replace Curricunet sometime in early 2019. Senators are urged to submit curriculum now rather than waiting for the fall since there may be obstacles then as we transition to the new system.

VIII. Senate Subcommittees/Task Forces/Work Groups Reports

- a. Curriculum Committee updates (Michael)
- b. BRC (Stephanie)
- c. DE (Colleen)
- d. SSC (Philip)

IX. Announcements for the Good of the Order: SB shares with senators that we are signing this summer to adopt a piece of software that will check accessibility of all our Canvas courses. Just a heads up that this is coming.

Adjournment at 4:53pm.